

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
SCOPING.....	3
MATTERS SCOPED OUT OF DETAILED CONSIDERATION.....	5
Landscape and Visual Amenity	6
Ecology	6
Ornithology.....	7
Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils	7
Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	7
Site Access, Traffic and Transport.....	7
Noise.....	7
Socio-economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use	8
Air Quality	8
Television Reception.....	8
Shadow Flicker.....	8
Decommissioning.....	8
POST SCOPING (PRE GATECHECK) CONSULTATION	9
NatureScot.....	9
Perth and Kinross Council / Transport Scotland	10
Historic Environment Scotland	10
Clackmannanshire Council.....	11
Stirling Council.....	11
GATECHECK AND FURTHER CONSULTATION	12
NatureScot.....	12
Clackmannanshire Council.....	13
SEPA.....	13
Historic Environment Scotland	13
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	14
REFERENCES	15

TABLES

Table 6-1: Scoping Consultees (Responses)	3
Table 6-2: Scoping Consultees (No Responses)	4

APPENDICES

Technical Appendix 6.1: Scoping Response Table	
--	--

Introduction

- 6.1 This Chapter sets out the Scoping process that has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed development. It also details additional consultation that has been undertaken in respect of the proposed development with consultees.
- 6.2 The purpose of scoping and consultation is to:
- ensure that statutory consultees and other bodies with a particular interest in the environment are informed of the proposed development and provided with an opportunity to comment at an early stage in the EIA process;
 - obtain baseline information regarding existing environmental site conditions;
 - establish key environmental issues and identify potential effects to be considered during the EIA;
 - identify those issues which are likely to give rise to significant environmental effects and therefore which require more detailed study and those which can be justifiably excluded from further assessment;
 - provide focus to the EIA process so that assessment is focussed in areas where there is likely to be significant effects; and
 - provide a means of confirming the most appropriate methods of assessment.

Scoping

- 6.3 A Scoping Report (available from the Energy Consents Unit (ECU) Portal¹) was submitted to the ECU on 23 March 2023 to accompany a request for the Scottish Ministers to adopt a Scoping Opinion under Regulation 12 of The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.
- 6.4 The list of organisations consulted that responded and the date of the response is shown in **Table 6-1**.

Table 6-1: Scoping Consultees (Responses)

Consultee	Scoping Response Date
Clackmannanshire Council	28/04/2023
Perth and Kinross Council	19/05/2023
Fife Council	16/05/2023
Stirling Council	21/04/2023
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	26/05/2023
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	01/05/2023
NatureScot	10/05/2023
Transport Scotland	25/05/2023

¹ Reference Number ECU00004782 on the Energy Consents Unit ECU Portal

Consultee	Scoping Response Date
RSPB Scotland	10/04/2023
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	04/05/2023
NATS Safeguarding	21/04/2023
Scottish Forestry	24/04/2023
Scottish Water	09/05/2023
Scottish Wildlife Trust	23/04/2023
Aberdeen Airport	03/04/2023
British Telecom (BT)	11/04/2023
Blackford Community Council	04/05/2023
Dunblane Community Council	24/04/2023
Menstrie Community Council	18/04/2023
Edinburgh Airport	10/04/2023
Friends of the Ochils	21/04/2023
Glasgow Airport	19/04/2023
Glasgow Prestwick Airport	31/03/2023
Highlands and Islands Airport Limited	25/04/2023
Joint Radio Company	31/03/2023
Mobile Broadband Network Limited	06/04/2023
OfCom	31/03/2023
Office for Nuclear Regulation	04/04/2023
ScotWays	24/04/2023
Telefonica	31/03/2023
Vodafone	12/04/2023

6.5 The list of organisations consulted that did not respond are shown in **Table 6-2**.

Table 6-2: Scoping Consultees (No Response)

Consultee
Falkirk Council
Airwave Solutions Ltd
Atkins
British Horse Society
Civil Aviation Authority – Airspace
Alva Community Council
Tillicoultry, Coalsnaughton & Devonside Community Council
Sauchie & Fishcross Community Council

Consultee
Braco & Greenloaning Community Council
Auchterarder & District Community Council
Muthill & Tullibardine Community Council
Crown Estate Scotland
Fisheries Management Scotland
Forth Rivers Fisheries Trust
Forth District Salmon Fisheries Board
John Muir Trust
Mountaineering Scotland
Oban Airport
Scottish Wild Land Group
Visit Scotland

- 6.6 A Scoping Opinion was received from the ECU on 07 June 2023 and included advice from the consultees listed in **Table 6-1**.
- 6.7 A summary of the key issues raised at Scoping is provided in **Technical Appendix 6.1**. The Scoping Opinion (and relevant consultee Scoping responses) is detailed in the consultation tables contained within each EIA Report **Chapters 7 to 14**, with reference to how the comments have been addressed. The EIA Report has been prepared based on the Scoping Opinion (as per Reg 5(3) of the EIA Regulations) received from the ECU on 07 June 2023 and has had regard to subsequent consultation held with consultees and the ECU.

Matters Scoped out of Detailed Consideration

- 6.8 Paragraph 76 of Circular 1/2017² is clear that it is the ‘significant’ environmental effects to which a proposed development is likely to give rise that should be the primary focus of the EIA Report and that the requirement “*is to include the information that may reasonably be required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the project on the environment*”. Other lesser impacts may need “*only brief treatment to indicate that their possible relevance has been considered*”. Although Circular 1/2017 is referring to The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017, it is equally applicable to the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.
- 6.9 Paragraph 3.1 of PAN 1/2013³ similarly outlines that EIAs should be proportionate and fit for purpose. “*Proportionality can best be achieved by seeking information from the planning authority and the Consultation Bodies on the scope of the assessment, paying*

² Guidance on The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

³ Guidance on the integration of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedures into the overall development management process

attention to their views from the outset, and by focussing on the significant environmental effects of the proposed development". A similar emphasis is contained at paragraph 5.4 of PAN 1/2013 that outlines that the EIA Report should contain a clear analysis of the significant areas of impact and should highlight key issues relevant to the decision.

- 6.10 On the basis of the desk based and survey work undertaken, the professional judgement of the EIA team, experience from other relevant projects, policy guidance or standards, and with the agreement of the consultees, a number of topic areas have been 'scoped out'. The following main issues have been scoped out of the EIA:

Landscape and Visual Amenity

- 6.11 The following Landscape Character Types (LCTs) within the study area have been scoped out, due to limited theoretical visibility:
- Lowland Basins (390);
 - Lowland Hills and Valleys (186);
 - Coastal Flats – Fife (196);
 - Hill Slopes (183); and
 - Coastal Hills – Fife (192).
- 6.12 The following Designated Landscapes within the study area have been scoped out, due to limited theoretical visibility:
- 'Upper Strathearn' Local Landscape Area;
 - 'The Forest' Special Landscape Area;
 - 'Southern Hills' Local Landscape Area; and
 - 'Cleish Hills' Local Landscape Area (see **Table 7-1** of Chapter 7).
- 6.13 Given that there are no residential properties within 2.5km of the proposed turbines, a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) will not be carried out as part of the LVIA.
- 6.14 Due to the distance (approximately 30km) from the site, to the nearest WLA, Ben More-Ben Ledi WLA, effects on Wild Land are scoped out.
- 6.15 Routes and settlements with limited theoretical visibility and/or beyond 15km from the site, where the potential for significant visual and sequential effects is limited, have been scoped out.
- 6.16 Landscape and visual receptors in the cumulative LVIA where the potential for significant cumulative landscape and visual effects is limited, have been scoped out.

Ecology

- 6.17 Wild deer are not considered to be present in significant numbers, therefore a draft deer management statement, which is needed where significant impacts on deer are possible, has been scoped out.
- 6.18 No Black Grouse have been recorded on site during dedicated lek surveys or any other surveys on site. In addition to this the site has poor potential for Black Grouse leks, with open ground available but no cover from forest or scrub nearby. Therefore, Black Grouse surveys have been scoped out.

Ornithology

- 6.19 Due to the lack of recorded activity at the site by the qualifying species of nearby designated sites, impacts on designated sites has been scoped out.
- 6.20 Effects on species which have below a 'Local' geographic level of importance have been scoped out.
- 6.21 As specified in current SNH (2017) guidance, impacts on species groups such as passerines (songbirds) which are not considered vulnerable to significant effects from wind farm developments, have been scoped out.

Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils

- 6.22 Effects on geology have been scoped out, as while there will be effects arising from rock extraction for borrow pits, track construction and for turbine and crane pad areas, these are limited in area and do not extend beyond the immediate development footprint. No particularly sensitive geological features have been identified within the study area.
- 6.23 Detailed Flood Risk Assessment has been scoped out as published mapping confirms that the site is not located in an area of fluvial or coastal flood risk.
- 6.24 Water quality monitoring has been scoped out. Classification data is available from SEPA for the watercourses at site and there are no known sources of potential water pollution at the site that might give rise for the need for water quality monitoring.
- 6.25 Quantitative hydrological and/or hydrogeological modelling of surface and groundwater flows and quality to potential receptors have been scoped out.

Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

- 6.26 Category B Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas located in excess of 5km from the proposed turbines have been scoped out.
- 6.27 Indirect and cumulative effects on Category C Listed Buildings have been scoped out.

Site Access, Traffic and Transport

- 6.28 Operational effects of the proposed development are scoped out.

Noise

- 6.29 A stand alone chapter within the EIA Report on operational noise from the proposed turbines is scoped out (due to distance between proposed turbines and habitable residential properties). It is instead proposed to update the simplified ETSU-R-97 assessment with the finalised turbine layout and provide a summary within the 'Other Issues' chapter of the EIA Report.
- 6.30 Operational vibration has been scoped out (due to distance between proposed turbines and habitable residential properties).
- 6.31 Infrasound and low frequency noise have been scoped out due to distance between proposed turbines and habitable residential properties).

- 6.32 Construction noise and vibration impacts, including that from construction vehicles, have been scoped out due to distance between proposed turbines and habitable residential properties).

Socio-economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use

- 6.33 Recreational activities outwith the site, other than those within the wider context of the hillwalking within the Ochil hills, are scoped out unless they are promoted regionally/nationally and are therefore likely to draw in visitors from outside the area.
- 6.34 Land use effects during the operational phase are scoped out, as the operation of the wind farm would have minimal effect on current grazing or recreational uses.

Air Quality

- 6.35 Consideration will be given within the Ecology and Hydrology & Soils Chapters to the potential impacts that dust generation could have on any identified sensitive ecological or hydrological receptors. If required, detailed mitigation measures will be proposed within these EIA Report Chapters. Otherwise air quality is scoped out of the EIA.

Television Reception

- 6.36 The proposed development is located in an area, which is served by a digital transmitter and is unlikely to be affected by the proposed development as digital signals are rarely affected. In the unlikely event that television signals are affected by the proposed development, mitigation measures will be considered by the applicant. Television reception is therefore scoped out of the EIA.

Shadow Flicker

- 6.37 As no properties are located within the zone of influence (10 x rotor diameter) of the proposed turbine locations, shadow flicker has been scoped out of the EIA.

Decommissioning

- 6.38 Over the period of operation of the wind farm it is recognised that there are likely to be changes in legislation and guidance, environmental designations, the status/condition of sensitive environmental receptors and stakeholder objectives that may affect decommissioning and restoration methodologies.
- 6.39 At the end of its operational life, the proposed development would be decommissioned (see **Chapter 3, Table 3-5**, for further detail on decommissioning requirements for infrastructure) or an application may be submitted to repower the site. The decommissioning period would take up to a year. A detailed Decommission and Restoration Plan (DRP) would be agreed with Clackmannanshire Council, Perth and Kinross Council, and other appropriate regulatory authorities in line with best practice guidance and requirements of the time; and
- 6.40 With this in mind, detailed assessment of the decommissioning of the proposed development has been scoped out of this EIA as, at this stage, the future baseline conditions cannot be predicted accurately and both the proposals for refurbishment / decommissioning and the future regulatory context are unknown.

Post Scoping (Pre Gatecheck) Consultation

- 6.41 In addition to the formal scoping process, further consultation (post Scoping but pre Gatecheck Report) was undertaken with a number of organisations regarding specific issues. In particular, follow up consultation was undertaken with:
- NatureScot;
 - Perth and Kinross Council;
 - Transport Scotland;
 - Historic Environment Scotland; and
 - Clackmannanshire Council.
- 6.42 Detail of the consultation carried out is provided in the relevant technical Chapters (EIA Report **Chapter 7 to 14**), however a summary is provided below.

NatureScot

Landscape and Visual

- 6.43 In their scoping response, received in May 2023, NatureScot requested a number of additional viewpoint locations to be included in the LVIA as follows:
- Cowie Road at Easter Greenyards;
 - Chartershall Road;
 - Stirling Castle esplanade
 - Kersebonny Road;
 - A811 near Gargunnock;
 - Stirling County Cricket Club ground;
 - Alva Glen walk; and
 - Cleish Hills.
- 6.44 In addition to these viewpoint requests, NatureScot also requested additional supporting wirelines to be included in the LVIA to represent views from nearby settlements and sequential views experienced from the M9/A9 corridor.
- 6.45 LUC reviewed the additional viewpoint requests and carried out email correspondence with NatureScot to provide clarification on which additional viewpoint requests would be taken forward into the LVIA and justification for requests not taken forward based on theoretical visibility. It was agreed with NatureScot that a viewpoint from Cowie Road at Easter Greenyards, Chartershall Road and A811 near Gargunnock was taken forward for detailed assessment in the LVIA. It was also agreed with NatureScot that the remaining requested locations were not taken forward for detailed assessment due to limited theoretical visibility, but that supporting wirelines from these locations were provided instead, with exception of Alva Glen walk where it was agreed that a wireline was not required due to very limited theoretical visibility. Additional supporting wirelines are provided as part of the visualisation package in Volume 3c.

- 6.46 It was also agreed that additional supporting wirelines were provided from nearby settlements and the M9/A9 corridor, as presented in the visualisation package in Volume 3c.

Ecology

- 6.47 In addition to the formal scoping process, further consultation was undertaken with NatureScot to discuss potential opportunities for peatland restoration and biodiversity opportunities at the site and in the surrounding area.
- 6.48 A meeting was held on 8 December 2023 between SLR and NatureScot, during which Craig Leith and Myreton SSSI and Alva Moss candidate Local Nature Conservation Site were discussed. Specifically, whether proposed habitat restoration and enhancement measures could potentially contribute towards the conservation objectives of either of these sites.
- 6.49 NatureScot provided additional information with regards to Alva Moss candidate Local Nature Conservation Site, which was taken into consideration when producing **Technical Appendix 8.4: Outline Habitat Management Plan**.

Perth and Kinross Council / Transport Scotland

- 6.50 A meeting was held on 12 September 2023 between SLR and representatives from Perth and Kinross Council roads department and Transport Scotland. This meeting was to discuss the proposed use of the A9 / Sheriffmuir road junction for construction vehicles (including abnormal loads) associated with the proposed development.
- 6.51 The action from the meeting was that a Roads Safety Risk Assessment should be carried out in order to understand what if any alterations may be required in order to make the junction suitable for construction vehicles.
- 6.52 The Road Safety Risk Assessment was completed on 07 December 2023 and issued to Perth and Kinross Council roads department and Transport Scotland on 10 January 2024. The Road Safety Risk Assessment proposed various suggestions (e.g. signage, shrub/tree trimming) for improving the A9 / Sheriffmuir road junction in order to make it suitable for construction vehicle traffic, however no substantial works were deemed required.
- 6.53 A further meeting was held on 17 January 2024 between SLR and representatives from Perth and Kinross Council roads department and Transport Scotland. At this meeting, the consultees confirmed that they had no concerns with the findings of the Road Safety Risk Assessment, and in principle the use of the A9 / Sheriffmuir road junction could be considered acceptable for wind farm construction traffic (including abnormal load vehicles). The consultees however advised that they would require an outline Traffic Management Plan to be submitted as part of the EIA Report – An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided in **Technical Appendix 12.3**.

Historic Environment Scotland

- 6.54 Response issued 24 October 2023. A ZTV was produced to further clarify potential impacts upon Sauchie Tower (SM629) and the Lairhill standing stones (SM4539). An appraisal of these asset's settings and reasons for scoping out were summarised. Developments of a similar scale (EIA Projects) shall be considered within the cumulative assessment.

- 6.55 Following correspondence from SLR on 24 October 2023, HES advised, on 27 November 2023, that they were content with scoping out The Lairhill standing stone from further assessment. However, they requested further clarification on any potential visibility of the proposed turbines within the setting of Sauchie Tower, tower and house. They also requested further rationale for the determination of the 10km study area. HES also advised that they expect the EIA Report to set out how the impact significance on an asset's interest have been derived and the basis of judgement.
- 6.56 SLR responded to HES confirming that Sauchie Tower will be included for full assessment within the EIA to establish any potential effects upon the asset's setting. It was also confirmed that HES's requests for clarifications regarding the extent of the study area and assessment methodology would be set out in the Cultural Heritage and Archaeology EIA Report Chapter.

Clackmannanshire Council

Landscape and Visual

- 6.57 In their scoping response received in May 2023, Clackmannanshire Council requested additional LVIA viewpoints from the following locations:
- B9140 between Fishcross and Collyland Roundabout;
 - from other hilltops in the Ochils such as Ben Ever;
 - a summit accessible from Glen Devon; and
 - the right of way between Blackford and Tillicoultry.
- 6.58 LUC reviewed the additional viewpoint requests and carried out email correspondence with Clackmannanshire Council to provide clarification on which additional viewpoint requests would be taken forward into the LVIA and justification for requests not taken forward based on theoretical visibility. LUC proposed that an additional viewpoint from the B9140, near Collyland was taken forward for detailed assessment in the LVIA to increase representation in this part of the Study Area. LUC also proposed that the remaining requested locations were not taken forward for detailed assessment due to existing proposed viewpoints in the Ochil Hills (VP1: Ben Cleuch, VP2: The Nebit, VP3: Innerdownie and VP4: Dumyat) that would represent views experienced by recreational receptors in the Ochil Hills. A supporting wireline from Ben Ever however has been provided as part of the visualisation package in Volume 3c due to its proximity to the Site. No response from Clackmannanshire Council however was received to this correspondence, which was made by LUC in both August and September 2023.

Stirling Council

Landscape and Visual

- 6.59 In their scoping response received in April 2023, Stirling Council requested additional LVIA viewpoints from the following locations:
- Stirling Castle Esplanade and;
 - the A9 near Balhaldie Services.
- 6.60 LUC reviewed these additional viewpoint requests and carried out email correspondence with Stirling Council to propose that these viewpoints would not be taken forward for detailed assessment within the LVIA due to the limited theoretical visibility of the proposed

development from these locations. Stirling Council held their position that these locations should be included as LVIA viewpoints. LUC therefore proposed to include supporting wirelines from these locations as part of the visualisation package in Volume 3c instead of inclusion for detailed assessment, given the limited theoretical visibility and the unlikelihood for significant visual effects. No response on this approach was received from Stirling Council.

Gatecheck and Further Consultation

- 6.61 A Gatecheck Report was submitted to the ECU on 19 January 2024. The report provides detail on how consultee Scoping responses have been addressed by the EIA process and the design of the proposed development. Responses to the Gatecheck Report were received from four consultees (Clackmannanshire Council, SEPA, NatureScot and HES) throughout February and March 2024.
- 6.62 The four consultees that responded to the Gatecheck Report generally confirmed that they were satisfied that the majority of their views had been considered and specified concerns addressed. Consultee Gatecheck comments and subsequent further consultation on the proposed development and approach to EIA, is summarised in the following sections (further detail on the below consultee comments is provided in each technical topic chapter of this EIA Report).

NatureScot

- 6.63 On 04 March 2024, NatureScot issued their response to the ECU, with key points summarised as follows:
- *“Table 3.1 states that the Wallace Monument and Stirling Castle have been scoped out of assessment due to lack of visibility in agreement with Historic Environment Scotland and Stirling Council and that a wireline will be included in the EIA report from Stirling Castle demonstrating this. We recommend that clarification is provided in the EIA report as to whether visibility of the turbines from these viewpoints may become possible should turbines be micro-sited up slope.”;*
 - *“We advise that priority peatland habitat should be avoided as far as possible in line with the mitigation hierarchy. We consider blanket bog, wet modified bog and dry modified bog to be priority peatland habitat. The NVC communities that we consider to be priority peatland habitat are M1, M2, M3 (which should be completely avoided), M17, M18, M19 and M20 including M15, M16 and M25 (when on deep peat (i.e. 50cm or above)).”;*
 - *“The HMP submitted at the application stage should be sufficiently detailed, clearly set out the type and scale of mitigation, compensation and enhancement it will deliver, and contain enough detail to demonstrate that proposals for peatland restoration are likely to be effective.”;*
 - *“Information on predicted losses of peatland (including indirect losses), and the proposed mitigation, compensation and enhancement should be clearly set out and concisely summarised in the EIA report, so that this can be easily understood by decision makers.”; and*
 - *“Our peatland guidance provides our recommendations on the amount of restoration needed to achieve compensation (1:10 ratio of area of peatland lost:area of peatland restored) and to achieve additional biodiversity enhancement (a further 10% of the baseline extent of priority peatland habitat). We advise that applications proposing*

less than our 1:10 recommendation should clearly address the factors noted in our guidance as part of their reasoning.”.

Clackmannanshire Council

- 6.64 On 21 February 2024, Clackmannanshire Council issued their response to the ECU, with key points summarised as follows:
- *“The information on wind turbine layout evolution is noted. Without prejudice to the Council’s consideration of a subsequent application, the development is still considered to result in significant, direct and cumulative adverse landscape and visual effects on the Ochil Hills, notwithstanding the revisions to the design and layout tabled in the Gatecheck Report.”;*
 - *“The response does not address the Service’s comment relating to information about decommissioning of the site.”;*
 - *“No response has been provided to the suggestion of inclusion of a VP on the Tillicoultry to Blackford right of way.”;*
 - *“The Council’s comments re para 6.8.1 highlighted that any assessment should not focus only on impacts experienced on routes identified as Core Paths as the majority of recreational routes within the hills and leading to the hill summits are not defined as Core Paths within Clackmannanshire.”; and*
 - *“The scope for biodiversity enhancement should include consideration of enhancement of the candidate LNCS at Alva Moss.”.*

SEPA

- 6.65 On 26 February 2024, SEPA issued their response the ECU, with key points summarised as follows:
- *“The explanation in Table 3.1 as to how our advice at the EIA scoping stage has been considered in the design process and EIA is very clear. We welcome the completion of additional peat probing and the completion of a NVC survey. We note that a 50m buffer for water features has been adopted ‘wherever possible’. As we set out in our scoping response where this cannot be achieved, we will require justification, the submission of a drawing, of the engineering works, and sufficient information to demonstrate that there are no adverse effects on the water environment.”.*

Further Consultation

- 6.66 SLR emailed SEPA, on 28 February 2024, requesting comment on a proposed alteration to track routing from what had been presented with the Gatecheck Report.
- 6.67 SEPA responded via email, on 06 March 2024, advising that as per NPF4 Policy 5 (Soils), the mitigation hierarchy should be adhered to, with avoidance of areas of deep peat being the starting point, before mitigation (e.g. floated track) etc. should be considered.

Historic Environment Scotland

- 6.68 On 13 March 2024, Historic Environment Scotland issued their response the ECU, with key points summarised as follows:

- *“We have indicated in our response (dated 27 November 2023) to the applicant’s letter (dated 23 October 2023) that it would be helpful for the EIA Report to clarify with a wireline visualisation whether there is any turbine visible when looking towards Sauchie Tower, tower and house (SM629) with turbines potentially appearing behind/in the same view, before scoping this monument out of the EIA to be undertaken. The applicant hasn’t indicated in Table 3-1 of the Gatecheck Report clearly that our comment above has been incorporated. It would be helpful for the applicant to clarify whether or not the proposed turbines could potentially appear behind/in the same view as Sauchie Tower, tower and house (SM629).”.*

Further Consultation

- 6.69 SLR emailed Historic Environment Scotland, on 15 March 2024, confirming that the view looking towards Sauchie Tower (SM629) has been considered, with a wireline produced, and will also be included in the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the Windburn Wind Farm EIA Report.

Community Consultation

- 6.70 Public consultation is a key element of the environmental assessment process; therefore, as part of the wider consultation process, attention was given to community engagement in cognisance of Planning Advice Note (PAN) 3/2010: Community Engagement and the Scottish Government’s Good Practice Guidance for Applications under Section 36 and 37 of the Electricity Act 1989 (2022). Local Community Councils were contacted during development of the proposals.
- 6.71 In addition to the consultation as part of the scoping process, consultation has been undertaken with the local communities in the form of public exhibitions and meetings.
- 6.72 The following Community Councils were invited to the public exhibitions held in June 2023 and November 2023:
- Alva;
 - Alloa;
 - Tillicoultry, Coalsnaughton and Devonside;
 - Auchterarder and District;
 - Braco and Greenloaning;
 - Blackford;
 - Clackmannan;
 - Menstrie;
 - Sauchie and Fishcross;
 - Tullibody, Cambus and Glenochil;
 - Muthill and Tullibardine;
 - Dollar;
 - Dunblane;
 - Muckhart; and

- Logie.

- 6.73 Local councillors were invited to attend the public exhibitions held in 2023.
- 6.74 The applicant has also met with a number of community councils and community groups in order to discuss the proposed development and also options for the associated community benefit.
- 6.75 The applicant would look to explore potential models for part community share ownership of the proposed Windburn wind farm, whereby the local communities would have the opportunity to invest into the project in line with the Scottish Government's Good Practice Principles.
- 6.76 Further details of the public exhibitions and Community Consultation held in respect of the proposed development are contained in the **PAC Report** submitted as part of the application for the proposed development.

References

Scottish Natural Heritage (2017). Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore windfarms.

The Electricity Act 1989.

The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017.

The Scottish Government (2017). Planning Circular 1/2017: Environmental Impact Assessment regulations. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/planning-circular-1-2017-environmental-impact-assessment-regulations-2017/>

The Scottish Government (2013). Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/planning-advice-note-1-2013-environmental-impact-assessment/>

The Scottish Government (2010). Planning Advice Note 3/2010: community engagement. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/pan-3-2010-community-engagement/>

The Scottish Government (2022). Good Practice Guidance for Applications under Section 36 and 37 of the Electricity Act 1989

Historic Scotland (2014). Scotland's Listed Buildings. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/listing-scheduling-and-designations/listed-buildings/search-for-a-listed-building/>