

# Balliemeanoch Pumped Storage Hydro

Environmental Impact Assessment  
Report

Volume 5: Appendices  
Appendix 4.3: Consultation Tracker

ILI (Borders PSH) Ltd

July 2024



## Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Graham Allen	Victoria Deacon	Ian Gillies	David Lee
Graduate Environmental Consultant	Principal Environmental Scientist	Renewables & Energy Transition Practice Lead	Technical Director – Renewable Energy

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	July 2024	Submission	DL	David Lee	Technical Director

## Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

© 2024 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

## Table of Contents

Appendix 4.3 Consultation Tracker.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1

# Appendix 4.3 Consultation Tracker

## 1. Introduction

This appendix has been produced to support *Chapter 4: Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (Volume 2: Main Report)*. *Table 4.1* contains the consultation feedback received on the Development since the submission of the Scoping Report (*Appendix 4.1 Balliemanoch Pumped Storage Hydro Scoping Report*) (*Volume 5: Appendices*).

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
01.1.01	Aberdeen Airport	01/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	The proposal is out with the consultation area for Aberdeen Airport. As such we have no comment to make and need not be consulted further.	Noted
02.1.01	Argyll and Bute Council	22/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>(1/3) Planning: There is an emerging Local Development Plan 2 which depending on the date of the future application may have reached a stage in the adoption process where there weight to be afforded to this will be increased or it may be adopted.</p> <p>ABC provided clarity on the inputs which would be required as part of the EIAR and not matters addressed as a condition on the following topics:            Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Transport and Waste Management            Requirement to account for cumulative impacts with other energy related infrastructure projects on the traffic network            Construction phasing with other projects need to be evaluated on submission of the EIAR and not left approval under any deemed consent. It is considered that a "duty to cooperate" for waste material use between the two S36 hydro proposals will be required by Scottish Ministers.</p> <p>Ecology / Nature Conservation / Marine Environment            Emphasised the need to ensure cumulative impacts of maximum simultaneous water draw from Balliemanoch and the Cruachan expansion. It is the opinion of the Planning Authority that such matters should not be left to the operational cycles of the energy markets to dictate the evaluation of potential maximum draw/discharge scenarios if both Cruachan and Balliemanoch are operating.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Waste Management is outlined in Section 5.4 of the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)</p> <p>Ecological impacts of the Development are detailed in the following chapters, and their associated appendices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 06 Terrestrial Ecology</li> <li>- Chapter 07 Aquatic Ecology</li> <li>- Chapter 08 Marine Ecology</li> <li>- Chapter 09 Ornithology</li> </ul>
02.1.02	Argyll and Bute Council	22/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>(2/3) Marine: Deemed as an EIA and clarified planning requirements for the pier/jetty- emphasised cumulative infrastructure impacts, importance safe access/egress and the precautionary approach undertaken during the duration of works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIAR must provide updated site survey information where appropriate; all surveys and data sets after two years must be updated.</li> <li>• Together with the EIAR, the applicant is requested to submit their Intertidal Phase 1 Survey, Subtidal Benthic Survey, and walkover fish habitat assessment.</li> <li>• The applicant is requested to submit a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and Method Statement for all aspects of the Development. With respect to the marine and coastal environment, the CEMP must include a Noise Method Statement for impact piling and include all management plans as set out under section 3.4.1.6 Mitigation.</li> <li>• In terms of possible introduction and spread of marine Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS), the applicant is requested to submit a Biosecurity Management Plan.</li> <li>• In terms of water quality, drainage and flooding; all water assessments</li> </ul>	<p>The marine ecology aspects of the Development are considered in Chapter 09 Marine Ecology, and its associated appendices.</p> <p>An Outline CEMP is included as Appendix 3.1.</p> <p>An Outline Construction Noise Management Plan is detailed Section 5.2 of the Outline CEMP.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				are to be submitted with the EIAR. • The applicant is requested to submit a bathymetric survey, review of geotechnical information, a sediment dispersion study, and sediment sampling analysis for the Marine Facility in Loch Fyne.	
02.1.03	Argyll and Bute Council	22/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	(3/3) Requests that the following are specifically scoped into the EIAR: - Cumulative Landscape Impacts - Cumulative Roads Impacts: require greater details on whether the importation of plant/materials and the handling or removal of any waste can realistically be undertaken with no impacts on the road network - Cumulative Water Extraction and Discharge Impacts at Loch Awe: "the EIAR should be required to specifically calculate maximum extraction for Balliemanoch coinciding with maximum extraction from Loch Awe for the proposed Cruachan Extension. References to Market cycles being involved in defining such matters do not seem to clearly commit to undertaking this maximum extraction and discharge cumulative impact exercise. "	Chapter 05 – Landscape and Visual Assessment has detailed and considered the landscape impacts in relation to the Development.  Chapter 14 – Access, Traffic and Transport has detailed and considered road impacts in relation to the Development.  Chapter 12 – Water Resources and Flood Risk has detailed and considered the extraction and discharge impacts in relation to the Development.
02.2.01	Argyll & Bute Council	19/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	Private Water Supplies - <i>Scottish Ministers request that the Company investigates the presence of any private water supplies which may be impacted by the development. The EIA report should include details of any supplies identified by this investigation, and if any supplies are identified, the Company should provide an assessment of the potential impacts, risks, and any mitigation which would be provided.</i> Gatecheck Comment: It is noted that the information provided by the council has been found to be incorrect. Contact should be made with Environmental protection to seek to clarify these matters. The Council will only hold data on private residential supplies where this has been subject to a request for testing by the occupier as this is not a statutory requirement. All commercial premises require to have their private water supplies tested and therefore more robust records of non-residential private water supplies should exist.  Use of Borrow Pits - <i>Where borrow pits are proposed as a source of on-site aggregate they should be considered as part of the EIA process and included in the EIA report detailing information regarding their location, size and nature. Ultimately, it would be necessary to provide details of the proposed depth of the excavation compared to the actual topography and water table, proposed drainage and settlement traps, turf and overburden removal and storage for reinstatement, and details of the proposed restoration profile. The impact of such facilities (including dust, blasting and impact on water) should be appraised as part of the overall impact of the working. Information should cover the requirements set out in 'PAN 50: Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings'.</i>	Noted  A Private Water Supplies Assessment has been conducted and is detailed in Appendix 11.3.  Chapter 05 – Landscape and Visual Assessment has detailed and considered the landscape impacts in relation to the Development.  Waste Management is outlined in Section 5.4 of the Outline CEMP.  Cumulative impacts are considered throughout the EIAR.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>Gatecheck Comment: The proposed introduction of a two borrow pits within the headpond as part of Design V is noted and reflects the requirements that borrow pits should form part of the S36 submissions as required by the scoping. Full details of all borrow pits, including restoration details where appropriate, should be provided within EIA submissions.</p>	
				<p>LVIA content and viewpoints - <i>The scoping report identified representative viewpoints at Table 5.1 to be assessed within the landscape and visual impact assessment. The EIA shall include the Planning Authority's additional viewpoints, additional considerations within the LVIA and cumulative effects. The EIA report shall scope in HES's and NatureScot's requests in relation to additional viewpoints (particularly in the context of wild land areas ("WLA's").</i></p> <p>Gatecheck Comment: The Planning Authority consider A viewpoint from the Duncan Bann Monument should be added as this is a well-used and popular local vantage point to be added (unless it can be confirmed that the headpond will not be visible from this viewpoint).</p>	
				<p>Waste Management - <i>The Scottish Ministers agree with the Planning Authority that waste management should be scoped in to the EIA report to fully evaluate to what extent the objective of minimising importation of materials can be achieved</i></p> <p>Gatecheck Comment: No specific reference to this in gatecheck, but the Planning Authority is content that this matter will form part of EIAR.</p>	
				<p>Cumulative Impacts - <i>The scope of the EIA report shall take into account the Planning Authority's comments throughout their response in relation to cumulative impacts in relation to landscape character and visual impact, transport and waste management, ecology, nature conservation and on the marine environment associated with a considerable number of large infrastructure proposals under sections 36 and 37 of the 1989 Act (and in particular the Cruachan Pumped Storage Hydro expansion project, the application for which has already been made to the Scottish Ministers).</i></p> <p>Gatecheck Comment: The reference to Flood/Risk and low water levels at Table 4.1 does not appear to make reference to potential cumulative impacts if the consented Cruachan Expansion scheme is also operating and extracting water at its maximum operational capacity. Clarification on this point would be appreciated as the scoping report confirms that "Impacts on the marine environment in cumulation with Cruachan and its proposed expansion in terms of water extraction and discharge should be carefully detailed"</p>	
				<p>Pier Construction Works - <i>Ministers advise that detail is required in the EIA report on the engineering construction works on the pier and to</i></p>	



ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p><i>provide related track upgrades for transportation of plant and materials, and that this will not be a suitable matter to be resolved through planning conditions.</i></p> <p>Gatecheck Comment: The alteration to the location and design of the pier and the confirmation of its temporary nature are noted in design V. The proposal to leave the pillars as a permanent feature does however raise the question as to whether this could appear as abandoned/unfinished feature within the landscape and therefore the Planning Authority will require visualisations of this aspect of the proposal as these may raise additional points of concern. The proposed movement of the construction compound to a less visually sensitive location is welcomed.</p> <p>Interaction with Blairgour Land Management Plan - <i>The Scottish Ministers advise that the EIA report must give proper consideration to the assessment of potential cumulative impacts from the restoration and mitigation measures already in place under the Blairgour Land Management Plan ("LMP").</i></p> <p>Gatecheck Comment: Assumed this will be addressed as required.</p> <p>General Comment - The Council welcomes the ongoing discussions by the applicant with the Area Roads Manager, and also in respect of the required workers housing strategy. A housing emergency has been declared by Argyll and Bute Council since the scoping was issued and ongoing discussions with the Scottish Ministers on the steps required to address this are actively progressing. Although not forming part of the EIAR these matters are of significance to the application proposals and consideration by the planning authority.</p> <p>It is noted that the applicants state that no Community Benefit will be provided. This may be a matter which requires further discussion outside the S36 consenting process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Planning Authority would draw the applicants attention to NPF 4 Policy 11 (c) and also NPF 4 Policy 25. That these are the policies of the Scottish Ministers as part of a Statutory Development Plan, is considered a substantive and material consideration for the anticipated S36 application. Further discussions on the manner in which these policy matters are proposed to be addressed by submissions/actions would be welcomed by the Planning Authority</p>	
03.1.01	Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board	16/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board ADSFB represent the interests of local fishery managers in the Awe Catchment including the Awe District River Improvement (ADRIA) and Loch Awe Improvement Association (LAIA) who administer the protection order for fish on Loch Awe. The Argyll Fisheries Trust inform the ADSFB of the habitats of different</p>	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>species of fish within the area of the Development. AFT fish and habitat surveys suggest the lower reaches are accessible to Atlantic Salmon, Brown Trout and Brook Lamprey and are used for spawning and juvenile nursery habitat.</p> <p>It is not if there is an intention to abstract water from other watercourses in the development area (apart from Lochan Airigh)</p> <p>ADSFb urge walkover habitat surveys to inform the location of monitoring sites for the pre-development stages to ensure that key sites are monitored during and after the proposed scheme is developed.</p> <p>Monitoring of macroinvertebrates should also be undertaken to ensure water quality is maintained.</p> <p>Note eDNA sampling should be conducted regularly over a period of a year. The design of the scheme should also consider the potential to draw fish into the pump storage scheme.</p> <p>ADSFb highlights Balliemanoch should be assessed as an addition to existing impacts on aquatic resources as fish habitat and population in the awe catchment is already affected by a variety of renewable energy schemes.</p>	
04.1.01	Blarghour Farm	15/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>One of the access routes to Balliemanoch Pumped Storage Hydro Scheme indicated on the plans submitted eg. on Figure 1.2 Above Ground Infrastructure (sheet 1) attached, incorrectly shows an access route over Blarghour Farm.</p>	Email forwarded to the Applicant for comments
05.1.01	Blarghour Power Company	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Please note that in addition to Beochlich Hydro Scheme and the three others noted as operating around Loch Awe under 11.2.2.1 copied below, that this list should also at the very least include Blarghour Hydro Scheme A and Blarghour Hydro Scheme B with regards to any hydrology impact studies to be undertaken due to their proximity to the proposed development.</p> <p>Both Blarghour A and Blarghour B take water from Allt Blarghour, the catchment for which is the Blarghour high hill. Blarghour's High hill, as well as bordering the proposed Balliemanoch Pumped Storage Hydro Scheme development area, is also wrongly shown on the development plans as an access route to the development.</p> <p>Chapter 11          11.2.2.1 Loch Awe</p> <p>There is an existing small-scale hydro scheme in operation within the Development Site known as Beochlich. The Beochlich hydropower project was constructed in 1998 and has an installed capacity of 1 MW. There are three additional existing hydro-electric power schemes operating on Loch Awe and the surrounding area. SSE plc operate the 25 MW Inverawe Power Station, which is a run of river hydropower scheme, which abstracts water from the River Awe Barrage at the Pass of Brander. The scheme at Cruachan is a 440 MW pumped storage scheme operated by Scottish PowerDrax Group plc. The third scheme is</p>	Email forwarded to the Applicant for comments

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				Nant, which is a 15 MW hydropower scheme that uses Lock Nant as the headpond and discharges into Loch Awe at the River Nant.	
07.1.1	BT	26/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	Having studied the proposal with respect to EMC and related problems to BT point-to-point microwave radio links BT concluded that the project should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.	Noted
06.1.01	BT	10/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>We have studied this Balliemanoch Pumped Storage Hydro Scheme with respect to EMC and related problems to BT point-to-point microwave radio links.</p> <p>As site boundary appears to be the same as previously submitted for WID11914, the project indicated should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.</p> <p>BT requires 100m minimum clearance from any structure to the radio link path. If the proposed locations change, please let us know and we can reassess this for you.</p> <p>Please note this refers to BT Radio Links only, you will need to contact other providers separately for information relating to other supplier links / equipment.</p> <p>Please direct all queries to radionetworkprotection@bt.com</p>	Noted
08.1.1	Crown Estate Scotland	18/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Whilst the Crown Estate has no direct comments in relation to the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment, the Crown Estate has interests in the marine pier that is to be constructed at or near Inveraray, loch Fyne; on review of their records they find that the foreshore is verified non-crown but the seabed remains Crown land under the management of the Crown Estate Scotland. Accordingly, any works (be they temporary or permanent, including any seabed surveys) extending on or over Crown seabed will require a seabed agreement from Crown Estate Scotland - they ask that the applicant submit a "marine works" application form when in a position to do so. These can be downloaded from <a href="https://www.crownstatescotland.com/resources/documents">https://www.crownstatescotland.com/resources/documents</a> .</p> <p>Information will required on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the nature and location of all seabed survey works;</li> <li>- the design of the proposed pier, including general arrangement and other technical drawings; and</li> <li>- details of any associated dredging and dumping operations that may be required</li> </ul>	Seabed surveys completed, for which Crown Estate Scotland (CES) licence was obtained prior to the survey
09.1.01	ECU & Marine Scotland	28/03/2022	Scoping Discussion	Alan Brogan in attendance from the ECU and Anni Makela from Marine Scotland to discuss the EIA arrangements for the marine elements of Balliemanoch. It was decided a joint process would be pursued for the marine licencing and the EIA- this would involve Marine Scotland looking at the EIA following ECU consent and the other consenting authority consent and Marine Scotland issuing a letter to state exemption under	The Scoping report was revised to include chapters on "Marine Physical Environment & Coastal processes" "Shipping and Navigation" "Commercial Fisheries"

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				the EIA process and can proceed under the marine licence. Following this it was determined that the EIA would require reuploading with new chapters on Commercial Fisheries, Shipping and Navigation and _ .	
09.2.01	ECU	04/07/2022	Scoping Discussion	Rebecca Young reviewed the proposed consultee list and sent over an updated consultee list with her comments. Indicated that David from Argyll and Bute required any comments by the end of w/c 04/07/2022	Noted
10.1.01	Edinburgh Airport	29/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	The location of this development falls outwith the Aerodrome Safeguarding zone and therefore Edinburgh Airport has no objection/comment	Noted
11.1.01	Edinburgh airport safeguarding	04/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	In respect of the above, I can confirm the location of this development falls out with our Aerodrome Safeguarding zone for Edinburgh Airport therefore we have no objection/comment.	Noted
12.1.01	Fisheries Management Scotland	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	Fisheries Management Scotland endorse the comments on the Development made by the Argyll District Salmon Fisheries Board. In particular we note that the Scottish Government have recognised that Atlantic Salmon are in crisis and published a wild salmon strategy in January 2022. This situation should be fully taken into account in both the screening and scoping and any subsequent licence decisions.	Noted
13.1.01	Glasgow Airport	02/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	Glasgow Airport has examined the report from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and observed that 1) the site is outwith the obstacle limitation surfaces and radar safeguarding area for Glasgow Airport 2) It is within the instrument flight procedures safeguarding area however no impact is expected. Glasgow Airport's position will only be confirmed once the development details are finalized and we have been consulted on a full planning application. At that time they will carry out a full safeguarding impact assessment and will consider their position in light of, inter alia, operational impact and cumulative effects	Noted
14.1.01	Glasgow airport safeguarding	05/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	Comments from scoping stand: The scoping report submitted has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and we would make the following observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site is outwith the obstacle limitation surfaces and radar safeguarding area for Glasgow Airport;</li> <li>- It is within the instrument flight procedures safeguarding area however no impact is expected.</li> </ul> Our position with regard to this proposal will only be confirmed once the development details are finalized and we have been consulted on a full planning application. At that time we will carry out a full safeguarding impact assessment and will consider our position in light of, inter alia, operational impact and cumulative effects.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
15.1.01	Glasgow Prestwick Airport	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	The Development lies outwith the Airport's safeguarding area and as such GPA have no comment to make on the scoping consultation and would have no aviation grounds to object to this proposal should it come to a full Section 36 Planning Application.	Noted
16.1.01	Glenochy & Innishail Community Council (G&I CC)	01/05/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>The gatecheck report accurately reflects the position as we understand it. There have been several opportunities for community members in our area to find out more about the development and the report reflects the issues that we are aware of. Of particular concern is the potential impact of the scheme on Loch levels which are already an issue of concern, and it is disappointing to see that discussions with SEPA are yet to take place. This concern is compounded by the potential development of Cruachan 2 on the other side of the loch.</p> <p>The impact of cumulative development across our area is a key issue. SSEN will be constructing a switching station at Creag Dhubh and will be upgrading their power line between Taynuilt and Inveraray; Cruachan 2 has planning permission and there is a proposed energy park development at Ladyfield, all in the vicinity and all potentially using the same road network to transport people and machinery. The environmental, social and economic impact of this level of development in an area of outstanding natural beauty requires careful consideration and we trust this will be the case.</p>	The EIAR considers the environmental, social, and economic aspects of the Development.
17.1.01	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	30/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>HES identified a potential for significant adverse impacts on the Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape around Inveraray Castle. The proposed new access and improved access from the proposed pier, the proposed temporary construction compound would affect the Upper Avenue of Inveraray castle and seems likely to affect the fisherlands area of parkland drained in the 1740s, which provide long views south from the castle and the watchtower on Dun Na Cuaiche which could be adversely affected by proposals</p> <p>Any assessment should pay close attention to the impacts on the following: Inveraray Castle (Inventory Designed Landscape), Balliemeanoch chapel and burial ground (Scheduled monument SM4227), Carn Dubh Carnnog E of Inverinan (Scheduled Monument SM4175), Keppochan Cup Marked Stone 600m E of (Scheduled Monument SM4186). Set out guidance for the assessment namely the Managing Change Guidance Note on Gardens and Designed Landscapes (2016, 2020) and in line with the Managing Change Guide Notice on Setting (2016,2020). Detailed comments on the potential impacts at these historic sites are below:</p> <p>To the north of Inveraray castle it is proposed to upgrade an existing track. This appears likely to be at least partly along the line of the Grand Approach from Garron Lodge, created around 1775. The upgraded access would also cross the earlier Oalk Walk to the immediate north of</p>	The Cultural Heritage aspects are detailed and considered in 'Chapter 13 – Cultural Heritage'.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>Duchess Louise Wood. The Oak Walk was the primary axial route north through the policies and terminated in an eye catching doocot built in 1747.</p> <p>At Balliemanoch, chapel and burial ground the proposed location of the Tailpond outlet/inlet might be visible from the main view that look outwards to the west/southwest.</p> <p>Carn Dubh, Crannog E of Inverinan- it is unclear from the ZTV maps if the proposed location of the tailpond outlet/inlet would be visible from the crannog.</p> <p>Keppochan, Cup Marked Stone 600m ESE of (Scheduled Monument SM4186) - as part of the development it is proposed to upgrade an access track within the vicinity of this monument. To the south of the stone is an area of open hill ground, the track in question passes through forestry in this area which should shield the view of any works from the monument. However, aerial photography shows recent felling in this area meaning that upgrade works here have the potential to impact the setting of the stone. Forestry is subject to seasonal changes, felling, windblow, etc and should not be relied upon as a mitigatory factor when considering setting impacts.</p> <p>HES reviewed the EIA Scoping Report and confirm that they are broadly content with the study area proposed for identifying potential impacts on heritage assets and their settings. The EIA Scoping Report is however, unclear about those parts of the Development within the Invereray Castle inventory site which are likely to have physical impacts on important elements of that landscape as well as visual, or other sensory, impact on its character and/or setting. These potential impacts should consider elements of the landscape that could be physically affected by the works and impacts on the landscape's character that could arise through visual, or other sensory changes. The latter could include changes caused by traffic along the proposed access tracks.</p>	
17.2.01	Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	20/03/2024	Gatecheck 1	Having reviewed the submitted gatecheck report, we are content that the applicant's approach for the EIA appears appropriate. Although not identified in detail in the gatecheck report we consider that HES has been appropriately consulted so far and would welcome continued consultation as the EIA process continues.	Noted
18.1.01	Joint Radio Company	01/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	The proposal is cleared with respect to radio link infrastructure operated by Scottish Hydro (Scottish and Southern Electricity). In the case of the Development JRS does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and the data you have provided. However if any details change, particularly the disposition or scale, it will be necessary to re-evaluate the proposal. (see full response in folder)	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
19.1.01	Marine Scotland	03/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p><u>Onshore fish ecology</u>            Thank you for seeking comment from Marine Directorate – Science, Evidence, Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) relating to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries on the gate check report for the proposed Balliemanoch Pumped Storage Hydro Scheme. MD-SEDD reviewed the gate check report and we outline our comments below. Our comments do not include advice relating to the marine facility on Loch Fyne which forms part of this Development.</p> <p>The developer states that fish habitat assessments and semi-quantitative electric fishing surveys were carried out and that quarterly eDNA sampling was/will be carried out in Loch Awe. No details are provided of fish assessments in Lochan Airigh. MD-SEDD advise that fully quantitative electrofishing surveys should be carried out in all watercourses that are at risk of an impact to provide sufficient information to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment. MD-SEDD commissioned a project to review the available methods for sampling freshwater fish in Scottish lochs. This review should be completed by April 2024.</p> <p>MD-SEDD advise that methods used to sample fish populations should provide sufficient information on the presence of fish species and their relative abundance in all waterbodies that are at risk of an impact associated with the Development.</p>	<p>A review of desk study data was undertaken with data available for Lochan Airigh which identified a population of brown trout in the lochan. However, as fish passage is impeded downstream by the existing impoundment passage of migratory species to Lochan Airigh is not possible.</p> <p>Surveys undertaken attempted to complete a fish survey downstream of the lochan, however it wasn't possible due to high flow conditions. Within the EIAR we have therefore stated pre-construction fish surveys will be undertaken within Lochan Airigh, and this would inform the mitigation that is outlined within the Aquatic Ecology chapter. This fish survey would follow best practice methods at the time of completion.</p> <p>Pre-construction fish surveys on Lochan Airigh have been recommended in Chapter 7.</p>
20.1.01	Marine Scotland Science	12/10/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>The response does not include advice on the marine facility proposed on Loch Fyne.</p> <p>The River Awe catchment supports important Atlantic Salmon, brown trout (including Ferox trout and sea trout), Arctic Charr, European eel, lamprey, pike and perch populations. Atlantic Salmon are listed in the habitat Directive Annex V - all these species are listed as priority species for conservation in the Scottish Biodiversity List.</p> <p>Potential impacts on fish populations associated with the construction and development of the Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- deterioration of water quality due to the release of sediment associated with the construction of the embankment, access tracks/tunnels and buildings and stock piled material, the release of hydrocarbons as a result of a fuel spillage and the release of concrete from mixing plants;</li> <li>- the disturbance and/or removal (through excavation/erosion/deposition) of fish habitat e.g. Allt Beochlich, and Arctic charr spawning areas in Loch Awe;</li> <li>- entrainment into intakes by fast flowing water;</li> <li>- impingement on poorly designed or malfunctioning screens at intakes/outlets or screens;</li> <li>- impediment to fish migration particularly salmon smolts migrating from the River Orchy passing the inlet/outlet points in Loch Awe and/or poorly designed watercourse crossings;</li> </ul>	<p>Chapter 07 – Aquatic Ecology details and considers aquatic ecological features in relation to the Development.</p> <p>Chapter 08 – Marine Ecology details and considers marine ecological features in relation to the Development.</p> <p>Chapter 11 – Water Environment details and considers the water environment features in relation to the Development, outlining measures for monitoring and mitigation.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>- change in water quantity and flow regimes through abstraction/discharge and the creation of impenetrable surfaces e.g. access tracks/tunnels and buildings;</p> <p>- altering fish behaviour, disturbance, injury or mortality due to noise and vibration associated with construction works e.g. pumps, turbines, drilling;</p> <p>- change in water temperature;</p> <p>- spread of invasive non-native species (INNS). Further guidance from SEPA, the lead organisation for controlling the spread of INNS in Scottish freshwaters, is available at <a href="https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/163480/biosecurity-and-management-of-invasive-non-native-species-construction-sites.pdf">https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/163480/biosecurity-and-management-of-invasive-non-native-species-construction-sites.pdf</a></p> <p>MSS advise to consider those potential impacts (e.g. entrainment, impingement and impediment to fish migration) which are regulated by CAR, and ensure all works are carried out in accordance with SEPA regulations under AR licence.</p> <p>MSS agree with ADSFB, that further surveys should be carried out to inform an assessment of impact on all fish species and associated fisheries in all waterbodies likely to be at risk - also the developer should consider likely resilience of fish populations particular salmon and trout to impacts.</p> <p>The developer should consider potential cumulative impact on fish populations particular in relation to water quality and quantity. Outlines how details of fish surveys should be presented in the EIA report.</p> <p>Proposed sampling/monitoring should consider seasonal use by fish species within all waterbodies.</p> <p>Proposed access tracks: Provides details on how proposed site design and suggests mitigation measures that should be a means of avoiding/minimising potential impact to the water environment. On the design of water crossing MSS advise the developer to consider the uninhibited passage of migratory fish in the design of all water crossings.</p> <p>Advise full details regarding proposed survey/ monitoring of water quality should be provided in the EIA report.</p>	
20.1.02	Marine Scotland Science	12/10/2022	Scoping Opinion	There is an important recreational fishery for Atlantic salmon, brown trout and pike on Loch Awe, the River Orchy (flows into Loch Awe) and the River Awe (flows out of Loch Awe).	Noted
21.1.01	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	The MCA has an interest in the works associated with the marine environment, and the potential impact on the safety and navigation, access to ports, harbours and marinas, and any impact on search and	Chapter 08 – Marine Ecology details and considers marine ecological features in relation to the Development.



ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
21.2.01	Maritime & Coastguard Agency	03/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>rescue operations. The MCA would expect any works in the marine environment to be subject to the appropriate consents under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 before carrying out any licensable works.</p> <p>We note that the proposed marine facility falls within the jurisdiction of a Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA)- Clyde Port and therefore they are responsible for the safety of navigation within their waters. The applicant will need to gain the approval/agreement of the responsible local navigation authority, and they may require a navigation risk assessment to be undertaken. They may also wish to issue local warnings to alert those navigating in the vicinity to the presence of the works as deemed necessary.</p> <p>The development will need to work with Clyde Port to ensure a robust safety management system (SMS) is in place for the project under the Port Marine Safety Code. Points to the Guide to Good Practice and the duties it places on Harbour authority to maintain safe operation of the harbour.</p> <p>It is not clear from the Scoping Report the extent of works required in the marine environment for the tail pond inlet/ outlet structure located to the north of the site on Loch Awe, and any potential impact on shipping and navigation. It is our understanding that this location falls outside of any statutory harbour authority jurisdiction. MCA, the MCA expect consideration to be given to the impact of the proposed works on shipping and navigation, relative to the scale of works, including any potential impact on fishing, recreational and commercial vessels. It is likely that any risk can be mitigation through suitably worded conditions and advisories at the formal marine licensing stage.</p>	<p>Chapter 11 – Water Environment details and considers the water environment features in relation to the Development, outlining measures for monitoring and mitigation.</p>
				<p>1) From the MCA's perspective, the Gatecheck Report accurately summarises the scoping stakeholder engagement that the applicant has undertaken with MCA and the summary of our advice given. When commenting on the Scoping Opinion on 16 August 2022 the MCA noted that shipping and navigation had been proposed to be scoped out of further assessment by the applicant, however, the Scoping Report from March 2023 states that "stakeholders to be consulted during the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") scoping process to ensure marine receptors are considered in the EIA report" which we welcome.</p> <p>2) As stated in the Gatecheck Report, the MCA advised that for the marine facility on Loch Fyne, Clydeport are responsible for the safety of navigation within their waters and the applicant will need to gain the approval/agreement of the responsible local navigation authority, and they may require a navigation risk assessment to be undertaken. The MCA notes the continuing stakeholder engagement by the applicant in the Gatecheck report which will ensure the relevant stakeholders, for example the Ministry of Defence (as Loch Fyne is a designated defence military exercise area) will remain consulted throughout the project. The MCA queried if there was a possibility of abnormal loads being</p>	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>required to replace components during maintenance. We note that this is possible that this may be required, however it is considered unlikely. Should this change, we would expect this aspect to be considered as part of the risk assessment.</p> <p>3) Although it is noted that the works on Loch Awe are not subject to the marine licensing regime, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency still has responsibilities for vessels operating inland, Loch Awe is considered Category C waters. The MCA would welcome further details on the proposals for the tail pond inlet/ outlet structure on Loch Awe, which we believe is outside of any statutory harbour authority jurisdiction. The MCA would expect consideration to be given to the impact of the proposed works on other marine users of Loch Awe and this can be discussed directly with MCA.</p> <p>4) Although the design for the project has evolved through Design IIII Post Scoping, to Design V Section 36 Submission design, the MCA does not consider that any of the changes proposed would alter the advice given to the applicant as summarised on page 19 of the Gateway Report.</p>	
22.1.01	MoD / QinetiQ	08/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>A new Pier is being installed in Loch Fyne to allow boats to off-load material, is this in support of the pumping station?            Is the Loch Fyne site and Pier only going to be used during the construction phase?            How often will it be used and would it be possible to de-conflict our trial activities?            During the construction phase how long and what construction?            Any in water construction is designed to not introduce noise to the water?            How far out does the Pier come?</p> <p>Any additional noise or vessel traffic when we have a trial on would be an issue. Also, when QinetiQ/MoD are completing high speed runs, the wake could cause issues for the project.</p>	<p>Email response given to queries 08-04-2024</p> <p><b>A new Pier is being installed in Loch Fyne to allow boats to off-load material, is this in support of the pumping station?</b> – the pier will be a temporary feature of the pumped storage hydro Development to allow for delivery of abnormal indivisible loads during construction. Post construction the pier will be removed with the piles remaining in-situ.</p> <p><b>Is the Loch Fyne site and Pier only going to be used during the construction phase?</b> – yes            How often will it be used and would it be possible to de-conflict our trial activities? – a maximum of 10 deliveries are estimated. These can be coordinated with the appointed construction contractor, I have added this into the mitigation register.</p> <p><b>During the construction phase how long and what construction?</b> – it will take approximately 12 months to construct with the piles installed from a jack-up barge. The installation method is expected to be dominated by in-water vibratory piling but there may be a requirement to use drop hammer impact piling to toe the piles into bedrock to install the Marine Facility. No dredging will be required for construction of the Marine Facility.</p> <p><b>Any in water construction is designed to not introduce noise to the water ?</b> – as noted above, vibro-piles will be used where possible, however without GI information we cannot confirm that this will be possible and so within our assessment have assessed worst case drop hammer within Loch Fyne. Mitigation is included within the noise assessment to reduce noise impacts where possible following BS 5228-1 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites Noise. Measures are set out within Table B.1 Methods of reducing</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
					<p>noise levels from construction plant  <a href="https://www.warrington.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2020-08/cf53_bs_5228_pt1-2009a1-2014.pdf">https://www.warrington.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2020-08/cf53_bs_5228_pt1-2009a1-2014.pdf</a></p> <p>How many trials are typically undertaken a year? It may be possible to cease piling activities on the day of the trials. This would be able to be coordinated with the appointed construction contractor. Please let me know an estimate number of days a year trials are undertaken and I can add this mitigation into the EIAR if it is something that we think can be managed in this way.</p> <p><b>How far out does the Pier come?</b> - The Marine Facility will comprise 72 (estimated) x 600mm (D) piles in a 5m x 5m arrangement on a 600mm deep pre-fabricated steel bridge deck which will be 180m long and 10m wide. The Marine Facility has been designed to accommodate the following vessel types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deck Cargo Barge. 50m x 14m, 2m draft (assumed), deck load 6 t/m2, deadweight tonnage 1300 tonnes. Only for use during mean tide and above.</li> <li>• Crane: Vessel- based Crane. Floating sheerleg. 45.1m x 20.1m, 1.6m draft, 400t lift capacity</li> </ul> <p>EIAR updated to include mitigation to cease piling on trial days to circa 12 days per year, with dates to be agreed with the appointed Construction contractor who will maintain in contact with the MoD / QinetiQ throughout construction as required.</p>
23.1.01	Mountaineering Scotland	10/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	Mountaineering Scotland has no comments to make on this Scoping report at this time.	Noted
24.1.01	MOWI	25/03/2024 & 03/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>25th March - I can advise that Mowi has an interest in this development given the presence of operational fish farms on Loch Awe and I will respond further on the scoping opinion once I had the opportunity to review the documents.</p> <p>3rd April - whilst the Loch Awe fish farms have previously raised Rainbow trout, a consultation process is underway with stakeholders and regulators on the potential transition of the Loch Awe fish farms to rear Atlantic salmon smolts.</p> <p>Concerned that no specific assessments on the potential effects to the operation of the fish farms has been scoped for inclusion in the EIAR. We would consider that this is a material omission.</p> <p>The farmed salmon sector contributes to the Scottish economy every year providing direct employment for over 2,500 people in farming and a further 10,000 across Scotland. It is surprising therefore that there is no reference to the economic importance of fish farming in the socio-</p>	<p>Thank you for your consultation response to the Balliemanoach Gatecheck. We confirm that Dawnfresh Fish Farming were consulted as part of Scoping and can only assume a technical error has resulted in the Scoping Report not being received as we have no record of issues with the email being delivered. Notwithstanding, we welcome the opportunity to consult with Mowi Scotland at this time. We take note of your comments received as part of the Gatecheck 1 consultation process and provide the following response.</p> <p>As noted within the Scoping Report there are two freshwater pen fish farms in Loch Awe:</p> <p>“A review of online aerial photography and SEPA’s Scotland’s Aquaculture website has identified two commercial fish farms. The first is approximately 10 km southwest of the proposed inlet / outlet structure of the Development into Loch Awe and is Braevallich Fish Farm, operated by Dawnfresh Seafoods Ltd under CAR licence CAR/L/100232. The</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>economic chapter of the Scoping Report given the presence of fish farms within Loch Awe</p> <p>The potential effects of the development on the continued operation of the fish farms requires to be scoped into the EIAR. We would expect the Water Environment and the Water Resources impact assessments outlined in the Scoping Report to be expanded to examine the specific risk to the fish farms and, if required identification of appropriate mitigation measures and actions. We would specifically highlight the following issues that require to be examined within the EIAR.</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>risk of connectivity of any potential catchment scale water quality impacts from construction phase pollution with the Loch Awe fish farms. Increased concentrations of suspended solids can impact farmed salmon behaviour and health through gill irritation and stress responses, including altered swim behaviour and reduced appetite. It will be necessary for the assessment of effects to define the likely particle sizes that the suspended material will comprise, in order to then also assess their potential dispersion and transport. Small particulates which remain in suspension for a significant period could have the potential to travel significant distances within Loch Awe via wind-driven surface currents, and this warrants specific examination within the EIAR.</li> </ul> <p>The liberation and release into the water environment of concentrations of metals from soil / rock excavations is also of potential concern for both wildlife and farmed fish, due to their persistency and potential for adverse effects. Impacts to fish (native and farm raised) can include oxidative stress, weakened immune systems, tissue and organ damage, and growth defects, with the ultimate potential to impact survival. Metal pollutants have the potential to cause toxicity effects to fish even at low levels. The EIAR should examine the potential impacts from the release of metals from soil / rock excavations with a specific assessment on potential impacts on farmed fish health.</p> <p>The Scoping Report identifies the potential for direct and indirect water quality and hydromorphological effects during the construction operation. We would stress the importance of maintaining water quality throughout the catchment during the construction phase, especially for Loch Awe in respect of the health and welfare of both native and farm raised fish. There should not be an inference that water quality impacts are inevitable and robust, effective mitigation measures supported by continuous water quality monitoring, with independent oversight are required. The Scoping Report in discussing construction phase impacts references that there is a significant buffering potential (within Loch Awe) due to the large size and volume of the waterbody. The size and scale of Loch Awe should not</p>	<p>second is located at the mouth of the River Awe, on the opposite bank of the Falls of Cruachan, and is Tervine Farm operated by Dawnfresh Farming Ltd (CAR/L/100236). Both farms are for rainbow trout. Elevated phosphorus levels from fresh water fish farming has been identified by SEPA as a pressure on this waterbody, although measures have been put in place to resolve this by 2024.”</p> <p>We note your statement that no specific assessments on the potential effects to the operation of the fish farms has been scoped for inclusion in the EIAR, and a request to examine the specific risks to the fish farms, and if required identification of appropriate mitigation measures and actions. Summarised below are key points raised by Mowi and how these will be addressed within the submitted EIAR:</p> <p><b>Socio-Economics</b></p> <p>Mowi: 1) The farmed salmon sector contributes more than £760 million to the Scottish economy every year through direct, supply chain and employment impacts. The sector generates more than £1.2 billion worth of Scottish salmon at farm gate providing direct employment for over 2,500 people in farming and a further 10,000 across Scotland. Freshwater lochs are an important part of the farming cycle for both Rainbow trout and Atlantic salmon, approximately 50% of salmon smolts are produced in freshwater lochs in Scotland. There is no reference to the economic importance of fish farming in the socio-economic chapter of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Response: The socio-economic and tourism chapter focusses on a 5 km Study Area, for which the two fish farms (Braevallich and Trevine) are outwith this distance from the Development. The Aquatic Ecology (see later response below) assessment highlights that there are no anticipated significant effects on the fish farms during construction or operation, and as such these were scoped out of further assessment within the Socio-economics chapter. Notwithstanding, the socio-economics chapter will be updated to include statistics on salmon fishing and address the points Mowi raise.</p> <p><b>Construction</b></p> <p>Mowi: 2) connectivity of any potential catchment scale water quality impacts from construction phase pollution with the Loch Awe fish farms:</p> <p>a) assessment of effects to define the likely particle sizes that the suspended material will comprise, in order to then also assess their potential dispersion and transport.</p> <p>Response: Chapter 11 in Volume 2 of the EIAR will consider potential impacts to Loch Awe and its catchment from any runoff potentially contaminated by fine sediment or chemicals from construction works. All construction works at the inlet/outlet structure will occur behind a silt curtain and coffer dam. This, and the mitigation measures to be outlined</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>be considered as a mitigating factor for construction phase pollution.</p> <p>Operational Phase Impacts:            A key concern for the continued viable operation of the fish farms is the potential impacts through changes to water levels within Loch Awe, both high water and low water levels. Mowi operates freshwater fish farms in a number of loch waterbodies which are also subject to storage hydro operations. Fluctuations in water levels outside of normal waterbody changes have the potential to significantly impact the operation of fish farms and we have direct experiences of this elsewhere.            The Scoping Report correctly identifies the range of existing hydro operations within the Loch Awe catchment and the influences and behaviour these operations have on current water levels in Loch Awe. The Development will result in further changes to water levels within Loch Awe and a generic assessment on the likely variation in water levels in Loch Awe is proposed, based on the pumped and generating volumes and surface area of the loch with a commitment that if the outcomes are found to be significant, further modelling of the impact will be undertaken to identify mitigation measures to reduce the impact. It is essential that effects of changes in water levels in Loch Awe and the potential for impacts to the operation of the fish farms is scoped into the EIAR. This EIAR should examine the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of water level changes on the mooring systems and containment measures for stock at the Tervine and Braevallich fish farms.</li> <li>• Assessment of water level changes to shoreside farm infrastructure such as slipways and vessel pontoons. High water or low water level changes may render facilities such as slipways and pontoons unusable for periods of time. Maintenance of year-round vessel access to the fish farms is required especially during key in-year periods involving sensitive operations such as fish transfers in and out of the fish farms.</li> </ul>	<p>in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Water Management Plan (WMP) will help to reduce the risk of construction runoff containing high levels of fine sediment entering the Loch Awe. Suspended sediment could enter Loch Awe from works further inland within the catchment. However, with the proposed mitigation measures and noting that both the fish farms are over 10km from the Development, it is determined that sediment-laden run off will not have any significant impact.</p> <p>b) assessment of effects from the release of metals from soil / rock excavations with a specific assessment on potential impacts on farmed fish health            Response: The Aquatic Ecology assessment has determined that adequate pollution and fine sediment prevention measures will be conditioned in the subsequent contractors CEMP (and WMP), and in combination with the distance of the fish farms from the Development it is considered to be proportionate to the risk on the fish farm with no significant effects on fish. With the embedded mitigation to ensure water quality is not adversely affected during construction, and considering the distance of the fish farms from the Development (approx. 10 km SW of the inlet/outlet, and at the mouth of the River Awe opposite the falls of Cruachan, approx. 11 km to the NW), it is considered that there to be no impacts on the fish farms due to water quality (suspended solids or metals).</p> <p>c) potential construction run-off release points to the water environment and connectivity to Loch Awe should be identified for appropriate mitigation measures            Response: Chapter 11 in Volume 2 of the EIAR will present an assessment of potential effects on the water environment, including the risk from construction site runoff to Loch Awe or the mobilisation of fine sediment or chemical spillage risk within Loch Awe. Construction works within Loch Awe and for the inlet/outlet will be behind a silt curtain and coffer dam, thus reducing the risk from suspended sediment or chemical spillages should they occur as part of the construction works. Other works further inland may be a source of contamination indirectly via hillside streams. Although none of these streams enter Loch Awe within 10 km of either Braevallich fish farm or Tervine Farm, there are also robust measures set out in the EIAR to manage these risks. These include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction works will be carried out in accordance with a CEMP and WMP, for which an Outline Water Management Plan (oWMP) will be submitted with the EIAR. Measures are included to manage the risk from:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Fine sediment on construction runoff</li> <li>o Risk of chemical spillages</li> <li>o Physical damage to water features</li> <li>o Works in water features</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
					<p>o Drainage from construction welfare facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All temporary works will be carried out under the necessary consents/permits (e.g. CAR licences as required under the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) Regulations 2011.</li> <li>• A Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Plan is proposed to monitor the construction works and identify early any issues with the temporary drainage system or pollution risks.</li> </ul> <p>d) effective mitigation measures supported by continuous water quality monitoring, with independent oversight</p> <p>Response: The Applicant recognises that the construction and operation of the Development may have adverse impacts on the water environment, and that third party users of local water resources could be affected. As set out in our answer to the above query, it is proposed to implement robust mitigation measures during construction and operation phases. The scope of monitoring will be defined in a Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Plan, which it is assumed will be implemented pursuant to a planning condition. The Water Quality and Flow Monitoring Plan will set out how baseline data and monitoring of construction works will be undertaken to ensure the correct operation of treatment measures and the early identification of any pollution risks; baseline water quality data for seasonal thermal stratification and physico-chemical changes in Loch Awe (where no other data exists) to monitor any future changes will be gathered; and how data will be gathered to support determination of suitable compensation flows along affected watercourses such as the Allt Beochlich. The plan will require monitoring pre-construction, during construction, and for a period post construction and during initial operation. The Environmental Clerk of Works or other suitably qualified person will be responsible for implementing the 'during works' monitoring and the Emergency Response Plan that will form part of the WMP. Water quality monitoring will be required of all potentially affected water features and may include daily/weekly visual and olfactory observations or after heavy or prolonged rainfall, in situ monitoring using a calibrated hand-held probe, and potentially the deployment of in situ sondes or collection of grab samples on a regular or ad hoc basis for analysis at an accredited laboratory. Monthly environmental audits to record performance and identify any corrective actions may also be undertaken, although the frequency may depend on the nature of the works. Overall, the water quality monitoring programme will be developed by the Construction Contractor in consultation with SEPA and other relevant stakeholders during detailed design and the process of obtaining CAR licences for works affecting, or for temporary discharges to, the water features and watercourses in and around the Development.</p> <p>e) construction phase impacts references that there is a significant buffering potential (within Loch Awe) due to the large size and volume of the waterbody. The size and scale of Loch Awe should not be considered</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
					<p>as a mitigating factor for construction phase pollution.            Response: As noted above, a number of mitigation measures will be included within the EIA and associated management plans which will be adhered to pre-construction, during construction and post construction. These measures will help to avoid, minimise and reduce potential adverse impacts on Loch Awe. However, it is relevant to note that the risk to the two fish farms will be proportionately lower due to the distance between the points where the Development may impact water quality in Loch Awe and the dilution and dispersion that would occur in between.</p> <p><b>Operation</b>            Mowi 3) A key concern for the continued viable operation of the fish farms is the potential impacts through changes to water levels within Loch Awe, both high water and low water levels.</p> <p>a) Assessment of water level changes on the mooring systems and containment measures for stock at the Tervine and Braevallich fish farms            Response: The commitment within the EIA to maintain water levels within normal fluctuations in Loch Awe through the operational regime of the scheme will ensure changes to water levels do not adversely affect the fish farms. Water levels will be controlled through a Controlled Activity Regulations (CAR) licence from SEPA. Operational regime is proposed to limit the impact if the scheme during periods of high and low water levels. This is based on a hands-off arrangement when water levels fall below and agreed level together with a no discharge / generation when water level are above an agreed level. This will ensure that the scheme does not impact on extreme water levels in Loch Awe. An assessment of the rate of variation in change of water level has been carried out based on the proposed generation and abstraction rate. The rate of change has been found to be in line with the current changes in Loch Awe based on review of historic water level. The larger rates of change however will occur on a more frequent basis as a result of the scheme operation.</p> <p>b) Assessment of water level changes to shoreside farm infrastructure such as slipways and vessel pontoons. High water or low water level changes may render facilities such as slipways and pontoons unusable for periods of time. Maintenance of year-round vessel access to the fish farms is required especially during key in-year periods involving sensitive operations such as fish transfers in and out of the fish farm            Response: Operational regime is proposed to limit the impact if the scheme during periods of high and low water levels. This is based on a hands-off arrangement when water levels fall below and agreed level together with a no discharge / generation when water level are above an agreed level. This will ensure that the scheme does not impact on extreme water level in Loch Awe. An assessment of the rate of variation in change of water level has been carried out based on the proposed generation and abstraction rate. The rate of change has been found to</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
24.1.02	MOWI	10/05/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>Thank you for the prompt response with further clarifications and the commitment to update the socio-economic chapter, reflecting the importance of fish farming both local to the Development and nationally.</p> <p>While we note (and welcome) the environmental studies and assessments that will form part of the EIAR report we are still of the opinion that these assessments should examine the specific risks (impacts to water quality and changes in water level management) to the operation of both our Loch Awe fish farms (Braevallich and Tervine). We are supportive in principle of renewable energy generation and recognise the national benefits that pumped storage hydro can deliver, however as an existing user of the shared water resource in Loch Awe we require confidence that any risks to our operations are fully addressed during the licensing of the development.</p> <p>Water Quality We require high water quality to support the health and welfare of our fish and notwithstanding the 10km separation distance between the development and the nearest farm we do not believe that at this stage it can be concluded with any degree of certainty that there will be "no impacts on the fish farms due to water quality (suspended solids or metals)." A detailed assessment may ultimately arrive at this conclusion, and we would maintain that this assessment should be an essential component of the EIAR.</p> <p>Water Levels We note the initial assessment that the Development will not result in any changes to the current extent of water level fluctuation within Loch Awe. As explained within our response, our operations are sensitive to changes in water level in terms of access to our fish farms and associated operations, such as fish movements. To illustrate, I can advise that the present high-water level in Loch Awe presents us with operational difficulties with unloading fish deliveries at our Tervine fish farm. The Development, while stated to maintain water level changes with current high and low water extremes, will cause the larger rates of change to occur on a more frequent basis. This is a significant concern; if the highest loch water level at Tervine will be achieved more frequently, this will be restrictive and impact on our ability to mitigate and adapt time sensitive operations such as fish transfers. We would therefore maintain</p>	<p>be in line with the current changes in Loch Awe based on review of historic water level. The larger rates of change however will occur on a more frequent basis as a result of the scheme operation. These however will be in line of the normal water level changes that are currently occurring in Loch Awe.</p> <p>Chapters updated as per consultation response.</p> <p>Chapter 12 – Water Resources and Flood Risk has been updated to include further assessment on impacts on changes in water levels to fish farms.</p>



ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>our position, with justification, that that the potential impacts to both our fish farms (specifically Tervine), from changes to water level management (extent and frequency) in Loch Awe requires to be examined in detail within the EIAR.</p> <p>We would be happy to further discuss and be supportive of any information requirements that would be required for the EIAR.</p>	
25.1.01	NATS Safeguarding	22/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	NATS anticipates no impact from the proposal as it does not include any wind turbines and is not in proximity to any of its infrastructure. They have no comments to make on Scoping.	Noted
25.2.01	NATS	19/03/2024	Gatecheck 1	NATS anticipates no impact from the proposal and previously made a representation to this effect. We are satisfied that the NATS representation and position are captured and correctly portrayed within the Scoping Report.	Noted
26.1.01	NatureScot	09/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>The proposal has the potential to affect nationally important peatland habitat on this site and if adverse impacts cannot be overcome by siting, design or mitigation we could object to this proposal.</p> <p>NatureScot advise that it is premature to scope out operational and decommissioning effects as during the operational phase significant impacts on peat resources and habitats are still expected from a long term change in hydrology over the whole catchment area and the possible effect of the change in reservoir water levels on adjacent peatland. They advise that a peat depth survey, a Peatland Management Plan and a Habitat Management Plan will be required for the site.</p> <p>The impacts of construction on groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE) receptors, peatland habitats and peat resources is likely to include a loss or degradation of their hydrological, hydromorphological and ecological characters, associated with the issue of water quality on and off-site. Request slope/embankment instability risks to be considered as this may trigger landslide and flooding events on adjacent habitats.</p> <p>Consider prolonged drought period post construction.</p> <p>Consider how lowering of the reservoir water level could expose peat material which will have been reused/ reinstated during construction of the reservoir and embankments which in turn could lead to GHG emissions/ increased particulate transport.</p> <p>The water resource assessment should consider the wider impact of the isolation of the upper part of Allt Beochlich on Peat and Peatland habitats. Change in flow curves and impacts on the water table level from the reservoir and streams during and post construction may impact on the integrity of the peat mass and function of peatland habitats.</p> <p>Propose habitat and NVC surveys should include sufficient area to determine the hydrological unit of blanket bog.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 – Geology and Soils details and considers the geological features in relation to the Development.</p> <p>A Peat Management Plan is also detailed in Appendix 10.2.</p> <p>Peatland loss to the Development has also been considered and peatland restoration/enhancement measures incorporated into the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>States that Section 10.5 Peat Assessment mistakenly identifies Peat landscape Hazard and Risk Assessment guidance but aside from this agrees proposals under this section are appropriate.</p> <p>Peat resource beyond the headpond, access tracks and tunnelling should be included as there could be hydrological connection between these areas.</p> <p>An assessment to determine the extent and impact of dewatering if peat removal during construction occurs, in conjunction with tunnelling Section 17. Climate does not appear to include loss of GHG associated with change or damage to soil/ peat and the carbon sequestration potential of peatland habitats.</p>	
26.1.01	NatureScot	09/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>NatureScot propose potential for collaboration between Blarghour wind farm's Land Management Plan and a Peatland/ Habitat Management Plan from Ballieameanoch's side in order to maximise potential benefits to the natural heritage and mitigate compensate impacts. Given the scale of the proposal and the potential to affect nationally important peatland habitat on this site they could object to this proposal if adverse impacts cannot be overcome by siting, design or mitigation.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 – Geology and Soils details and considers the geological features in relation to the Development.</p> <p>A Peat Management Plan is also detailed in Appendix 10.2</p>
26.1.01	NatureScot	09/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>The proposal could potentially result in significant adverse effects and cumulative effects in relation to highly sensitive landscape of the nationally important Loch Etive Mountains Wild Land Area (WLA 09). Should effects on this WLA be found to significantly affect the qualities of this landscape, we may object to this Proposal in relation to effects on these interests.</p> <p>The ZTVs show that there would be no predicted visibility within the 15km study area over the Ben Lui Wild Land Area (WLA 06). However, the wider extents of the ZTV shows visibility of the headpond over Beinn a' Chleibh to the southwest of Ben Lui within WLA 06 and given this pattern of visibility we predict potential visibility over the surrounds and summit of Ben Lui, out with the study area.</p> <p>The Scoping Report has not included WLAs on the landscape designations or site constraints mapping and does not state the inclusion of a Wild Land Assessment within the scope of the proposed assessment. We advise that the effect on WLAs should not be scoped out until we have a better understanding of the potential for effects on the WLAs. Wirelines on Ben Cruachan, Stob Garbh, Ben Eunaich and Beinn a' Chleibh/ Ben Lui are suggested to understand the effects on WLA 06 and WLA 09.</p> <p>If a Wild Land Assessment is deemed to be required the following should be included: cumulative effects on WLA 06 and WLA 09, effects from lighting on WLA 09, also may be a requirement for night-time visualisations here. the cumulative effects of lighting may also be required given the potential proposal lighting of Blarghour Wind Farm variation.</p>	<p>Chapter 05 – Landscape and Visual Assessment has detailed and considered the landscape impacts in relation to the Development.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
26.1.01	NatureScot	09/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Further details on what should be included in the photomontages can be viewed in the scoping opinion:            Z:\UK\UKEDI4\Jobs\PR-291676_ILI_Portfolio_EIA\400_Technical\430_EIA Management\4303_Ballie\00 Consultation\Scoping Opinion 2022\NatureScot</p> <p>Impacts on the Glen Etive and Glen Fyne Special protection Area (SPA) for breeding golden eagles.            The assessment should include impacts on the SPA, its Natural Heritage Zone (NHZ) 14 population and transient birds. NatureScot suggest satellite tag data for the two golden eagles in the vicinity of the Proposal area should be obtained from Natural Research Projects Ltd.            The proposal is located within a golden eagle territory which has only recently become a single territory historically having been two separate territories. NatureScot propose the Applicant should consult with Argyl Raptor Study Group with regards to nest sites, alternative nest sites, and recent breeding productivity, in order to gain a clearer understanding of the situation.            Highlight the requirement for sufficient level of detail regarding construction methods, and the likely requirement for a Species Protection Plan as part of the EIA Report given the location of the Proposal and surrounding developments.            White tailed eagle, other Schedule 1 raptors and Black Grouse are likely to be additional main species of interests on the site. Should be assessed for onsite impacts and cumulative impacts from other operational and consented development at the relevant NHZ level.            List surrounding developments of interest: Blarghour. Car Duibh (ECU reference: ECU00003254), and Ladyfield (ECU reference: ECU00003291) wind farms which are in very close proximity to the Proposal, as well as the Creag Dhubh to Inveraray 275 kV OHL (ECU reference: ECU00003442), Creag Dhubh – Dalmally 275 kV OHL (ECU reference: ECU00002199), and Blarghour connection 132kV OHL.            Regarding vantage point survey locations - due to being located in areas of high predicted eagle activity, they could affect bird behaviour and reduce NatureScot's confidence in survey results. Propose minimise observers' effect on bird behaviour - and suggest best located outside the survey area where possible and provide further guidance on minimising the effects on bird behaviour.</p>	<p>Chapter 09 – Ornithology details and considers the ornithology features in relation to the Development, outlining measures for monitoring and mitigation.            Appendix 9.1 accompanies Chapter 9: Ornithology of the EIAR (Volume 2). It describes in detail the desk study and field survey carried out to establish the baseline conditions within the zone of influence (ZoI) of the Development with respect of bird species.            Golden Eagle Topographical Modelling has been conducted and can be found in Appendix 9.2.</p>
26.1.01	NatureScot	09/09/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Regarding the potential impacts on the Upper Loch Fyne and Loch Goil Nature Conservation Marine Protected Area (MPA). NatureScot recommend that the following additional information is obtained:            - A video seabed survey of the development footprint should be carried out to check for the presence and extent of any protected features of the Upper Loch Fyne and Loch Goil NC MPA. If there is potential to micro-</p>	<p>Noted,            The EIAR has detailed and considered the marine features in relation to the Development. Additional baseline reports and survey reports are detailed below:</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>locate the Proposal, there will be a requirement to extend the survey beyond the immediate footprint. The video will need to be of sufficient quality to identify biotopes/species and their extent to help determine whether the impacts are capable of affecting the protected features other than insignificantly;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide mitigation measures to minimise the siltation and debris from construction, loading and transport and address any impacts from ballast water; and</li> <li>- Provide information on vessel movements such as the frequency of vessel visits.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding Marine Mammals, note that JNCC mitigation protocols covered by "Section 8.5 Likely mitigation measures" does not document measures to mitigate disturbance effects but has been developed to reduce to negligible levels the potential risk of injury or death to marine mammals in close proximity operations. It should be used in conjunction with 'The Protection of Marine European Protected Species from Injury and Disturbance: Guidance for Scottish Inshore Waters' available at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/publications/marine-european-protected-species-protection-from-injury-and-disturbance/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/marine-european-protected-species-protection-from-injury-and-disturbance/</a>.</p> <p>Several marine mammals are known to commonly occur in the outer Loch Fyne area including harbour porpoise (<i>Phocoena phocoena</i>), bottlenose dolphins (<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>), grey seal (<i>Halichoerus grypus</i>) and harbour seal (<i>Phoca vitulina</i>). In our opinion, there is a risk that disturbance could occur, even with the proposed mitigation. As such, the requirement for an EPS licence should be discussed with Marine Scotland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aquatic Ecology Baseline Report is found in Appendix 7.1.</li> <li>- Intertidal Survey Report is found in Appendix 8.1</li> <li>- Subtidal Benthic Survey Report is found in Appendix 8.2</li> <li>- A Marine Protected Area Assessment is found in Appendix 8.3</li> </ul>
26.2.01	NatureScot	16/03/2023	post-scoping	Meeting to discuss site access for their upcoming site visit and validity of our bird survey data	N/A
26.3.01	NatureScot	15/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>Loch Etive Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - The Proposal could affect Loch Etive Woods SAC is protected for its woodland habitat and otter (<i>Lutra lutra</i>). More information can be found on our website at: <a href="https://sitelink.nature.scot/site/8295">https://sitelink.nature.scot/site/8295</a>. The site's status means that the requirements of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &amp;c.) Regulations 1994 as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations') apply or, for reserved matters, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Consequently, the Energy Consents Unit is required to consider the effect of the Proposal on the SAC before it can be consented (commonly known as Habitats Regulations Appraisal). The NatureScot website has a summary of the legislative requirements (<a href="https://www.NatureScot.scot/professional-advice/safeguarding-protected-areas-and-species/protected-species/legal-framework/habitats-directive-and-habitats-regulations">https://www.NatureScot.scot/professional-advice/safeguarding-protected-areas-and-species/protected-species/legal-framework/habitats-directive-and-habitats-regulations</a>).</p>	<p>Thank you for your response to Gatecheck for Balliemeanoch. We welcome your feedback and can provide the following response:</p> <p>Loch Etive Woods SAC          This SAC has been considered in both the Statement to Inform HRA and the EIA, including the otter qualifying interest and taking account of otter home ranges of up to 40 km. The Statement to Inform HRA concludes no likely significant effect on otter, and the EIA similarly concludes that effects on otter will be Not Significant. The Statement to Inform HRA and the EIA also consider other European sites, including Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA, the former concluding no adverse effect on site integrity and the latter a Negligible effect which is Not Significant. In summary, no adverse effects are predicted on any European site.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>A potential connection exists between the Proposal and the otter qualifying interest which was not raised in our scoping response. Otters are wide-ranging and highly mobile. The population at Loch Etive Woods SAC is reliant on suitable habitat in the surrounding wider terrestrial, freshwater, and coastal environments. At this SAC otters will also feed in coastal waters that lie outwith the boundary of the site along Loch Etive, and in freshwater at Loch Awe. Males living in rivers and streams can have a mean linear range size of around 40 km and females living in the same habitat can have a linear home range of around 20 km. When assessing the effects of the Proposal consideration should be given to whether impacts originating outwith the SAC, i.e. changes in the Loch Awe water levels, could affect achievement of the conservation objectives.</p> <p>Peat, peatland habitat and carbon rich soils - The Gatecheck Report does not contain or address all our scoping comments within Table 3.2 column Scoping Response Topic or Post-Scoping Consultation, specifically in relation to impacts on nationally important carbon-rich soils, deep peat (&gt; 0.5 m) and priority peatland habitat, Upper Loch Fyne and Loch Goil Nature Conservation Marine Protected Area (NC MPA), or wild deer. Please refer to our scoping response for the latter two topics. In light of NPF4, we wish to highlight that we have updated our guidance note on carbon-rich soils and priority peatland habitats in development management, available at: <a href="https://www.nature.scot/doc/advising-peatland-carbon-rich-soils-and-priority-peatland-habitats-development-management">https://www.nature.scot/doc/advising-peatland-carbon-rich-soils-and-priority-peatland-habitats-development-management</a>. This revised note now includes information on the mitigation hierarchy (including the level of offsetting we would expect) and enhancement as well as outlining what information we require from developers as part of the EIA. It also provides clear advice on how we identify priority peatland and assess whether a development will result in impacts which raise issues of national interest. To offset potential loss, we consider that the area of peatland restoration needs to be substantially greater than the area lost. Our guidance provides our recommendations on the amount of restoration needed to achieve compensation (1:10 ratio of lost:restored) and to achieve additional biodiversity enhancement (a further 10% of the baseline extent of priority peatland habitat). NPF4 Policy 5d states that where development on peatland, carbon-rich soils or priority peatland habitats is proposed, a detailed site-specific assessment is required. Annex 2 of our peatland guidance recommends that information to support an application should contain enough detail to clarify the estimated extent of restoration and to demonstrate that proposals for peatland restoration are likely to be effective. It advises the provision of information similar to that required for a Peatland Action application. For example, clear mapping of the condition of the peatland habitats (whether Near-Natural, Modified, Drained and Actively Eroding),</p>	<p>Peat, peatland habitat and carbon rich soils          With regard to wild deer, the possible impact of habitat loss by increasing wild deer pressure on retained habitats has been addressed and discussed in the EIA, under the operational effects on ancient/semi-natural woodland, blanket bog, groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE) and other notable habitats. For blanket bog, GWDTE and other notable habitat, the EIA concludes that there would be Permanent Adverse effects through wild deer pressure, but of Local significance only (regarded by the EIA as overall Not Significant). The effect of wild deer pressure on ancient/semi-natural woodland was assessed as Negligible and Not Significant.</p> <p>Peatland loss to the Development has also been considered and peatland restoration/enhancement measures incorporated into the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). Loss of blanket bog to the Development amounts to 1.6 km<sup>2</sup>. This area has been calculated using the National Vegetation Classification (NVC) results, including all mosaic components corresponding to blanket bog (mainly forms of M17 and M19). This is more accurate than using the Phase 1 blanket bog extents, because small amounts of blanket bog can occur in areas dominated by other habitats. Figure 6.3 of Chapter 06 Terrestrial Ecology provides information on blanket bog condition by indicating where blanket bog is clearly degraded (mapped and symbolised as the Phase 1 category E1.7), and where blanket bog is wettest with the most sphagnum (mainly forms of M17) and closest to natural condition (symbolised using an overlaid non-Phase 1 symbol). Blanket bog that is not symbolised as either of these conditions is frequently not in optimal condition, being subject to a degree of overgrazing and considered likely to have been burnt at various times in the past (suggested, for example, by the otherwise inexplicable great rarity of species such as cloudberry <i>Rubus chamaemorus</i> in the drier M19 bog, and with four known locations of obvious recent burning).</p> <p>The outline LEMP includes a habitat measure termed 'Peatland/Upland Rehabilitation'. This is proposed to be a large deer-fenced area around the proposed headpond, within which grazing will be permitted by livestock (deer being excluded) to conservation-level intensity only. The level of grazing, measure in livestock units, would be similar to that employed on SACs with qualifying blanket bog, and would be monitored and altered if necessary. Burning would also not be permitted within this area. The proposed Peatland/Upland Restoration area is approximately 3 km<sup>2</sup> in size. There will also be restoration of small areas of bare peat exposure and local blocking of drainage grips, using peat obtained from the proposed headpond area. It is acknowledged that 3 km<sup>2</sup> is less than the 1:10 ratio suggested by NatureScot, however it is approximately double the area lost; for a project of this type (in contrast to, for example,</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>identification of site-based restoration features (hags, gullies, peat dams etc), identification of a 'restoration footprint' around these features, based on identification of ditches to be blocked for example. We recommend the application should include information on past and current management, and proposals for future management including explanation of how grazing/browsing will be appropriately managed. It should also describe the proposed restoration methods informed by best practice advice, including our website guidance on peatland restoration techniques, and particularly our technical compendium.</p>	<p>a wind farm, whose extent can be very large but actual footprint small) a 1:10 ratio would require an extremely large restoration area of 16 km<sup>2</sup>, roughly equivalent in size to the entirety of Balliemanoch estate. It is also noted that the referenced NatureScot guidance does not consider grazing control and cessation of burning to constitute peatland restoration. However, we consider on the contrary that it is appropriate to consider them as restoration measures. Whilst deer grazing might theoretically be controlled by a deer management plan, this would require on-going culling at a high level, with deer able to enter the area and re-colonise from adjacent land, and may be not guaranteed to achieve sufficient grazing reduction; whereas a maintained deer-fenced area would instantly stop deer grazing in the deer-fenced area and provides for much easier control of low-level grazing (by livestock only). Similarly, it is considered appropriate to treat cessation of burning as a form of restoration – burning of peatland has taken place recently in the area, and almost certainly historically over a prolonged period, and this has very likely contributed to the rarity of certain species (such as the cloudberry mentioned above) and the frequency of reduced ericoid cover – cessation of burning (in combination with grazing reduction) would in time allow ericoids and other blanket bog species to develop and spread, forming a more natural bog vegetation. This would also likely provide benefits to fauna – for example, development of more ericaceous bog vegetation has potential to encourage more red grouse, which in turn would have potential to support golden eagle (present locally) whose breeding success is known to be much-aided by a sufficiency of live prey, currently rather lacking (red grouse numbers not being high, and with an apparent absence of mountain hares despite historical evidence).</p> <p>I hope that the above satisfies NatureScot's queries and concerns, however if you would like to discuss this further please get in touch.</p>
27.1.01	Network Rail	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Request to design and carry out works on this site in accordance with Network Rail's guidance document "Requirement for Construction Work on or Near Railways Operational Land by Outside Parties" which is attached to the Scoping Opinion.</p> <p>In order to further assist with responding specifically to the enquiry ask that the attached development questionnaire is completed and returned with as much detail as possible. A member of their team will then response with advice on the specific requirements needed in relation to the proposed works.</p>	Attached development questionnaire filled in for specific feedback.
27.2.01	Network Rail	05/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>After assessing the submitted Gatecheck Report, Network Rail considers that the development and the proposed construction traffic routes will have no impact on railway infrastructure. Network Rail also supports the proposed delivery of abnormal and indivisible loads via a new marine facility to be constructed on Loch Fyne.</p>	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
28.1.01	Northern Lighthouse Board	18/03/2024	Gatecheck 1	Northern Lighthouse Board note the amendments that have been made following the Scoping Report consultation, and are content with the elements proposed for inclusion for the jetty construction and operation. NLB will continue to engage with the developer with regard to navigational safety, and will provide lighting and marking recommendations in response to the Marine Licence consultation for the construction of the jetty.	Noted
29.1.01	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	Although the Development does not lie within a nuclear site consultation zone, the scale of the reservoir proposed in the planning application is such that it meets our "special case" criteria: this means that we retain an interest in the proposal. Consequently, we have no comment to make at this time but we request that we be consulted at all future stages of the planning application process.	Noted
30.1.01	Peel Port Group	08/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	Considerations for the safety of navigation and protection of the marine environment, and the construction of the new pier are Clydeport's focus. Clydeport acknowledge that more assessments are requirement and consider that an assessment of any impact of the works on surrounding designated sites and where appropriate outlining any mitigation measures that the project may need to undertake. It is not clear whether any dredging is required for the construction of the new pier, and whether this would be needed to accommodate vessels delivering equipment or materials for the Hydro Scheme. Any works below MHWS proposed within the Clydeport's jurisdiction may require a Works Licence so early consultation would be required when plans are more advanced. We note that the new pier is considered temporary so we would to understand what are the intentions for this structure on completion of the construction of the Hydro Scheme?	Details and considerations for the safety of navigation and protection of the marine environment can be found in the following chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 18 – Marine Physical Environment and Coastal Processes</li> <li>- Chapter 19 – Shipping and Navigation</li> <li>- Chapter 20 – Commercial Fisheries</li> </ul>
30.1.02	Peel Port Group	08/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	Invasive Non-Native Species have been considered, however we would like to see a risk assessment undertaken as part of further environmental assessments	Details to be included in the EIAR. An Outline Biosecurity Management Plan is detailed in Section 5.8 of 'Appendix 3.1 Outline CEMP'
31.1.01	Royal Yachting Association Scotland (RYA)	18/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	A new or upgraded pier could benefit recreational boaters and the local community. As it is unclear what on recreational boating will be during construction phase then the impact on recreational boating should be scoped in. However, mitigation measures should ensure that there are no adverse effects. They state it will be important to consult Inspire Inveraray which is a charitable compact that acts on behalf of the Inveraray community and which wishes to buy the old pier. RYA Scotland is a non-statutory consultee of Marine Scotland so will be consulted when the marine licence is applied for.	Consult with Inspire Inveraray - as they wish to buy the old pier. Include new pier as beneficial impact to the community within the Socio-economic chapter.  Consultation and response with Inspire Inveraray is detailed in ID 45.1.01 of this Consultation Tracker.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				RYA conclude that the area of the loch is great enough to ensure that short-term water level changes associated with the scheme are likely to be trivial to small recreational boats.	
32.1.01	RSPB	26/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	We are content that the EIA has identified all the likely negative impacts of the scheme on birds of conservation concern at this stage. The proposed surveys are comprehensive enough that a detailed assessment of these impacts can be made at the next stage. However we would suggest that dedicated ring ouzel ( <i>Turdus torquatus</i> ) should require dedicated surveys over areas of suitable habitat, as they are often missed by moorland breeding bird surveys due to their habitat preferences and tendency for territorial song to occur very early in the morning. Ring ouzel are a conservation priority for RSPB Scotland.	Noted
33.1.01	RYA	01/05/2024	Gatecheck 1	In my opinion, the contents of the Gatecheck Report accurately reflect the position as I see it in relation to recreational boating. I consider that the Developer has engaged appropriately with me and addressed the issues RYA Scotland raised in the response to the scoping consultation.	Noted
34.1.0	Scottish Fisherman's Federation	01/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	"Having discussed this we don't think it will have any impact on our members, so consider us a Nil Response"	Noted
35.1.01	Scottish Forestry	15/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Scottish Forestry understand that the scale of tree felling and woodland removal may be small and an appendix rather than a chapter may be acceptable.</p> <p>The Scoping opinion sets out the scope of the forestry chapter/appendix. The EIA report should justify and provide evidence for the need for woodland removal and the associated mitigation measures.</p> <p>The removal of large areas of woodland will not be supported.</p> <p>Information set out by Scottish Forestry to include and consider:            Consideration of forestry design guidelines when going through forest.            Should describe and recognise the social, economic and environmental values.</p> <p>Baseline conditions of the forest including ownership, species composition, age class structure, yield class, and other relevant crop information.</p> <p>Describe changes to the forest structure, woodland composition and describe the work programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed areas of woodland for felling to accommodate all proposed infrastructures including access tracks and ancillary structures. Including evidence to support the proposed felling.</li> <li>- Trees feels must be replanted on-site or compensated off-site and clearly identified in the plan. On site must be prioritised.</li> <li>- Areas of open ground in the forest designed for biodiversity or landscape enhancement or recreation should not be considered for</li> </ul>	The forestry aspects related to the Development are detailed and considered in Appendix 5.5 Forestry



ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
35.2.01	Scottish Forestry	03/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>onsite replanting            The potential cumulative impact of existing and the Development on forest resource in particular the impact of felling operations on habitat connectivity, biodiversity, water management, landscape impact, impact on timber network, and forestry policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A native woodland plan should be provided which clearly demonstrates application of the NPF 4 hierarchy of mitigation, demonstrating that all efforts have been made to avoid native woodland removal and impact. The plan should also encompass other woodland types listed in Guidance on how to apply the Scottish Government's policy on control of woodland removal</li> <li>• This should be clearly described in the Environmental Statement and a more detailed native woodland plan secured by condition.</li> <li>• Appropriate CP should be proposed, exceeding the area removed and accounting for indirect impact. This may be outlined in the Environmental Statement and a more detailed report secured by condition of any consent.</li> <li>• Compensatory planting should be secured by a condition</li> </ul>	Items specified included within the EIAR.
36.1.01	Scottish Water	02/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Scottish water has no objection but it does not confirm that the Development can be serviced.            Live infrastructure in the proximity of the development may impact on Scottish water assets - the applicant must identify any potential conflicts with Scottish Water assets and contact the asset impact team via customer portal.            Written permission before any works within the area of Scottish Water's assets.            The proposed activity falls within a drinking water protected area - any incident that could affect Scottish Water should be notified.            Anyone working on site should be made aware of the drinking water catchment during site inductions and the drinking water catchment should be noted in future documentation.            request further involvement at the more detailed design stages, to determine the most appropriate proposals and mitigation within the catchment to protect water quality and quantity. Scottish water state it would be useful to get a timeline of work to make sure it does not coincide with ongoing SSEN pylon works request that 3 months in advance of any works commencing on site, Scottish Water is notified at protectdwsources@scottishwater.co.uk to enable awareness of activities and to arrange site meetings</p>	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
36.2.01	Scottish Water	11/04/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application; however, the applicant should be aware that this does not confirm that the Development can currently be serviced.</p> <p>Drinking Water Protected Areas: A review of our records indicates that the proposed activity falls within a drinking water catchment where a Scottish Water abstraction is located. Scottish Water abstractions are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas (DWPA) under Article 7 of the Water Framework Directive. The Cladich Intake supplies Cladich Water Treatment Works (WTW) and it is essential that water quality and water quantity in the area are protected. In the event of an incident occurring that could affect Scottish Water we should be notified without delay using the Customer Helpline number 0800 0778 778.</p> <p>The notification looks to confirm upgrading and extending of the existing forest track to the south of the catchment. So, the risk should be relatively low, provided the usual control measures are implemented to protect source WQ during the work. Some of this proposal will take place within the River Aray catchment also, which supplied Inveraray WTW as a drought contingency source.</p> <p>However, to be sure that the activity and associated infrastructure does indeed fall within the catchments and to fully understand and access the risks to water quality any shapefiles of the boundary and access tracks would be really useful. They can be sent to <a href="mailto:protectdwsources@scottishwater.co.uk">protectdwsources@scottishwater.co.uk</a></p> <p>The fact that this area is located within a drinking water catchment should be noted in future documentation. Also, anyone working on site should be made aware of this during site inductions.</p> <p>We would request further involvement at the more detailed design stages, to determine the most appropriate proposals and mitigation within the catchment to protect water quality and quantity and it would be useful to get a timeline of when work is likely to commence on site, as we have to make sure this proposal doesn't coincide with the ongoing SSEN pylon works scheduled to take place in this area.</p> <p>It would be useful if we were kept informed as this progresses through the planning stages, so we can provide additional comments going forward.</p> <p>We would also like to take the opportunity, to request that 3 months in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Water Environment chapter and Outline Water Management Plan (chapter 11 and Appendix 11.5) includes the mitigation that during construction Scottish Water will be contacted in the event of an incident that could affect the drinking water protected areas using the Customer Helpline number 0800 0778 778.</li> <li>• The Water Environment chapter and Outline Water Management Plan (chapter 11 and Appendix 11.5) includes mitigation that given this area is located within a drinking water catchment this will be noted in future documentation by the appointed construction contractor. In addition, anyone working on site will be made aware of this during site inductions.</li> <li>• The Water Environment chapter and Outline Water Management Plan (chapter 11 and Appendix 11.5) states Scottish Water will be consulted during detailed design stage and provided timescales of construction start dates so that any cumulative pollution risks with other third party major construction projects can be determined and, with Scottish Water and these third parties, appropriate water quality risk reduction measures implemented across the drinking water catchment.</li> <li>• The Water Environment chapter and Outline Water Management Plan (chapter 11 and Appendix 11.5) includes mitigation to the effect of: 3 months in advance of any works commencing on site, Scottish Water is notified at <a href="mailto:protectdwsources@scottishwater.co.uk">protectdwsources@scottishwater.co.uk</a>. so SW are aware of activities in the catchment and to arrange a site meeting with the relevant member of SW Sustainable Land Management team if it is deemed a requirement.</li> </ul> <p>Water environment chapter and mitigation register updated.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>advance of any works commencing on site, Scottish Water is notified at protectdwsources@scottishwater.co.uk. This will enable us to be aware of activities in the catchment and to arrange a site meeting with the relevant member of our Sustainable Land Management team if it is deemed a requirement.</p> <p>Surface Water: Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system. where a surface water discharge to our combined sewer system is anticipated, the developer should contact Scottish Water at the earliest opportunity with strong evidence to support the intended drainage plan prior to making a connection request</p>	
37.1.01	Scotways	24/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>The right of way SA128 is recorded in the National Catalogue of Rights of Way (CROW) as crossing or close to the application site. Scotways notes that at the scoping stage they have focused solely on the immediate area and a wider search is required to inform the EIA. Outline the information relating to other forms of public access to land and recreational amenity should be considered. The Applicant should take into account both recreational amenity and landscape impacts. Comments on the legal duties to uphold access rights deriving from the Land reform act (Section 3) and Section 14. Scotways suggests approaching the relevant authority's access team for their input when drawing up their Access Management Plan.</p>	<p>Noted,          Chapter 14 – Access, Traffic and Transport details and considers access and transport aspects in relation to the Development.</p>
38.1.01	SEPA	16/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Outlines the scope of information which should be provided in the EIA including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 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.</li> <li>b) Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers.</li> <li>c) Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers.</li> <li>d) Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals.</li> <li>e) Map and table detailing forest removal.</li> <li>f) Map and site layout of borrow pits.</li> <li>g) Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures.</li> <li>h) Borrow Pit Site Management Plan of pollution prevention measures.</li> <li>i) Decommissioning statement</li> </ul>	<p>Noted,          A Peat Management Plan is also detailed in Appendix 10.2.          Peatland loss to the Development has also been considered and peatland restoration/enhancement measures incorporated into the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
38.2.01	SEPA	01/05/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>Site specific comments</p> <p>Detailed peat surveys - strongly encourage the applicant to submit the peat depth survey, overlaid with the proposed infrastructure in draft form, prior to final submission- helpful if it was presented with contrasting colours between deep peat and non-deep peat.</p> <p>Proposal needs to address how excavated catotelmic peat will be re-used appropriately, within a functional peat system, locked underground below the water table and covered in reinstated turfs. Encourage early dialogue on this. There may be opportunities outwith the site boundary and this should be considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>Use of National Vegetation Classification survey to demonstrate all areas of pristine or near natural peatland habitat is avoided through design and compensatory restoration and additional enhancement.</p> <p>SEPA do not support the proposed two access tracks. Their rationale is that access tracks should be kept to a minimum and is not clear why two access tracks are required to the same location. Alternatives should be considered and a single track considered to reduce overall footprint and impacts on the environment.</p> <p>Expect floating tracks over areas of deep peat and to see floated tracks throughout the whole development unless proven technically infeasible. All tracks should be kept to a minimum 10m away from any waterbody with the exception of watercourse crossing which should be minimised. As long as watercourse crossings are designed to accommodate the 1 in 200 year flow and other infrastructure is located well away from watercourses we do not foresee a need for detailed information on flood risk to be provided. All watercourse crossings must be designed as traditional style bridges or bottomless arched culverts.</p> <p>Any temporary infrastructure (i.e. laydown areas and construction compounds) which is to be left on site must be justified in line with "SEPA's Guidance on the life extension and decommissioning of onshore wind farms"</p> <p>Provides information on regulatory requirements and permits - recommends pre-application discussions with local SEPA office (full information contained within Scoping opinion)</p>	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
39.1.01	Transport Scotland	10/08/2022	Scoping Opinion	<p>Assessment of Environmental Impacts            Transport Scotland is in agreement with the approach for the screening process for the assessment using thresholds as indicated within the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic.</p> <p>Regarding base traffic Transport Scotland note that in addition to A83(T) counts, only one count is proposed on the A85(T), located at Taynuilt - some 17km west of the junction with the A819. Transport Scotland state that base traffic in the vicinity of the A85(T)/ A819 junction should be used.</p> <p>Transport Scotland note that it is proposed to establish design year traffic flows using "National Road Traffic Forecasts (Great Britain)," (NRTF) 'low' growth assumptions. Transport Scotland is satisfied with this approach.</p> <p>Transport Scotland note that it is proposed that operational and decommissioning transport impacts will be scoped out of the EIAR. Transport Scotland considers this appropriate in this instance.</p> <p>Abnormal Loads Assessment            "We understand that development components will originate from the Inveraray Marine Facility.            The SR states that it is not envisaged that abnormal load vehicles would use the A83(T); they will be transported to site via the A819 via an upgraded existing access track that runs to the north then east, from the A83(T), around the north of Inveraray. It also states that there are proposed upgrades to the existing unclassified road "Upper Avenue" at Inveraray and a new track linking this to the A83(T) at the proposed pier location.            Transport Scotland would state that any proposed changes to the trunk road network must be discussed and approved (via a technical approval process) by the appropriate Area Manager. At this stage, we would advise that 1:500 scale plans of any new or modified access from the trunk road should be submitted along with visibility splay plans. This will allow the standard of the junction to be assessed. It would be helpful to engage with the Area Manager for the A83(T) who is Neil McFarlane and who can be contacted at neil.mcfarlane@transport.gov.scot.            Transport Scotland will require to be satisfied that any abnormal loads can negotiate the A83(T) junction, therefore, an Abnormal Loads Assessment and swept path analysis will be required."</p>	<p>Noted, A framework CTMP is contained within Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment Report (Volume 5 Appendices). The final CTMP will be finalised following consultation with Police Scotland, ABC and Transport Scotland.</p>
39.2.01	Transport Scotland	01/05/2024	Gatecheck 1	<p>Transport Scotland was consulted on the Scoping Report for this application and provided comment in our letter dated 10th August 2022.</p>	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>Gatecheck Report</p> <p>The Gatecheck Report makes no mention of Transport Scotland's previous comments. We note, however, that a copy of this letter was included within the Scoping Opinion provided by the Energy Consents Unit. It is clear, therefore, that the Applicant has had sight of this response.</p> <p>We also note that the proposed route for both general construction traffic and Abnormal Loads remains as previously detailed within the Scoping Report. We would, therefore, state that all comments as provided in our letter of 10th August 2022 remain valid and will require to be taken into account when preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.</p>	
40.1.01	UK Chamber of Shipping	18/03/2024	Gatecheck 1	Confirmed nil return from the UK Chamber of Shipping	Noted
41.1.01	UK Chamber of Shipping	20/07/2022	Scoping Opinion	The UK Chamber of Shipping have no comments on the proposal.	Noted
42.1.01	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	<p>General Interest</p> <p>The most common and frequent questions showed a general interest in the project. People wanted to understand what PSH was, how it worked, why it was required, how it benefitted the grid, etc.</p> <p>Individuals wanted to understand the overall effect of the Development upon nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Overall positive feedback, it was felt that the public were generally supportive of the proposals.</p>	Noted
42.1.02	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	<p>Proposed Jetty</p> <p>The issue that generated the most interest from the residents of Inveraray was the proposed jetty. They asked questions along the lines of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why is a jetty necessary?</li> <li>- What will the jetty be used for?</li> <li>- What will the jetty look like?</li> <li>- What is the location of the proposed jetty?</li> <li>- Will the jetty be a permanent or temporary feature?</li> <li>- Will a jetty negatively affect the communities plans to restore the town's historic pier for commercial use?</li> </ul> <p>There was a broad consensus that people would rather there was no permanent new jetty.</p> <p>The visual impact of the jetty was a concern for certain local residents. The public did not want the proposed jetty to be permanent as they have funding to restore the town's historic pier which they have worked hard to</p>	<p>Visual impact of the jetty was noted as a concern for some local residents. The layout of the jetty was designed to reduce visual effects on nearby residential properties.</p> <p>The location, layout and use purpose of the construction compound near the marine facility were changed to reduce effects on nearby properties. It was determined that the jetty would be a temporary installation, removed upon completion of the Development's construction, in order to reduce effects on nearby residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed jetty is temporary with the deck removed and only supports left in situ during operation.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				obtain. Residential dwelling south of the jetty requested a VP looking east as they are concerned over their views being impacted. Also raised concerns over the temporary compound adjacent.	
42.1.03	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Roads and Transportation The residents of Inveraray wanted to understand what purpose the two access roads performed and why they were necessary. Residents were keen that traffic not be directed through the town. Concerns over the B840 were raised – public did not want construction traffic on this road. Also do not want road straightened as this would encourage more traffic (tourists) to use it. Happy for B840 to be widened a little.	The access routes are necessary to facilitate construction traffic access to site. The proposed pier will be used for the delivery of abnormal indivisible loads (AIL). AIL will then be transported over the A83 before continuing on a dedicated construction traffic route that links in to Upper Avenue and connects to the A819 north of Inveraray. As set out in the Chapter 14 (Access, Traffic and Transport), HGV construction traffic is not proposed to route via the B840 and does not route through the town of Inveraray.
42.1.04	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Grid Connection and Overhead Lines There was a great deal of interest from the residents of Dalmally about whether our proposals included plans for any above ground power lines.	It is not expected that the proposals will include the installation of above ground power lines.
42.1.05	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Workers' Accommodations and Traffic People wanted to understand how many workers the project would require at peak times, where would they be housed, and how would their traffic movements be controlled. Some local contractors expressed an interest in working on the project.	It is expected that up to 1000 individuals will be employed during construction of the Development. A Workers Housing Strategy has been prepared which sets out the proposed arrangements for accommodating workers during construction of the Development. Where feasible, the Applicant will look to engage workers from the local area on the project during construction.
42.1.06	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Ecology Various general ecology queries were raised. It was noted that red squirrel and pine martens are present in the woods. Queries over peat disruption.	An Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken as part of the Development. The mitigation measures suggested within Chapters 6-9 will be implemented to minimise and where possible negate any impacts of the Development upon the local ecology. Chapter 10 assesses any potential impacts of the Development upon local geology and soils including peat. Through the implementation of the mitigation measures suggested, the Development is not expected to have an impact upon peat within the local area.
42.1.07	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Private Water Supplies Portsonachan PWS needs to be taken into consideration. Local PWS issues are an existing problem.	A risk assessment has been undertaken as part of Chapter 11 of the EIA. The assessment concludes that the Development poses low risk to the Portsonachan Private Water Supply on account of its distance from the proposed works and the presence of natural barriers (e.g. other watercourses that flow away from the PWS). It is assessed that mitigation is therefore not required.
42.1.08	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Landscape and Visual General landscape and visual queries raised. General design queries re RLB eg inlet/outlet & access points. Queries over the size of the largest embankment and whether any pylons would be associated with the proposals.	AECOM's Landscape Architects have assessed the proposals in relation to 19 viewpoints and where significant effects are considered likely, mitigation measures have been proposed.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
42.1.09	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Community Benefit Public would like to see a new grass sports pitch. South Loch Awwide Community Committee – query over community funding benefit. Shinty pitch would be welcomed.	Whilst the Applicant is unable to commit to such requests at this stage, possible community benefits opportunities have been investigated. It is expected that new and upgraded access tracks for recreational use will be implemented. Information, warning and directional signage will be installed around the Development Site to enhance the visitor experience during operation and ensure visitor safety. In addition, benches will be installed for visitors.
42.1.11	local resident (HC)		Exhibition event feedback	Recreational Loch Users Queries over flood risk	The Applicant has undertaken a flood risk assessment. This analysis confirms that the Development is not expected to exacerbate flooding nor noticeably alter water levels in Loch Awe or Loch Fyne.
42.1.12	local resident (HC)		Individual email response	<p>I'm a lochside resident of Dalavich, so I'm keenly interested in the effect of the Development on loch levels and use, and what measures you're putting in place to not exacerbate an already flood prone area. Please can you confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The maximum volume of water to be held, and the maximum difference in local* loch level, understanding it may take some time to redistribute water across the loch so local levels may be more variable.</li> <li>- The maximum water speed on discharge and the area of effect on loch users. Loch Awe is used for swimming and unpowered water sports, by both novices and enthusiasts including the 3 lakes challenge which sees SUP/kayakers and swimmers (both very vulnerable to lateral pressure) pass very close to the proposed outlet point, some on record attempts.</li> <li>- If there would be any contractual or other issues which would require the operator to discharge water into the loch during periods of flooding, exacerbating problems locally.</li> </ul> <p>Having seen the proposed size of the upper reservoir (it looks more akin in to Loch Avich than to the Cruachan reservoir) I'm very concerned about the effect so much water may have on Loch Awe and all who use it. I understand the project team are yet to do flooding studies, so thought some background information may provide a helpful overview.</p> <p>As I'm sure you're aware, the water levels in Loch Awe are managed primarily by the barrage at the Pass of Barrachander. The operation of the barrage often does not match inflows from the river system resulting in gardens, farmland and recreation areas being flooded, and the loch banks eroded, even when tributaries are well within their normal range; oftentimes while they're in the lower 1/3rd of their range. In periods of high rainfall flooding has been severe, with farm animals and a plant nursery lost, and nearly lives &amp; homes too. Work is ongoing to improve proactive and co-ordinated management of the loch levels in the face of increasingly extreme weather and consented increases in Cruachan's capacity.</p>	<p>Explanation provided. No design adjustments required.</p> <p>The maximum volume of water to be held, and the maximum difference in local* loch level, understanding it may take some time to redistribute water across the loch so local levels may be more variable.</p> <p>The working volume of water in the Headpond is around 53,000,000 m<sup>3</sup>, which will result in a maximum water level change in Loch Awe of around approx. 1.4 m over a period of around 30 hours. This estimate is based on the direct impact of the generation flows from the head pond and does not take into account any other meteorological-related flows or any other hydroelectric activities in the catchment.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the impact of a generating cycles is being undertaken. This will be used to set an operational regime to ensure that the impact on water levels and receptors around the Loch Awe are minimised. An operational arrangement will be established ensuring that abstraction and discharges are not carried out during periods where impact would be unacceptable. When constructed the scheme will operate under and agreed Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) license with SEPA at this planning stage. Within the CAR license a minimum and maximum water level within Loch Awe will be set which will dictate when the project can and cannot operate. The minimum water level will be set to prevent water being abstracted from Loch Awe when water levels are low. The maximum water level will be set to prevent water being discharged into Loch Awe when water levels are high.</p> <p>The maximum discharge velocity (water speed) at the outlet is around 0.4 m/s. These flows are not considered to impact loch users; however additional mitigation may be included to deter and protect users at the inlet/outlet, if required. The inlet/outlet is designed to minimise the outlet velocities and it is estimated that any impacts on the loch will be localised.</p>



ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>Most the time (circa 9/10ths the year) the loch stays within about a 0.5m range, and generally changes less than 50mm in a day. This range and rate is exceeded in periods of sustained heavy rain. However, such occasions are well forecast giving people both warning and time to move livestock etc. In fair/mild weather, folk can relax confident that the water level will not change much, and so can leave boats, garden furniture etc on the lower parts of their gardens so aiding their use. Campers (the loch banks are well used for wild camping and fishing) can pitch tents and light fires on the shore, and sleep safely there.</p> <p>The introduction of an unpredictable variation in loch level, if at all significant in height, would be very difficult for locals &amp; visitors to manage. Visitors could not set up camp in safety, even in dry weather. Locals could not leave livestock or any property on their grounds with any confidence it'll be there when they wake/return. Additionally,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Any increase in the level or regularity of flooding to loch banks would further increase erosion, including to crannogs and other scheduled monuments on/around the loch. It would also reduce access for recreation, impact the use and productivity of fields, and disrupt the breeding cycle of the birds, such as geese and sandpipers, which nest there.</li> <li>- Any additional rise during flooding caused by heavy rain could be devastating to residents, businesses etc, and cause pollution from the sewage treatment tanks located in communities around the loch. However, an ability and obligation to take significant amounts of water from the loch to reduce flood risk at such times would be welcome.</li> <li>- Any significant drop during dry periods could cause moored boats to ground, expose sewage outfall pipes and make boat launch areas dangerous as the water's edge gets closer to the loch shelf, increasing the chance that trailers/cars may reverse over it.</li> </ul> <p>With such a finely balanced, and already flood-prone, system, it's difficult to see how very large volumes of water could be regularly added and withdrawn without the barrage being able and obliged to take co-ordinated action to largely counteract the resultant changes, and flow rates managed within the capacity of the loch to transfer such volumes through narrower/shallower sections.</p> <p>The communities around Loch Awe are being asked to accept a lot of change to help the decarbonisation of our nation's power supply, with a large number of windfarms and hydro schemes. We should not also be asked to be additionally, and continually, vulnerable to flooding. If you want local communities to accept, or even support the project, you need to demonstrate how it will be designed and managed, alongside other assets in the area, to reduce our risk.</p> <p>---</p>	<p>When constructed the scheme will operate under and agreed Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) license with SEPA at this planning stage. Within the CAR license a minimum and maximum water level within Loch Awe will be set which will dictate when the project can and cannot operate. The minimum water level will be set to prevent water being abstracted from Loch Awe when water levels are low. The maximum water level will be set to prevent water being discharged into Loch Awe when water levels are high. Fundamentally, the loch level will not change by the full range in a single event as a result of the PSH scheme.</p> <p>The quoted 1.4m change is based on the full volume of storage proposed at the Balliemanoch reservoir and therefore is the worst-case scenario where the entire headpond was being filled in a single pumping activity over 30 hours (approx. 46mm / hour) – this does not consider the external movement of water from natural sources into the Loch. In reality this is not an operational scenario that will occur.</p> <p>During operational cycles the loch level fluctuations will be considerably less (approx. 46mm / hour) based on the full volume not being utilised in a single cycle. The initial filling of the reservoir will be gradual and over a much greater period of time. The natural inflows into Loch Awe will partially balance the pumping up to the headpond. This will result in reduced fluctuation in level. A detailed water resource assessment is being undertaken looking at the water balance and the fluctuation and recharge period based on both initial filling and operational regime. The findings of the water resource assessment will be used to set an operational regime to ensure that the impact on water levels and receptors around the Loch Awe are minimised. An operational arrangement will be established ensuring that abstraction and discharges are not carried out during periods where impact would be unacceptable.</p> <p>When constructed the PSH scheme will operate under an agreed Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) license with SEPA at this planning stage. Within the CAR license a minimum and maximum water level within Loch Awe will be set which will dictate when the project can and cannot operate. The minimum water level will be set to prevent water being abstracted from Loch Awe when water levels are low. The maximum water level will be set to prevent water being discharged into Loch Awe when water levels are high. The inclusion of additional storage within the Loch Awe catchment also provides the potential of greater control of water in the catchment and hence the scheme has the ability to assist in emergency flooding and drought scenarios as SEPA require.</p> <p>The discharge / pump rate will remain the same in both scenarios therefore the rate of change in level remains the same. However, the duration over which the PSH scheme will be operating will be less than</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				<p>When the loch rises above 36.5m AOD, the land (fields, gardens etc) around the loch becomes subject to erosion, and access for recreation is increasingly limited. The Loch shelves steeply at about 35.5m, so boat launch areas etc become dangerous if the loch gets below 36m. There is no safe way of frequently changing the loch height by 1.4m.</p> <p>The operation of the proposed PSH appears totally reliant on the ability of the SSE barrage to respond. However, their capacity to shift water through their turbines is far smaller than that proposed for the PSH, and the barrage has a limited spill capacity into the R.Awe before risking highly damaging high speed floods*. This pinch point in the R.Awe catchment would place a severe limitation on the PSH's operation.</p> <p>Can I strongly recommend you investigate partnering with SSE and seek to significantly increase the capacity at the barrage. A new tunnel, parallel to their existing one, would allow power to be generated a second time from the same outfall from the PSH's headpond by adding a further 36m drop to the sea loch, safely bypassing the communities on R.Awe. This could either increase the total power generation capacity of the combined project, or allow a smaller installation to be built at Balliemeanoch while retaining the same total generating capacity. It would also extend the conditions under which the plant can operate by providing greater control over levels in L.Awe, so increase the return on the investment and reduce operational risk both to the project, and all the communities and users of Loch Awe.</p> <p>I hope you take a serious look at this suggestion. It was a similar one (made by the place I used to work) which saved the Queensferry Crossing £0.3bn by rescoping the project from a complete replacement to retaining the old bridge for public transport, cyclists etc so reducing the size of the new.</p> <p>* SSE don't open the flood gates more than 1/3 their capacity*, even when there's flooding around the loch caused by storms, for fear of washing away more of the Bridge of Awe and wiping out more herds of cattle. This outflow, combined with the turbines at full draw, is only enough to match inflow into the loch when the R.Orchy is at 1.5m (the mid point of its normal range) at the SEPA sensor.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Could I just check the rates of change given? The text suggests one is considerably less than the other but the numerical value given (46mm/hr) is the same in both... It's therefore unclear which is correct.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The rate of change is still far faster than is currently experienced outside major rainfall, so (if not counteracted by natural inflow or the barrage)</p>	<p>the theoretical maximum based on the full volume therefore this would reduce the overall impact.</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				very likely to catch out loch users as swathes of bank appear or disappear in just a few hours with no warning or obvious cause.	
42.2.01	Local resident (ML)		Individual email response	<p>I give permission for the equipment to be placed on my property for a week at the front of the house.</p> <p>My big concern about this project is the impact to us getting on and off our property. The lane we use at present has very limited visual time between there being a vehicle and not due to how close we are located to a crest of a hill.</p> <p>The current level of traffic it has been manageable, but any increase will make it very dangerous for us and any visitors. We have been here since October last year and already has been an accident outside due to the time it takes to enter our lane and the visual black spot. I've got two girls under (6 &amp; 7) and a baby on the way, and the thought of large lorries and increased traffic does make me very worried.</p> <p>Really appreciate you taking the time to review my concerns.</p>	<p>These concerns were passed to the project's traffic consultants who have suggested some mitigation which can be implemented to help with this matter. The proposals include a 60mph road reduced to 40mph due to construction traffic using it for an extended period of time. Abundant signage would be used to inform drivers why the temporary change in speed has been implemented. We consider that the above principle could be applied to temporarily extend the current 40mph speed limit c.580m north up A819. Access to the property in question would then be within a 40mph limit thus reducing vehicle speeds on the main road and reducing likelihood of collisions for vehicles emerging from residential access.</p>
42.3.01	Local resident (JC)		Individual email response	<p>I am the owner of both South Cromalt Lodge and Tigh An Raat (Dalchenna) in Inveraray.</p> <p>I have received a request from yourself regarding the potential use of my property to set up sound monitoring equipment for baseline sound data for the above proposal. In order for me to consider that proposal and also for my information could you supply me with a location plan (of a readable scale), in order that I can check location of works as it looks (with great effort on small scale location plan provided) that both my properties may be within the project boundary?, which is interesting to say the least.</p> <p>I am also very keen for you to mitigate the impact of the works on my properties also. As you know I am keen to understand the proposed works affecting my properties and the impact this will have on my quality of life going forward.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Thanks for that and I am glad to see that the PAN red line boundary no longer includes any land directly in front of South Cromalt including shorefront as shown in flyer distributed last week.</p> <p>As discussed my main concerns are any temporary or permanent works planned for shorefront or within the loch itself and the proposed use of the field directly North of South Cromalt and the effect of this on my quality of life either in the temporary or permanent state. And also fairly obviously the potential negative commercial aspect of the project on my property both short term or indeed long term.</p>	<p>Explanation provided. No design adjustments required.</p> <p>A Teams call with one of AECOM's Technical Directors was set up to answer additional questions regarding the pier and any construction activities near South Cromalt. Additionally, the following explanation was provided:</p> <p>The red-line boundary, as shown on the various drawings currently, is the PAN red-line boundary. PAN stands for Proposal of Application Notice. This is a notice to the Local Planning Authority as part of the pre-application consultation. The purpose of this red-line in the context of pre-application consultation is to be "sufficient to identify" the site at which development will take place. This is to allow consultees and members of the public to identify where the different elements of the project will be located. With those elements being remote from one another the plans are by necessity drawn at a large scale to cover a wide area.</p> <p>The application boundary will also be delineated with a red-line but this is yet to be determined. This will not include any of your land at South Cromalt.</p> <p>OS plans at different scales contain different information. A 1:500 plan will show more detail than a 1:2500 plan. There are also discrepancies between the accuracy of OS plans of different scales. I have taken a screenshot from the land register of South Cromalt. You can see that the boundary has a step, or kink, in it and is not straight. &lt;South Cromalt Land Registry.png&gt; At larger scales this kink is not present on the OS</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
				I hope that we can work together to minimise these issues at source within any parameters of possibility and requirements of the project. I am also interested in any betterment and value that the project could bring to the local community and surrounding areas.	plan and appears as a straight line. There has been no attempt to mislead or include any of your land. This is simply a quirk of the map scaling. <South Cromalt PAN Boundary.png>
42.4.01	Local resident (GP)		Individual email response	<p>I live at Ardbrecknish where our private water supply is taken from the Allt An Eireannaich burn. This burn supplies water to 27 houses AND Ardbrecknish House Hotel. Understandably, like all the other members of the community, I am concerned that all the groundwork's necessary for construction of this reservoir will disrupt our water supply which is overstretched as it is.</p> <p>This water is used for drinking, food preparation and washing.</p> <p>We have no other supply from mains water but there are two small springs that supply 9 of these houses and Ardbrecknish House in addition to their burn supply. The rest of us rely purely on the burn.</p> <p>I note from your map that although we do not live within the development boundary, we do lie within the 2km boundary.</p> <p>As a community, I am sure that if AECOM or ILI secured a mains water supply or financed several private bore holes, in much the same way that Drax have contributed to many community projects, the community would be much more welcoming of your development.</p> <p>Out of interest, have SSE had a hand in promoting this hydro scheme? I suspect it is very much in their own interests to welcome another renewable energy source to the area to give weight to their proposal for the much advertised but unpopular new pylon network.</p>	<p>Explanation provided. No design adjustments required.</p> <p>We note your concerns regarding private water supplies and have set out below some information which we hope will reassure you that adverse effects on your supply are not considered to be likely. Our planning and technical consultants note the following:</p> <p>Allt An Eireannaich is situated approximately 1700m north from the planning application boundary on the nearest approach. Here the work is to upgrade the existing road/track for access to the main site only. SEPA advises a 100m buffer from roads, tracks and trenches and 250m from buildings, excavations and quarries.</p> <p>Allt An Eireannaich is not crossed by any construction works and no temporary or permanent works are planned to be built in Ardbrenish. The main works will be carried out significantly further southwest from Allt An Eireannaich, approximately 4,000m southwest.</p> <p>Although there could be fine particulates and potentially small quantities of contamination in runoff from the access track, this will drain to the verges and / or settlement ponds and will not enter any watercourses or bodies directly. Good practice guidance will be followed by contractors during construction and operation to mitigate any potential pollution incidents.</p> <p>Between the access road and Allt An Eireannaich is the Keppochran River, which crosses SW to NE. Therefore it is considered that any runoff from the access track that drain northwards would likely be intercepted by this watercourse and would not reach Allt An Eireannaich. However, as noted above, all construction and operational activities will adhere to current good practice and therefore any significant pollution incidents in any watercourses or bodies are unlikely.</p> <p>If you are able to please provide us with the exact coordinates of the source of the private water supply we can review this in further detail, however given the distance of the proposals from Allt An Eireannaich it is considered unlikely that the proposals would cause any contamination or dewatering to your water supply.</p>
42.5.01	Local resident (AW)		Individual email response	Hello, I am a riparian owner on Loch Awe with an existing hydro scheme and tailrace onto Loch Awe. Could you please tell me what the upper and lower range will be on Loch Awe when the Balliemanoch PSH scheme pumps to full volume. Then what these ranges will be when Balliemanoch, Drax and Drax extension all pump at once.	<p>Explanation provided. No design adjustment required.</p> <p>The commitment within the EIAR is to maintain water levels within normal fluctuations in Loch Awe through the operational regime of the scheme. Water levels will be controlled through a Controlled Activity Regulations (CAR) licence from SEPA. Operational regime is proposed</p>

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
					to limit the impact if the scheme during periods of high and low water levels including when all PSH schemes operate at once. This is based on a hands-off arrangement when water levels fall below an agreed level together with a no discharge / generation when water level are above an agreed level. This will ensure that the scheme does not impact on extreme water levels in Loch Awe. An assessment of the rate of variation in change of water level has been carried out based on the proposed generation and abstraction rate. The rate of change has been found to be in line with the current changes in Loch Awe based on review of historic water level. The larger rates of change however will occur on a more frequent basis as a result of the scheme operation.
43.1.01	Glenorchy & Innishail Community Council		Community Council	Residents in smaller settlements may be receptive to accommodating workers housing, subject to the management of impacts and good community consultation.	Options for workers housing have been set out in the proposal's accompanying Workers Housing Strategy. Options include the use of vacant hotels, a compound, spare hotel capacity and the construction of 12 houses. It is not expected that local residents in smaller settlements will be required to accommodate workers.
43.1.02	Glenorchy & Innishail Community Council		Community Council	Residents would welcome the benefits from the temporary population, e.g. workers spending money in local businesses, but would also want to see a legacy post-construction, such as longer-term housing for the community or key workers (e.g. locum pharmacist)	As set out in chapter 16, a minor beneficial impact is expected for the local economy as the presence of workers, engaged in the PSH scheme's construction, in the local area is expected to increase spending in the local businesses.  It is expected that 12 houses will be built as part of the Development to house workers. Following the construction period, nine of these houses will be offered to Argyll Estate to help address the local housing emergency experienced in the Argyll and Bute region.
44.1.01	South Loch Awe-side Community Company (SLACC)		Community Consultations	I'm contacting you on behalf of our local community group – South Loch Awe-side Community Company (SLACC). Those of you who presented at the community consultations at Inveraray and Dalmally will probably recall meeting one or two of our members. The area we represent covers most of the B840, which as you know will be appreciably affected by the potential PSH development. SLACC is holding its AGM on Thursday 26 October at 7.30pm, in the Portsonachan Village Hall (not far from Balliemanoch), and we'd like to invite you to send one or more of your team to give an overview of the plans. It would be considered particularly helpful for those of the community who weren't able to travel to Inveraray or Dalmally for the initial consultations or who don't have access to online information. The AGM formalities shouldn't take very long at all, and there's plenty of room in the Hall for your excellent display boards.	No design adjustment required.  Members of project team attended AGM meeting as requested and presented the proposals to attendees.
43.1.02	South Loch Awe-side Community		Community Consultations	impact of the Development upon water levels in Loch Awe when station is pumping or generating	No design adjustment required.  The commitment within the EIAR is to maintain water levels within

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
	Company (SLACC)				normal fluctuations in Loch Awe through the operational regime of the scheme. Water levels will be controlled through a Controlled Activity Regulations (CAR) licence from SEPA. Operational regime is proposed to limit the impact if the scheme during periods of high and low water levels. This is based on a hands-off arrangement when water levels fall below an agreed level together with a no discharge / generation when water level are above an agreed level. This will ensure that the scheme does not impact on extreme water levels in Loch Awe. An assessment of the rate of variation in change of water level has been carried out based on the proposed generation and abstraction rate. The rate of change has been found to be in line with the current changes in Loch Awe based on review of historic water level. The larger rates of change however will occur on a more frequent basis as a result of the scheme operation.
44.1.03	South Loch Awe-side Community Company (SLACC)		Community Consultations	Noise impacts	An Outline CEMP has been prepared (EIAR Volume II Appendix 5A) which details the embedded mitigation and additional mitigation measures which will be implemented to reduce noise impacts during construction. Measures include, but are not limited to, the selection of quiet and low vibration equipment; adherence to standard construction working hours; and utilising access tracks to limit traffic noise. As such the noise impacts of construction activities are understood to be reduced.
45.1.01	Inspire Inveraray			Post-construction retention of the proposed jetty would have implications for the reinstatement of the historic pier in Inveraray	The jetty deck will be removed once construction has been complete. Piles will remain in place to facilitate the replacement of any large components of the PSH scheme and to avoid the need to repeatedly rebuild the jetty.
46.1.010			Questionnaire response	Routes, paths and trails used monthly for walking Other comments on project: excellent. What about use of the Dubh Loch and Shira Dam	Additional forestry paths to be provided as part of Development, improving accessibility of the area for active travel users. It is expected that new and upgraded access tracks for recreational use will be implemented. Information, warning and directional signage will be installed around the Development Site to enhance the visitor experience during operation and ensure visitor safety. In addition, benches will be installed for visitors.
46.1.02			Questionnaire response	Routes, paths and trails around north of area used annually for walking Other comments on path and road closure: excess traffic on A85 already Other comments on the project: please ensure there is a leisure legacy for future generations e.g. walking path, bicycle trails	
46.1.03			Questionnaire response	Routes, paths and trails used weekly for walking and dog walking All forest paths and paths around Inveraray Castle out to A83 Other comments on path and road closure: B840 should never be closed at anytime, it is the life line for the lochside. Other comments on the project: if this goes ahead where are the workers going to stay/be housed? This consultation should also be held at Portsonachan Village Hall to give everyone equal access to view the proposals. Holding in Dalmally looks as though you are trying to hide the enormity and impact of it. What will you to lessen the noise of construction?	An Outline Access Management Plan has been prepared which sets out the access arrangements throughout the construction and operation of the PSH scheme. Maintaining access to routes, paths and trails throughout the Development Site has been a key priority throughout the design development process. A finalised Access Management Plan will be prepared which will detail the measures to be implemented to ensure the safety of active travel users within the Development Site during the construction period.  Two public exhibitions were undertaken, the first in Inveraray and the

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from the Applicant
46.1.04			Questionnaire response	<p>Routes, paths and trails used daily for walking, dog walking, running, swimming in bay area where pier is proposed.</p> <p>Walking paths round Inveraray and Bushang Electric Cottage Route</p> <p>Other comments on path and road closure: At present, I don't feel there is enough information for me to comment. However, I would urge you to consider alternative options, other than using the field at Cromalt as the proposed depot location and the back track to the A819. These are important areas for walking for locals.</p> <p>Other comments on the project: Generally supportive of what the project is proposing, however I am very concerned about the potential impact on local walking routes around Inveraray.</p>	<p>second in Dalmailly. In addition, at the request of SLACC, members of the project team attended the community company AGM to present the proposals and respond to queries. A project website and virtual exhibition room were also set up online to provide information to those who were unable to attend the consultation events.</p> <p>Whilst it is expected that the field at Cromalt will be the most feasible location for the depot and back track to the A819, this route will be used infrequently during the construction period, specifically to facilitate the delivery of large abnormal loads to site. Approximately 10 abnormal loads are expected to use this route over the seven year construction period. The route will remain accessible for active travel users during the construction period.</p> <p>Options for workers housing have been set out in the proposal's accompanying Workers Housing Strategy. Options include the use of vacant hotels, a compound, spare hotel capacity and the construction of 12 houses.</p> <p>A temporary diversion will be in place for the B840 during construction and will ensure access for all residents is maintained.</p> <p>An Outline CEMP has been prepared (EIAR Volume II Appendix 5A) which details the embedded mitigation and additional mitigation measures which will be implemented to reduce noise impacts during construction. Measures include, but are not limited to, the selection of quiet and low vibration equipment; adherence to standard construction working hours; and utilising access tracks to limit traffic noise. As such the noise impacts of construction activities are understood to be reduced.</p>

