RWE Renewables UK Onshore Wind Limited

Eredine Wind Farm Further Environmental Information Report

January 2026

Report for

RWE Renewables UK Onshore Wind Limited

Main Contributors

Aaron Loman
Nicolas Holmberg
Shaun Salmon
Rohan Sinha
Rebecca Rylott
Alastair Miller
Danny Flenley
Graham Burt-Smith
Craig Stewart

Issued by

Nicolas Holmberg
.....

Approved by

Glen Robson
.....

WSP

8 First Street
Manchester M15 4RP
United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0)1612 005 000

Copyright and non-disclosure notice

Third party disclaimer

Management systems

This document has been produced in full compliance with our management systems, which have been certified to ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and ISO 45001 by Lloyd's Register.

Document revisions

No.	Details	Date
1	First Draft	26/09/2025
2	For Issue	14/11/2025
3	Final Issue	15/01/2026

Executive Summary

This Further Environmental Information (FEI) Report has been prepared by WSP UK Ltd ("WSP) on behalf of RWE Renewable UK Onshore Wind Limited (hereafter referred to as the "Applicant"). The purpose of the report is to supply supplementary information regarding comments received from a number of consultees in response to the Eredine Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report that accompanied the November 2024 application for Section 36 consent (reference ECU00004517).

The EIA Report was submitted in support of the application to the Scottish Government under Section 36 on the Electricity Act 1989 for the construction and operation of up to 22 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 200m and combined generating capacity in excess of 50MW, together with access tracks, crane hardstandings, electricity substation, battery energy storage system, a permanent anemometer mast and two temporary construction compounds (the "Proposed Development").

Consultee responses have been received in response to the Section 36 application and following consideration of these, the Applicant has revisited the design of the Proposed Development. This FEI Report details the changes to the layout of the Proposed Development, the main elements of which are the removal of turbines 3, 5, 7, 11 and 20 and infrastructure associated with these, and provides an update to the assessment presented in the EIA Report where necessary.

The EIA Report concluded that other than for some landscape and visual receptors, significant effects as a result of the Proposed Development were unlikely. The revised assessments presented in this FEI Report conclude that no additional significant effects on environmental receptors will occur as a result of the Revised Development. All effects previously assessed as Not Significant in the EIA Report remain Not Significant following the layout design amendments.

Some adverse landscape and visual effects assessed as Significant in the EIA Report remain Significant following the layout design amendments, including on part of the Craggy Upland and adjacent Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic landscapes, visual effects from transport and recreational routes, as well as offshore recreational receptors on parts of Loch Awe and cumulative effects on the views from parts of Dalavich.

However, adverse visual effects on views from transport routes A886 and B8000 as well as views from offshore recreational receptors on parts of Loch Fyne previously assessed as Significant in the EIA Report have been revised to Not Significant following the design amendments.

Contents

Tables

Figures

Appendices

Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments

Appendix 1B: SEPA Consultation Response

Appendix 1C: Competent Experts

Appendix 2A: Forestry Assessment

Appendix 4A: Nighttime Assessment

Appendix 5A: GET Wind Farm Assessment (Confidential)

Appendix 5B: Bird Protection Plan

Appendix 5C: Ornithology Collision Risk Models

Appendix 5D: Updated Ornithology Baseline (Confidential)

Appendix 6A: Otter Survey Baseline Report (Confidential)

Appendix 6B: Bat Survey Baseline Report

Appendix 6C: Habitat Loss Calculations

Appendix 6D: Outline Habitat Management Plan

Appendix 7A: Outline Peat Management Plan Addendum

Appendix 7B: Carbon Payback Tables

Appendix 7C: Stage 1 Checking Report Response

Appendix 9A: Revised Lighting Strategy

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

1.1.1 This Further Environmental Information (FEI) Report has been prepared to supplement the November 2024 application for Section 36 consent for Eredine Wind Farm (reference ECU00004517), specifically addressing responses from the consultees noted in **Section 1.3**. The FEI Report should be read in conjunction with Eredine Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report (2024) that accompanied the application for Section 36 consent.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Eredine Wind Farm EIA Report was submitted to the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU) on 20 November 2024, under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989. The application related to the construction and operation of a wind farm comprising up to 22 wind turbines with a maximum blade tip height of 200m and combined generating capacity in excess of 50MW, together with access tracks, crane hardstandings, an electricity substation, a battery energy storage system, a permanent anemometer mast and two temporary construction compounds (the "Proposed Development"). The full history of the Proposed Development is set out in **Chapter 1** of the EIA Report (2024).

1.2.2 Following its submission, consultee responses have been received to the Section 36 application. This FEI Report provides further information, including details of the removal of turbines 3, 5, 7, 11 and 20 and associated infrastructure, responses to consultee comments and an update to the assessment presented in the EIA Report (2024) where appropriate.

1.2.3 This revised design is hereafter referred to as the "Revised Development" and is described further in **Chapter 2** of this report. The 'Proposed Development' continues to refer to the wind farm design presented in the EIA Report (2024) for which ECU consent was sought.

1.2.4 It should be noted that this FEI Report does not repeat elements of the EIA Report where the redesign of the Proposed Development has resulted on little or no change to information presented previously. Therefore, only new information, including project description and responses to application consultation, and elements of the previous assessment which require updating are included in this FEI Report.

1.2.5 In this respect, the technical topics for which the changes to the Proposed Development were most influential are:

- **Chapter 3**: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology;
- **Chapter 4**: Landscape and Visual;
- **Chapter 5**: Ornithology;
- **Chapter 6**: Ecology;
- **Chapter 7**: Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management; and
- **Chapter 8**: Historic Environment.

1.2.6 For those technical topics where the redesign of the Proposed Development is less influential on the outcome of the assessment of effects, a summary is provided in **Chapter 9: Further Considerations**.

1.3 Summary of Post-Submission Consultation

1.3.1 Consultation responses to the application were received between November 2024 and July 2025. All consultation comments received and responses to these are provided in **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments.** Note that comments received from the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) on specific design elements have been responded to in **Appendix 1B: SEPA Consultation Response**.

1.4 Competent Experts

1.4.1 A list of the competent experts that have contributed towards this FEI is provided in **Appendix 1C: Competent Experts**.

2. Project Design

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This section forms an update to **Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development** included within the EIA Report (2024). As noted, only sections which require updating are included here and existing information which is not subject to change is not repeated.

2.2 Development Proposals

2.2.1 Consultee responses were received in response to the Section 36 application. These responses were considered by the Applicant and a design review was subsequently carried out.

2.2.2 The Revised Development incorporates the following design changes to the Proposed Development (see **Figure 2.1: Site Layout,** and **Figure 2.2: Typical bottomless arched culvert**):

- Removal of turbines 3, 5, 7, 11 and 20;
- Removal and/or shortening of access tracks associated with these turbines;
- Modification of culvert design to bottomless arch culverts that accommodate 1 in 200 flood flow;
- Movement of turning head associated with Turbine 18 to avoid areas of deep peat;
- Altering of peat storage areas and Borrow Pit 9 search area outside the 15m watercourse buffers;
- Modification of access tracks associated with Turbine 2 and Turbine 4 to replace the proposed loop with a single access road and associated turning heads;
- Added a turning head associated with turbines 6, 14, 16, 17 and 19;
- Modification of access track associated with Turbine 13 to remove a section over Tom Mor;
- Modification of access track associated with Turbine 22 to allow a turning head to be located at least 15m from the watercourse; and
- Realignment of the access track associated with borrow pit 9, to ensure it crosses the Allt nam Muc watercourse as near to perpendicular as possible.

2.2.3 **Table 2.1** lists the key development features of the Revised Development.

Table 2.1 Key Development Features of the Revised Development

Component	Proposed Development Description	Revised Development Description
Wind Turbines	Number: 22 turbines Dimensions: Turbine Heights up to 200m to blade tip. Capacity: In excess of 50 Megawatts (MW). Micro-siting: 50m Turbine Foundations: 960m^3	Number: **17 turbines** (see **Table 2.2** for grid coordinates). Turbine Heights up to 200m to blade tip Capacity: In excess of 50 Megawatts (MW). Micro-sitting: 50m Turbine Foundations: 960m^3.
Turbine Crane Hardstanding	Dimensions (simplified): ~25m by 50m Footprint per Crane Hardstanding: ~0.125ha Micro-siting: 50m	N/A – no change
Auxiliary Turbine Crane Hardstanding	Two per wind turbine Dimensions (simplified): ~20m by 12m Footprint per Auxiliary Crane Hardstanding: ~0.024ha Micro-siting: 50m	N/A – no change
Blade Laydown Areas	Dimensions: ~83m by 15m Footprint per Laydown Area: ~0.125ha Micro-siting: 50m	N/A – no change
'Permanent' Anemometer Mast	Approximately centred on (E) 201587 (N) 706328 Description: up to 125m high permanent wind monitoring mast Micro-siting: 50m	N/A – no change
Substation/Control Building and Compound	Location: Approximately centred on (E) 199094, (N) 705553, Dimensions: up to 180m by 110m Control Building Height: up to 7m Maximum Compound Footprint: up to 1.98h Micro-siting: 100m	N/A – no change
Battery Energy Storage and Compound	Location: Approximately centred on (E) 198857 (N) 705224 Compound Dimensions: up to 50m by 50m Battery Container Height: Up to 3m Maximum Compound Footprint: ~0.25ha Re-use of area vacated by temporary construction compound 1 Micro-siting: 100m	N/A – no change
New Access Tracks	Length: ~22km Running width: Up to 6m (wider on bends) Total footprint: ~13.2ha Micro-siting: 100m	Length: **~17km** Running width: Up to 6m (wider on bends) Total footprint: **~10ha** Micro-siting: 100m
Existing Access Tracks upgraded	Length: ~19km Running width: Up to 6m (wider on bends) Footprint: increased by ~5.59ha	N/A – no change

Passing Places	Number: estimated 82 Dimensions: 30m in length, up to 5m wide Total Footprint: ~1.22ha	Number: estimated **71** Dimensions: 30m in length, up to 5m wide Total Footprint: **~1.06ha**
Watercourse Crossings	Number: up to 92 culverts, 35 new culverts have been proposed in addition to 57 upgrades	Number: up to **88 culverts**, **31 new culverts** have been proposed in addition to 57 upgrades
Potential Borrow Pits	Number: Up to 9 Micro-siting: 100m	N/A – no change
Temporary Construction Compound 1	Approximately centred on (E)198857 (N) 705224 Dimensions: ~100m by 50m Maximum Compound Footprint: ~0.5ha Micro-siting: 100m	N/A – no change
Temporary Construction Compound 2	Approximately centred on (E) 203995 (N) 707136. Dimensions: ~50m by 50m Maximum Compound Footprint: ~0.25ha Micro-siting: 100m	N/A – no change
Cable Trenches	Cables will be installed alongside access tracks. (Indicative dimensions are: 1m depth and up to 1.2m width). Micro-siting: 100m	N/A – no change
Concrete Batching Plant	Location adjacent to a borrow pit or adjacent to a temporary construction compound.	N/A – no change

Turbine Layout

2.2.4 The layout of the Revised Development is presented in **Table 2.2** below and has taken account of the findings of consultation responses, environmental and engineering studies, including desktop studies, field visits, peat depth surveys, planning designations and wind yield analysis.

Table 2.2 Wind Turbine and 'Permanent' Anemometry Mast Locations

Component	Maximum Height (m)	Easting	Northing
1	200	201508	706114
2	200	201128	707054
4	200	200779	706459
6	200	200175	705910
8	200	199236	705149
9	200	199178	707191
10	200	199172	705898
12	200	198805	704370
13	200	198850	706418
14	200	198423	706930
15	200	198350	705076

Component	Maximum Height (m)	Easting	Northing
16	200	198155	703498
17	200	198091	705578
18	200	198064	706123
19	200	197886	702986
21	200	197029	704927
22	200	196547	704575
Anemometry Mast	125	201587	706328

2.3 Forestry

2.3.1 Advanced felling is required to create adequate space for the footprint of the Revised Development. The total felling required to accommodate construction of the Revised Development totals 192.3 ha.

2.3.2 Further information on the felling and re-stocking required can be found in **Chapter 9: Further Considerations** and **Appendix 2A: Forestry Assessment** of this FEI Report.

3. Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section forms an update to the **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology**. Only sections which require updating are included here and existing information which is not subject to change is not repeated.

3.2 Consultation

3.2.1 **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments** includes comments received from consultees following submission of the EIA Report relating to the **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology** and the response of the Applicant and its consultant to these comments. Comments relevant to this environmental topic have been received from SEPA, Argyll and Bute Council (ABC), Scottish Water (SWa) and the Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board (ADSFB). Note that comments received from SEPA on specific design elements have been responded to in **Appendix 1B: SEPA Consultation Response**.

3.2.2 These comments and responses are in addition to those received prior to the submission of the EIA Report and summarised in **EIA Report Appendix 12F: Summary of Consultation**.

3.3 Scope of the Assessment

Spatial and Temporal Scope

3.3.1 The spatial and temporal scopes of the assessment are as summarised in **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.7 Scope of the Assessment**.

Potential Receptors

3.3.2 The receptors that are identified as still requiring impact assessment (i.e. 'scoped in') for the Revised Development are shown on **Figures 3.1a** and **3.1b**. Further Detailed aerial imagery of T2, T6, T9 and 13 is provided **Figure 3.2 (a-d)**

3.3.3 The receptors are also listed in **Table 3.1**, broadly in accordance with their first appearance in the **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.5 Overall Baseline** and are referenced by means of the one or two-letter category character and two-digit sequential number codes used in the baseline description therein.

Table 3.1 Water Receptors Requiring Impact Assessment

Receptor no.	Receptor	Location
Aquifers and WFD groundwater body		
GW01	Bedrock aquifer and Oban and Kintyre WFD bedrock groundwater body	Beneath and beyond the Development Site
GW02	Superficial aquifer	Enhanced permeability superficial deposits beneath and beyond the Development Site
Watercourses and associated WFD surface water bodies		
W01	Abhainn a' Bhealaich WFD surface water body	Within the Development Site
W02	Douglas Water WFD surface water body	Within the Development Site
Licenced abstractions		
A02_1	Braevallich Hydro Power Station, Braevallich	E 197140, N 705750
A02_4	Braevallich Hydro Power Station, Braevallich	E 197300, N 706270
A02_5	Braevallich Hydro Power Station, Braevallich	E 197450, N 706900
A04_1	Douglas Water Hydro Scheme, Argyll	E 204020, N 707570
A04_2	Douglas Water Hydro Scheme, Argyll	E 204040, N 706970
A10	Highland Heathers Ltd, Braevallich Nursery	E 195630, N 707750
A12	Inveraray SDB, Black and Veatch site offices	E 207102, N 705294
A16	Douglas Water offtake for Inveraray WTW	E 205330, N 705010
Private water supplies (PWSs)		
P07	Upper Braevallich Cottage	E 195874, N 707266
P08	Kilbride Chalet	E 207070, N 705215
Groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTEs)		
GT3	Moderate / Low GWDTE	Within 100m SEPA buffer
GT12	Moderate GWDTE	Within 100m SEPA buffer
GT22	Moderate GWDTE	Within 100m SEPA buffer
GT46	Moderate GWDTE	Within 100m SEPA buffer
GT48	Moderate GWDTE	Within 100m SEPA buffer
GT228	Moderate GWDTE	Within 100m SEPA buffer

3.3.4 The following previously assessed receptors have been 'scoped out' from further assessment because with the removal of turbines 3, 5, 7, 11 and 20 and associated infrastructure, the likely effects are considered to be **Not Significant**, based on the increased separation distance from the proposed infrastructure of the Revised Development:

- the Leacann Water and River Add (u/s Abhainn Bheag an Tunns confluence) WFD surface water bodies (W03 and W04 respectively), now both approximately 1 km from the nearest infrastructure;
- the Leacann Water Hydropower Scheme and Loch Leacann Reservoir licensed abstractions (A08_1 and A14 respectively) now both approximately 2 km and 1 km respectively from the nearest infrastructure; and

- a large number of GWDTEs, namely GT24, GT28, GT30 – 34, GT47, GT58 – 60, GT77, GT78, GT88, GT103, GT109, GT185, GT195, GT196, GT206, GT214 and GT215, now outside of SEPA buffers.

3.3.5 This is in addition to those receptors that are 'scoped out' of the assessment presented in **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.7 Scope of the Assessment**.

3.3.6 References within the **EIA Report Appendix 12A: GWDTE Risk Assessment** to the removed turbines and associated infrastructure and the GWDTEs 'scoped out' in this FEI Report are now redundant.

Potential Significant Effects

3.3.7 The potential significant geological, hydrological and hydrogeological effects on the remaining 'scoped in' receptors that are taken forward for assessment are included in **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Table 12.6**. The consideration of decommissioning effects remains 'scoped out'.

3.4 Embedded Measures

3.4.1 The redesign of the Proposed Development outlined in **FEI Report Chapter 2: Project Design** to form the Revised Development has been undertaken primarily in response to the consultee concerns outlined in **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments**. Some additional measures are set out in **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments** and these constitute an extension of the embedded water mitigation measures that are described in **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.8 Embedded Measures** and **EIA Report Appendix 12G: Mitigation Measures (for inclusion in CEMP)**.

3.4.2 Measures introduced as part of the redesign include the following:

- The removal of turbines T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20;
- Removal and/or shortening of access tracks associated with removed turbines, resulting in the reduction in the number of watercourse crossings from 92 to 88. This includes the modification of the access tracks associated with Turbine 2 and Turbine 4 to replace the proposed loop with a single access road and associated turning heads
- Modification of access track associated with Turbine 22 to allow a turning head to be located at least 15m from the watercourse;
- Altering of peat storage areas and Borrow Pit 9 search area outside 15m watercourse buffers;
- Modification of the proposed culverts to permit 1 in 200 plus climate change flood flows and to be of a bottomless arch culvert form, as per SEPA guidance WAT-PS-06-02. The Applicant would accept a planning condition to this effect;
- Realignment of the access track associated with borrow pit 9, to ensure it crosses the Allt nam Muc watercourse as near to perpendicular as possible; and
- Commitment to a planning condition to ensure post-development surface water runoff should not exceed pre-development runoff and adoption of ABC's best practice drainage checklists.

3.4.3 In addition to the above, by making use of the turbine micro-siting provisions, the proportion of foundations of the remaining turbines (T2, T6, T9 and T13) and associated

infrastructure within watercourse buffers would be significantly reduced or eliminated (see **Figures 3.2a-d**).

3.4.4 The removal of the five turbines in particular facilitated the 'scoping out' of the WFD surface water bodies, licensed abstractions and GWDTEs identified in **Section 3.3**. The other mitigation would serve to further reduce the impacts on the remaining 'scoped in' receptors, as discussed in **Section 3.6** below.

3.5 Assessment Methodology

3.5.1 The assessment methodology is as described in **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.9 Assessment Methodology**.

3.6 Assessment of Effects

3.6.1 Following the 'scoping out' of previously assessed receptors described in **Section 3.3** and the measures introduced as part of the redesign and identified in **Section 3.4**, the assessment of effects presented in **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.10 Assessment of Effects**, is updated as follows:

- With the removal of five turbines T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20 and their associated tracks, the scale of the construction and operational activities above the local bedrock aquifer and Oban and Kintyre WFD groundwater body (GW01) would be reduced;
- The scale of the construction and operational activities in both the Abhainn a' Bhealaich (W01) and the Douglas Water WFD (W02) surface water bodies would be reduced with the removal of turbines and associated tracks (namely T5 and T7 in W01 and T3 in W02). The adoption of bottomless arch culvert watercourse crossings would benefit both water bodies, and the modification of the Borrow Pit 9 crossing would also be beneficial for W01;
- The scale of the construction and operational activities upstream of the Braevallich Hydro Power Station (A02_1) and Highland Heathers (A10) abstractions on the Abhainn a' Bhealaich and the Douglas Water Hydro Scheme (A04_1), Invereray SDB (A12) and Inveraray WTW (A16) abstractions on the Douglas Water would be reduced with the removal of turbines and associated tracks (namely T5 and T7 on the former and T3 on the latter). The adoption of bottomless arch culvert watercourse crossings would benefit all of these abstractions, as would the modification of the Borrow Pit 9 crossing with respect to A02_1. The watercourse crossing refinements would also benefit abstractions on side-tributaries, namely others at Braevallich Hydro Power Station (A02_4) and Douglas Water Hydro Scheme (A04_2);
- The scale of the construction and operational activities upstream of the Upper Braevallich Cottage (P07) PWS on the Abhainn a' Bhealaich and the Kilbride Chalet (P08) PWS on the Douglas Water would be reduced with the removal of turbines and associated tracks (namely T5 and T7 on the former and T3 on the latter). The adoption of bottomless arch culvert watercourse crossings would benefit both of these abstractions, as would the modification of the Borrow Pit 9 crossing with respect to the former; and
- The scale of the construction and operational activities in the vicinity of GT46 and GT48 would be reduced with the removal of the T11 turbine and associated tracks. The adoption of bottomless arch culvert watercourse crossings would benefit GT22.

3.6.2 **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.10 Assessment of Effects** with respect to the above-mentioned receptors already indicated

that the effects would be either of **Negligible** (GW01, W02, GT46 and GT48) or **Minor** (W01, A02_1, A02_4, A04_1, A04_2, A10, A12, A16, P07 and P08) significance (i.e. **Not Significant**), and the benefits of the Revised Development would not change this assessment outcome.

3.6.3 There are therefore **no significant** adverse effects related to the Revised Development in isolation.

3.7 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

3.7.1 Consideration has also been given to the findings of the **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.11 Assessment of Cumulative Effects** to determine whether any of the reduced list of geology, hydrology and hydrogeology receptors that have been taken forward for assessment in this FEI are likely to be subject to any change in cumulative effects.

3.7.2 It is reasonable to assume that that good practice mitigation of the type referenced in **Section 3.4,** as well as those stated within the **EIA Report Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology, Section 12.8 Embedded Measures,** would also be applied to the other wind farms in the same catchments (An Suidhe, Glasvaar, A'Chruach and A'Chruach Phase 2 Wind Farms), ensuring **no significant** cumulative effects downstream.

3.8 Conclusions of Significance Evaluation

3.8.1 The summary of the significance of predicted geological, hydrological and hydrogeological effects presented in **EIA Report Appendix 12H: Summary of Significance of Adverse Effects** is still appropriate for the reduced list of geology, hydrology and hydrogeology receptors that have been taken forward for assessment in this FEI. There are **no significant** adverse effects related to the Revised Development in isolation or cumulatively with other developments.

4. Landscape & Visual

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This Chapter provides a summary of the revised Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) taking account of the Revised Development (for 17 turbines) described in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 of this report. Section 4.4 provides a response to the NatureScot (NS) and Argyll and Bute Council (ABC) consultation responses to the Eredine Wind Farm application (the 'Proposed Development' for 22 turbines). It should be read in conjunction with the EIA Report (2024), **Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual,** and is supported by the following FEI Report figures:

- **Figure 4.1** Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to Blade Tip with Viewpoint Locations;
- **Figure 4.2** Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to Hub Height with Viewpoint Locations;
- **Figure 4.3** Detailed Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to Blade Tip (10km);
- **Figure 4.4** Detailed Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to Blade Tip with Forestry Excluded (10km);
- **Figure 4.5** Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to Blade Tip with Viewpoint Locations and Cumulative Wind Farms (1:90,000 scale);
- **Figure 4.6** Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to Blade Tip with Viewpoint Locations and Cumulative Wind Farms (1:35,000 scale);
- **Figure 4.7** Cumulative Wind Farms;
- **Figure 4.8** Cumulative ZTV 1 - Eredine with An Suidhe and A'Chruach;
- **Figure 4.9** Cumulative ZTV 2 - Eredine with An Suidhe / Blarghour and A'Chruach / A'Chruach Phase 2 / Glasvaar;
- **Figure 4.10** Cumulative ZTV 3 - Eredine with An Suidhe, Blarghour and An Carr Dubh;
- **Figure 4.11 (a to e)** Viewpoint 1 B840 Durran;
- **Figure 4.12 (a to d)** Viewpoint 2 Loch Awe Waters;
- **Figure 4.13 (a-g)** Viewpoint 3 Kilmaha;
- **Figure 4.14 (a-h)** Viewpoint 4 Dalavich;
- **Figure 4.15 (a-g)** Viewpoint 5 Minor Road between Dalavich and Inverinan;
- **Figure 4.16 (a-g)** Viewpoint 8 Leanach;
- **Figure 4.17 (a-e)** Viewpoint 9 Strachur;
- **Figure 4.18 (a-g)** Viewpoint 10 Dun na Cuaiche;
- **Figure 4.19 (a-g)** Viewpoint 11 Ford;
- **Figure 4.20 (a-c)** Viewpoint 12 Loch Fyne Waters;

- **Figure 4.21 (a-e)** Viewpoint 15 Beinn Bhan;
- **Figure 4.22 (a-e)** Viewpoint 18 Hell's Glen Road (B839);
- **Figure 4.23 (a-e)** Viewpoint 20 Ardkinglas Woodland Garden; and
- **Figure 4.24 (a-z)** Comparative Wirelines.

4.1.2 As a result of a revised Lighting Strategy (**Appendix 9B**), a revised night-time assessment has also been included to support the LVIA in FEI Report (**Appendix 4A**), which includes a number of revised figures (**Figure 4A.1 to 4A.13**).

4.1.3 The revised LVIA and response to consultation has been prepared by chartered landscape architects at WSP.

4.2 Project Design and Evolution

4.2.1 The Development Site is located in an upland, forested area which is undesignated and surrounded by low-rising summits, and the proposed turbines are located approximately 8km south-west of Inveraray and to the north of Loch Fyne.

4.2.2 The design of the Revised Development is explained in **Section 2 Project Design** of this FEI Report and has been re-reviewed against SNH's guidance *Siting and Designing Wind Farms in the Landscape*, Version 3a, 2017, the advice contained within the ABLWECS, the relevant policies of the ABC LDPs and Supplementary Guidance. The design objectives of the Proposed Development in **Chapter 8** of the EIA Report have also been reviewed, and those relevant have been incorporated into the design of the Revised Development. Most recently, the consultation responses from NS and ABC have been considered and, where possible, taken into account in the design of the Revised Development.

4.2.3 Most notably, the removal of the five turbines in the south and south-east of the Development Site (T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20), as recommended by NS, has resulted in a reduction in visual effects (some from significant to not significant) in the Loch Fyne area.

4.3 Revised Assessment

4.3.1 The Revised Development now includes 17 wind turbines, 200m to blade tip (there has been no change to the location of these turbines in comparison with the Proposed Development). There have also been some corresponding reductions to the access tracks and some minor adjustments made to one borrow pit as described in the Proposed Development. A revised project description is reported in section 2.2 of this FEI Report. A new Lighting Strategy (agreed with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)) is proposed and the revised night-time assessment of the landscape, visual and cumulative effects of the aviation warning lights is provided in **Appendix 4A:Night time Assessment**. This revised night-time assessment accords with the NS Guidance on Aviation Lighting Impact Assessment (November 2024) and their General pre-application and scoping advice for onshore wind farms, Annex 2.

4.3.2 As a result of changes to the turbine layout (removal of T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20) there has been a reduction to the landscape and visual effects assessed and reported in **Chapter 8** the EIA Report.

Revised Cumulative Baseline

4.3.3 An update of the cumulative baseline has been undertaken for the Revised Development as part of this FEI Report and is illustrated in **Figure 4.7**. The main changes from the EIA Report are as follows:

- Blarghour Variation is now consented (superseding the original Blarghour);
- Glasvaar Application is now consented;
- Ladyfield Application is now consented;
- Corr Chnoc is a new application;
- Cruach Clenamacrie is a new application;
- High Brenfield is a new application;
- Giant's Burn is a new application; and
- The existing Sròndoire and Allt Dearg wind farms are removed as they are now outwith the 45km Study Area.

Revised ZTV and Viewpoint Analysis

4.3.4 For clarity there has been no change to the 45km Study Area or viewpoint locations.

4.3.5 Comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) plots are illustrated in **Figures 4.1 & 4.2**, confirming a reduction in theoretical visibility resulting from the removal of the five turbines. The blade tip ZTV coverage for the Proposed Development (yellow + green) would affect 29.7% of the 45km Study Area. The removal of the five turbines would reduce the blade tip ZTV coverage for the Revised Development (green) to 28.49% of the 45km Study Area. Similarly, the hub height ZTV coverage for the Proposed Development (yellow + green) would affect 24.4% of the 45km Study Area, while the removal of the five turbines would reduce the hub height ZTV coverage for the Revised Development (green) to 22.7% of the 45km Study Area. The extent of ZTV coverage in each case would reduce to 31.67% as a result of forestry screening which is indicated in **Figure 4.4**.

4.3.6 Notably, a number of receptors located in the Loch Fyne area would either no longer view the Revised Development or have limited visibility of it. This includes the views from Lachlan Castle and Bay, Inveraray (Old Military Road), settlements of Strachur, Ardnagowan, Loch Fyne Waters and the B8000 and A886.

4.3.7 The revised viewpoint analysis is summarised in **Table 4.1** and the revised cumulative viewpoint analysis is summarised in **Table 4.2**. The 'Level of Effect' is compared to the assessment in the EIA Report. Significant effects are indicated in bold text and changes from the EIA Report are underlined.

4.3.8 Further the revised landscape effects and cumulative landscape effects are summarised in **Table 4.3** and **4.5** whilst the revised visual effects and cumulative visual effects are summarised in **Table 4.4** and **4.6**.

Revised Landscape Effects

4.3.9 Landscape Effects are concerned with how the Revised Development would affect the elements that make up the landscape, the aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape, and its distinctive character. The revised landscape assessment is summarised in **Table 4.3** and **4.5**. EIA Report **Figure 8.7** illustrates the landscape receptors including landscape character, designations and Wild Land Areas.

Landscape Effects on Landscape Character

4.3.10 The Revised Development would have a significant and localised landscape and cumulative effect on part of the 'host' Craggy Upland LCT and part of the Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic LCT. Craggy Upland LCT

4.3.11 ABC and NS disagreed with the overall geographical extent of significant effects on the host *Craggy Upland* Landscape Character Type (LCT)[1] reported in the EIA Report, due to the vertical height and horizontal extent of the Proposed Development. The revised LVIA has reconsidered the landscape character assessment in light of consultee comments and the reductions made as part of the Revised Development.

4.3.12 In summary, the Revised Development would significantly affect the landscape character of the *Craggy Upland* LCT within the site boundary, extending up to the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm. In addition, the revised LVIA finds that the landscape would be significantly affected for approximately 2km, beyond the outermost turbines, subject to ZTV and forestry coverage.

4.3.13 It should be noted that the Revised Development is contained within the 'envelope' for the Proposed Development and would therefore not extend effects on landscape character beyond those previously assessed. Logically, there would be a slight reduction in landscape effects along the southern part of the site to account for turbines removed from the scheme. The geographical extent of significantly affected *Craggy Upland* LCT would extend up to approximately 2km from the outmost revised turbine positions for the following reasons:

- The effects would be limited by the topography and existing / retained forestry cover which is reflected by the ZTV coverage shown in Figures 4.1 to 4.5. The ZTVs illustrate fragmented ZTV coverage beyond approximately 2km which may additionally be screened by intervening forestry.
- It should be noted that felling and replanting of forestry surrounding the Revised Development is carried out in accordance with the forestry felling and restocking plans although at any one time, the majority of this area is under forestry cover which restricts visibility and the fragmented ZTV coverage indicate limited scope for significant effect to the baseline landscape character.
- Within 1-2km to the south-east, the landscape is crossed by the recently constructed Inveraray to Crossaig 275kV overhead line which would also tend to intensify and 'contain' significant effects related to the Revised Development within this area.
- The geographical extent of these effects would also overlap with and intensify the effects of the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm, where the landscape is already characterised by existing wind farm development.

4.3.14 As a result of the Medium sensitivity and the High magnitude of change, the level of effect on part of the *Craggy Upland* LCT would be **Major** and **Significant**, extending over an area of approximately <2km from the outer most turbines. Beyond this distance the ZTV becomes fragmented and the magnitude of change to landscape character would drop to Medium or less and would no longer be significant. The nature of these effects would be long-term, direct and negative due primarily to the height and scale of the proposed turbines.

4.3.15 There would be ***no change*** to the assessment as reported in the EIA Report.

[1] Referred to as the south-eastern unit of AGC 7 Craggy Upland in their consultation response.

4.3.16 Cumulatively, there would be ***no change*** to the assessed level of effect, although there would be a change to the number of wind farms considered as part of Scenario 1[2], which would now include the consented Glasvaar and Blarghour Variation wind farms. In both Scenario 1 and 2[3], the level of effect is assessed as **Major** and **Significant** and collectively would extend across a wider geographical area of the *Craggy Upland* LCT such that wind farm development would become a key characteristic, with parts of the landscape (within and close to wind farm clusters) becoming a 'wind farm landscape'.

Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic LCT

4.3.17 The Revised Development would **significantly** affect part of the AGC 6a – *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic*, within approximately 2km from the proposed turbines. Beyond approximately 2km and extending to within 10km, the ZTV coverage of AGC 6 a – *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic* is fragmented and would be further limited by forestry cover which is an established characteristic of this LCT. The closest turbines to this receptor (T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20) have been removed. This means there is little scope for the Revised Development to have a significant effect on this LCT beyond approximately 2km, as demonstrated by the ZTVs.

4.3.18 Cumulatively, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment level of effect although there would be a change to the number of wind farms considered as part of Scenario 1, which would now include the consented Glasvaar and Blarghour Variation and Ladyfield wind farms.

4.3.19 None of the remaining LCTs would be **significantly** affected by the Revised Development.

Landscape Effects on Designated Landscapes

4.3.20 There would be **no significant** effects on any designated landscapes within the 45km Study Area, as reported in the EIA Report, including the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park and the Knapdale National Scenic Area. NS and ABC agreed that the effects of the Proposed Development in the EIA Report on the SLQs of both designated landscapes would be **not significant**.

4.3.21 There would, however, be a reduction in the magnitude and level of effect on the East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA (**Minor to None** and **Not Significant**) due to the removal of turbines T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20 in the southern part of the Revised Development.

Revised Visual Effects

4.3.22 Visual effects are concerned wholly with the effect of a development on views, and the general visual amenity that would be experienced by people in the landscape.

4.3.23 The revised viewpoint analysis (**Table 4.1**) indicates that **significant** visual effects would generally extend to within approximately 7.5km of the Revised Development (subject to a clear view of the turbines and landform and / or vegetation screening). This is a reduction from the extent of significant visual effects assessed for the Proposed Development which would generally extend to within approximately 9.8km.

4.3.24 Significant visual effects are illustrated by viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 inclusive (**Figures 4.11 (a-e) to 4.15 (a-g)**) with a further, isolated **significant** effect identified on the summit of Beinn Bhan (Viewpoint 15, **Figure 4.21 (a-e)**), approximately 11.8km distance from the

[2] Scenario 1 includes existing and consented wind farm developments within the 45km Study Area.

[3] Scenario 2 includes existing and consented wind farm developments and other wind farm applications within the 45km Study Area.

nearest turbine. This viewpoint was also identified as significant in the EIA Report. The High sensitivity of this viewpoint combined with a Low magnitude of change would result in a **significant** visual effect. In overall terms, however, the views from the summit of Beinn Bhan would be **not significant** when considered as part of the wider 360° views and the hill walker experience.

4.3.25 Visual effects from Viewpoints 8 (**Figure 4.16 (a-g)**) and 12 (**Figure 4.20 (a-c)**) would no longer be significant due to the removal of five turbines from the Revised Development. There would also be a reduction in the level of effect from Lachlan Bay and Castle (Viewpoint 6), Strachur (Viewpoint 9, **Figure 4.17 (a-e)**), the Old Military Road near Inveraray (Viewpoint 13), and Cruach Mor Dunardry Summit (Viewpoint 22), with all these viewpoints remaining **not significant**.

4.3.26 There would be **no significant** visual effects from the north-east, east and west of the Revised Development or beyond the containing slopes and facing edges of Loch Awe.

4.3.27 There would also be **no significant** visual effects from any receptors associated with Loch Fyne as a result of the Revised Development.

4.3.28 The **significant** effects on viewpoints 2, 3, 4 and 5 as result of the Revised Development would be cumulative. In total, 23 of the 26 of the viewpoints are cumulative in that they also involve the visibility of other wind farms, in particular the existing An Suidhe and A'chruach Wind Farms, the consented Blarghour, Glasvaar and Ladyfield wind farms and the An Carr Dubh Wind Farm application which are all located within approximately 10-15km from the Revised Development. Other wind farms beyond 10-15km are also visible from some of the assessment viewpoints, although often to a negligible degree.

4.3.29 Viewpoints 12 and 15 would no longer be significantly affected as a result of the combined or additional effects of the Revised Development. There would be no cumulative effects from viewpoints 1, 6 and 13. The viewpoint assessment also identifies eight other viewpoints (10, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 26) that, while not affected by the Revised Development, are significantly affected as a result of other existing, consented or application wind farms within the 45km Study Area.

4.3.30 The Revised Development would generally appear as a distinctly separate group of turbines from the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm, primarily due to the different scale of the turbines at each wind farm. The combined visibility of these two developments would be limited to approximately seven years, accounting for the decommissioning of An Suidhe. This would occur approximately ~28 years prior to the end of the operational period of the Revised Development, thereby eliminating this cumulative effect.

4.3.31 The revised visual assessment is summarised in **Table 4.4** and the revised cumulative visual assessment is summarised in **Table 4.6**.

Visual Effects on Settlements and Residential Properties

4.3.32 The Revised Development would result in **significant** visual effects on the views from parts of one settlement at Dalavich (reflecting no change from the previous assessment of the Proposed Development in this case). The revised cumulative assessment also confirms significant cumulative effects on views from parts of Dalavich as a result of the consented Blarghour Wind Farm the An Carr Dubh application and the Revised Development.

4.3.33 The Revised Development has led to a reduction of the visual effects likely to be experienced from the settlement of Strachur which has reduced from Moderate in the EIA Report to Minor and **not significant** as a result of the Revised Development. This is due to the reduction in turbines visible from this location and particularly the removal of T11 leading to minimal blade / blade tip visibility as illustrated in **Figure 4.24i**.

4.3.34 There are no residential properties within 2km of the proposed turbines at the Revised Development, with the nearest property – Kirn Lodge - at approximately 2.5km to the north-west from the nearest turbine location.

Visual Effects on Transport Routes

4.3.35 There would remain localised and **significant** visual effects on the views from two transport routes, as follows:

- Up to approximately 1km of the B840 in oblique inland views at Durran for northbound and southbound users; and
- The minor road along western shore of Loch Awe (C29 and C30) (overlapping with the Caledonia Way and Core Path C173 (a-d) Ford to Annat via Loch Avich and Inverinan) for ~4.6km where there would be glimpsed open views at Kilmun and between Dalavich and Acrihamish (subject to intermittent screening from vegetation and local landform).

4.3.36 The views from the A886 and B8000 would no longer be significantly affected by the Revised Development due to the reduction in turbine numbers.

4.3.37 There would be **no significant** visual effect on the views from the remaining transport routes as a result of the Revised Development.

Visual Effects on Recreational Routes

4.3.38 **Significant** visual effects would remain from parts of the following four recreational routes:

- Core Path C119 (b-c): Braevallich, Loch Awe to Furnace / Scottish Hill Track 104. This route passes through the Development Site;
- Core Path C305: Dalavich to Barnaline Lodge;
- Core Paths C486 – Dun Dubh, Ford; and
- Scottish hill track 105 / 106 Furnace to Ford / Kilmichael Glassary.

4.3.39 There would be a reduction in the level of effect on the following two routes as a result of the Revised Development:

- Loch Lomond and Cowal Way – reduced from *Moderate to No View* (Proposed Development), to *Minor to No View* and **Not Significant** (Revised Development). This is due to the reduction in turbines visible from this route and particularly the removal of T11 from the views near Strachur which is the closest point on the route to the Revised Development.
- Core Path C220 (a-b) Strachur Village Back Road - reduced from *Moderate to No View* (Proposed Development), to *Minor to No View* and **Not Significant** (Revised Development). This is due to the reduction in turbines visible from this route and particularly the removal of T11.

4.3.40 There would be **no significant** visual effects on the views from any other recreational routes within the 45km Study Area.

Loch Awe

4.3.41 ABC advised "*The accolade of longest freshwater loch in Scotland has led to a number of challenges for enthusiasts including the Loch Awe Challenge for 'paddlers' of all sorts and the Three Lakes Challenge (paddling the longest lakes in England, Wales and Scotland). The loch is also well-used by fishermen*." The revised LVIA notes **no change** to the previous EIA Report which considered recreational activity on and along the length of the Loch Awe, both from single locations (fishermen) and as part of a sequence (people on watercraft / paddlers). These receptors would be focused on the main activity, with an appreciation of the landscape occurring as a secondary interest. Nonetheless, the revised LVIA confirms that the Revised Development would have a **significant** effect on the views from recreational receptors on Loch Awe.

4.3.42 These views would also be experienced sequentially and cumulatively with the existing and consented wind farms at An Suidhe and Blarghour (Scenario 1) and the An Carr Dubh application (Scenario 2).

Loch Fyne

4.3.43 There would be **no significant** effects on the views from recreational receptors on Loch Fyne as a result of the Revised Development.

Other recreational and tourist destinations

4.3.44 There would be **no significant** visual effects on any other recreational and tourist destinations including Gardens and Designed Landscapes(GDLs) and hill summits. As noted previously, there would be a **significant** visual effect on Viewpoint 15 Beinn Bhan (**Figure 4.21 (a-e)**). However, the views from the summit of Beinn Bhan would be **Not Significant** when considered as part of the wider 360° views and the hill walker experience.

Night-time Assessment on Aviation Warning Lights

4.3.45 Due to the reduced number of turbines of the Revised Development, the revised Lighting Strategy would lead to a reduction in the number of required aviation warning lights from thirteen to eight.

4.3.46 The revised Lighting Strategy (**Appendix 9B**) requires eight of the 17 turbines to be lit (T1, T2, T6, T9, T12, T18, T19 and T22) all of which would be dimmed to 10% for approximately 94% of their operation. This strategy represents the greatest level of mitigation currently available and approved by the CAA. In addition, angle intensity mitigation is included and this would benefit receptors within low lying areas relative to the elevation of the lights, reducing the intensity to a low as 4-39 cd in some cases.

4.3.47 The night-time assessment (**Appendix 4A**) concluded that there would be **no significant** effects on landscape character or nightscape as a result of the Revised Development, including the perceptual qualities of "*seclusion and naturalness*" or the SLQ and integrity of the LLTNP, NSA or LLA designations.

4.3.48 There would be **no significant** night-time effects on the views from any visual receptor locations. This is due to the varying levels of artificial light present at most of these locations and / or associated with the activity of travelling through the landscape. Other mitigating factors, including the distance between the lights and the receptor locations, the direction and location of the aviation warning lights relative to the activity, and the effects

of darkness adaptation further contribute to the conclusion that the night-time visual effects would not be significant. In addition, the effects of angle intensity mitigation would also reduce the likelihood of significant night-time effects from low lying receptors, although this would not apply to elevated receptors, such as hill walkers occasionally camping on hill summits.

4.3.49 There would, however, be **Significant** combined, cumulative night-time landscape and visual effects, resulting from the consented Blarghour, the An Carr Dubh application, and the Revised Development on the 'host' *Craggy Upland* LCT and from a small number of visual receptor locations in the Loch Awe area, including part of Dalavich, and the minor road along the western shore of Loch Awe. Recreational users of the waters of Loch Awe are unlikely to be present at night, for practical and safety reasons.

4.3.50 During the summer months, most people, including hill walkers, are unlikely to experience the aviation warning lights. For example, during the summer solstice 2025 the aviation warning lights would switch on at 22.43 and switch off at 04.02. Local residents and local road users are more likely to experience the aviation warning lights during the winter months. For example, during the winter solstice 2025 the lights would come on at 16.14 and switch off at 08.22. It is also reasonable to expect that most people would be commuting or indoors during these periods of colder weather, during the twilight and night, and would experience the aviation warning lights incidentally to their main activity.

4.3.51 Operation of the aviation warning lights would have no adverse effect on periods of sunrise (when the sun disk passes above the horizon and the period just after this) and sunset (the period just before the sun disk passes below the horizon) as their operation is programmed to switch off 30 minutes before sunrise and switch on 30 minutes after sunset, respectively.

Conclusions to revised LVIA

4.3.52 The Revised Development would result in the following landscape and visual effects:

- Revised Landscape Effects:
  - **Significant** and localised landscape effects (including cumulative effects) would affect part of the 'host' *Craggy Upland* LCT and part of the AGC 6a – *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic* LCT. Both of these effects would be reduced in comparison with the previous assessment for the Proposed Development due to the reduced number of turbines.
  - There would be **no significant** effects on any of the remaining LCTs or any of the designated landscapes as a result of the Revised Development. There would however be a reduction in the magnitude and level of effect on the East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA due to the removal of the southern and south-east turbines of the Revised Development.
- Revised Visual Effects:
  - The viewpoint analysis reports a reduction in the general extent of significant visual effects from 9.8km to 7.5km as a result of the Revised Development. This is illustrated by viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 inclusive (**Figures 4.11 (a-e) to 4.15 (a-g)**) with a further, isolated **significant** effect identified on the summit of Beinn Bhan (Viewpoint 15, **Figure 4.21 (a-e)**), approximately 11.8km distance from the revised turbines.
  - **Significant** visual effects (including cumulative effects) would affect receptors at Loch Awe, including part of Dalavich, part of the B840, and the minor road along the western shore of Loch Awe (overlapping with the Caledonia Way and Core

Path C173 (a-d), recreational users on Loch Awe and receptors on three Core Paths (C119 (b-c), C305, C486) and a Scottish hill track 105 / 106.

- The Revised Development has led to a reduction and **no significant** effects on the views from Strachur, Cruach Mor Dunardry summit, parts of the Loch Lomond and Cowal Way, and the Core Path C220 (a-b) Strachur Village Back Road. Equally, the Revised Development has led to a reduction and **no significant** effects on the Loch Fyne area due to the removal of five turbines. This includes the views from Leanach on the A886 and B8000.
- There would also be no visibility of the Revised Development from Lachlan Bay and Castle or the A83 Old Military Road on the approach to Inveraray.

4.3.53 There would be **no significant** night-time effects due to the revised Lighting Strategy and the reduced number of aviation warning lights (reduced from thirteen to eight). There would, however, be **Significant** combined, cumulative night-time landscape and visual effects resulting from the consented Blarghour, the An Carr Dubh application and the Revised Development on the 'host' *Craggy Upland* LCT and from a small number of visual receptors in the Loch Awe area including parts of Dalavich, and parts of the minor road along the western shore of Loch Awe.

4.3.54 The revised viewpoint analysis is summarised in **Table 4.1** and the revised cumulative viewpoint analysis is summarised in **Table 4.2**. The revised landscape effects and cumulative effects are summarised in **Tables 4.3** and **4.5**, whilst the revised visual effects and cumulative effects are summarised in **Tables 4.4** and **4.6**. The 'Level of Effect' is compared to the assessment in the EIA Report. Significant effects are indicated in bold text and changes from the EIA Report are underlined.

Table 4.1 Summary of Viewpoint Analysis

Viewpoint No. and Title	Distance to nearest turbine4	Viewpoint Analysis: Revised Development			
		Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Comments
1. B840 Durran	2,820	Medium	Medium	**Moderate**	Although five turbines have been deleted there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the proximity of the remaining turbines in the north.
2. Loch Awe Waters	3,420	High	High-Medium	**Substantial to Major**	Although five turbines have been deleted there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the proximity of the remaining turbines in the north.
3. Kilmaha	4,602	High	High-Medium (Medium)	**Substantial to Major (Major)**	Although five turbines have been deleted there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the proximity of the remaining turbines in the north.
4. Dalavich	6,019	High	Medium	**Major**	Although five turbines have been deleted there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the proximity of the remaining turbines in the north.
5. Sustrans Cycle Route 78 between Dalavich and Inverinan	7,496	High-Medium	Medium	**Major to Moderate**	Although five turbines have been deleted there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the proximity of the remaining turbines in the north.
6. B8000 Lachlan Bay	8,489	High	Zero	No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Minor to No View) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines resulting in No View of the Revised Development.
7. Ardnagowan	8,219	High	Very Low	Minor	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining two turbines.
8. Leanach	8,827	Medium	Medium-Low	Moderate to Minor	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate and Significant) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines resulting in a reduction in the number of hubs and upper towers visible on the skyline. The magnitude of change would be Medium-Low resulting in a Moderate to Minor and ***Not Significant*** effect.
9. Strachur	8,551	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate) to the magnitude of change and level of visual effect due to the removal of five turbines.
10. Dun na Cuaiche (Fort)	9,361	High	Low	Moderate	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
11. Ford	9,400	High	Low-Very Low	Moderate to Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.

[4] Distance to nearest turbine as reported on the viewpoint figures – this refers to the nearest turbine to the viewpoint which may or may not be visible.

12. Loch Fyne Waters	10,393	High	Low-Very Low	Moderate to Minor	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate and Significant) to the magnitude of change and level of visual effect due to the removal of five turbines resulting in a Moderate to Minor and ***Not Significant*** effect.
13. A83 Old Military Road	10,260	High	Zero	No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Minor) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines. The remaining two blade tips would be behind intervening forestry and not visible.
14. St Catherine's	10,706	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
15. Beinn Bhan	11,836	High	Low	**Moderate**	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
16. Minor Road at Fernoch Hill	12,728	High-Medium	Low	Moderate to Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
17. Tom Soilleir	13,492	High	Low	Moderate	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
18. Hell's Glen Road (B839) near A815	14,588	High-Medium	Low	Moderate to Minor	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
19. Beinn Lochain	15,490	High	Low	Moderate	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
20. Ardkinglas Woodland Garden	15,950	High	Low	Moderate	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
21. Otter Ferry	19,133	High	Low- Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Although the number of visible turbines is reduced, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the visibility of the remaining turbines.
22. Cruach Mor Dunardry Summit	20,180	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate to Minor) to the magnitude and level of visual effect due to the removal of five turbines.
23. Beinn Bhuidhe	22,424	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
24. Beinn Ìme	24,099	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
25. Ben Cruachan	24,106	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
26. A83 South of Inverneill	27,077	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.

Note: Significant effects as a result of the Revised Development are indicated in bold text and shaded dark grey.

Table 4.2 Summary of Cumulative Viewpoint Analysis

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude (Applications)**	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
1. B840 Durran	Zero	No cumulative effect		Zero	No cumulative effect		***No change*** to the assessment.
2. Loch Awe Waters	Medium-Low	**Substantial to Major**	**Substantial to Major** (RD, Blarghour)	Medium	**Substantial to Major**	**Substantial to Major** (RD, Blarghour, An Carr Dubh)	***No change*** to the assessment. Blarghour (previous variation application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
3. Kilmaha	Low	**Substantial to Major (Major)**	**Substantial to Major (Major)** (RD, Blarghour)	Medium	**Substantial to Major (Major)**	**Substantial to Major (Major)** (RD, Blarghour, An Carr Dubh)	***No change*** to the assessment. Blarghour (previous variation application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
4. Dalavich	Medium	**Major**	**Major** (Blarghour, RD)	High - Medium	**Major**	**Substantial to Major** (Blarghour, An Carr Dubh, RD)	***No change*** to the assessment. Blarghour (previous variation application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
5. Sustrans Cycle Route 78 between Dalavich and Inverinan	Medium	**Major to Moderate**	**Major to Moderate** (Blarghour, RD)	High-Medium	**Major to Moderate**	**Major** (Blarghour, An Carr Dubh, RD)	***No change*** to the assessment. Blarghour (previous variation application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
6. B8000 Lachlan Bay	The Revised Development is no longer visible in the view. Therefore, there would be no cumulative effects.						***Change*** to the assessment. The Revised Development

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms Cumulative Scenario 1: **Magnitude** (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	Cumulative Scenario 2: **Magnitude (Applications)**	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Comments**
							is no longer visible in the view.
7. Ardnagowan	Low	Minor	Moderate (Ladyfield)	Very Low	Minor	Moderate (Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Cumulative magnitude in Scenario 2 is reduced.
8. Leanach	Zero	No cumulative effect		Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor (RD and High Brenfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. The High Brenfield application is now visible and introduces a cumulative effect in Scenario 2.
9. Strachur	Low	Minor	Moderate (Ladyfield)	Very Low	Minor	Moderate (Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Cumulative magnitude in Scenario 2 is reduced.
10. Dun na Cuaiche (Fort)	Medium	Moderate	**Major to Moderate** (Ladyfield and not the RD)	Medium	Moderate	**Major to Moderate** (Ladyfield, An Carr Dubh and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
11. Ford	Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor	Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor	***No change*** to the assessment.
12. Loch Fyne Waters	Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor (RD)	Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor (RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. The level of effect as a result of the Revised Development is reduced. (No change to cumulative level of effects).

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude (Applications)**	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
13. A83 Old Military Road	The Revised Development is no longer visible in the view. Therefore, there would be no cumulative effects.						***Change*** to the assessment. The Revised Development is no longer visible in the view.
14. St Catherine's	Very Low	Minor	Minor	Low-Very Low	Minor	Moderate to Minor	***No change*** to the assessment.
15. Beinn Bhan	Medium	Moderate	**Major to Moderate** (Glasvaar and not the RD)	Low-Very Low	Moderate	**Major to Moderate** (Glasvaar and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Cumulative magnitude in Scenario 2 is reduced. **No significant** cumulative effects as a result of the Revised Development due to Glasvaar.
16. Minor Road at Fernoch Hill	Low-Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor	Very Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate to Minor	***No change*** to the assessment.
17. Tom Soilleir	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Very Low	Moderate	Moderate	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Cumulative magnitude in Scenario 2 is reduced.
18. Hell's Glen Road (B839) near A815	Medium	Moderate to Minor	**Major to Moderate** (Clachan Flats and not the RD)	Medium	Moderate to Minor	**Major to Moderate** (Clachan Flats, An Carr Dubh and not the RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.
19. Beinn Lochain	High-Medium	Moderate to Minor	**Substantial to Major** (Creag Dhubh and not the RD)	Low-Very Low	Moderate to Minor	**Substantial to Major** (Creag Dhubh and not the RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms Cumulative Scenario 1: Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	Additional Level of Effect (RD)	Combined Level of Effect	Cumulative Scenario 2: Magnitude (Applications)	Additional Level of Effect (RD)	Combined Level of Effect	Comments
20. Ardkinglas Woodland Garden	Very Low	Moderate	Moderate	Zero	No cumulative effect		***No change*** to the assessment.
21. Otter Ferry	Low	Moderate to Minor	Moderate (A'Chruach, Glasvaar and not the RD)	Medium-Low	Moderate to Minor	**Major to Moderate** (High Brenfield and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. High Brenfield application is now visible and results in a significant cumulative effect in Scenario 2.
22. Cruach Mor Dunardry Summit	Low- Very Low	Minor	**Moderate** (Glasvaar and not the RD)	Medium-Low	Minor	**Major to Moderate** (High Brenfield, Glasvaar and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. High Brenfield application wind farm is now visible and results in a significant cumulative effect in Scenario 2.
23. Beinn Bhuidhe	Medium-Low	Minor	**Major to Moderate** (Ladyfield, Clachan Flats and not the RD)	Low-Very Low	Minor	**Major to Moderate** (Clachan Flats, Ladyfield and not the RD)	***No change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Cumulative magnitude in Scenario 2 has been reduced.
24. Beinn Ìme	Low	Minor	Moderate (Clachan Flats, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield and not the RD)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Clachan Flats, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield and not the RD)	***No change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
25. Ben Cruachan	Low	Minor	Moderate (Carraig Gheal, Ladyfield,	Low	Minor	Moderate (Carraig Gheal, Ladyfield,	***No change*** to the assessment.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude (Applications)**	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
			Blarghour and not the RD)			Blarghour, Corr Chnoc and not the RD)	Corr Chnoc application has been added to Scenario 2. Ladyfield moved to Scenario 1.
26. A83 South of Inverneill	Very Low	Minor	Minor	Medium	Minor	**Major** (High Brenfield and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. High Brenfield application is now visible and results in a significant cumulative effect in Scenario 2.

Note: Significant effects as a result of the Revised Development are indicated in bold text and shaded dark grey.

Table 4.3 Summary of Landscape Effects

Landscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Comments
Direct Landscape Effects on the 'host' Craggy Upland LCT				
Construction Effects: Craggy Upland LCT	Medium	Zero to **High**	None to **Major** (up to 2km)	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines.
Operational Effects: Craggy Upland LCT	Medium	**High** to Zero	**Major** (up to 2km) reducing to **Moderate** to **Minor**, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines.
Decommissioning Effects: Craggy Upland LCT	Medium	**Very Low**	Negligible	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines.
Indirect Landscape Effects on the Surrounding Landscape Character within 10km (and 12km south-west)				
AGC 1 – Steep Ridgeland and Mountains	High-Medium	Low to Zero	**Moderate to Minor**, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines.
AGC 6a – Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic (two units)	Medium	**High-Medium**, to Zero (western unit) Very Low to Zero (eastern unit)	**Major to Moderate** (up to 2km - western unit) to None Minor (eastern unit) to None	Although five turbines in close proximity are deleted, there would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines, one of which remains within 2km of the LCT boundary.
AGC 20 – Rocky Mosaic (four out of seven units)	High- Medium	Unit A: **Low** to Zero Units B / C: **Low-Very Low**, to Zero	Unit A: **Moderate** to None Units B / C: **Moderate to Minor**, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines.
AGC 10 – Upland Parallel Ridges	High	**Low-Very Low** to Zero	**Moderate to Minor**, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment, due to the remaining turbines.
Indirect Landscape Effects on the Surrounding Landscape Character within the wider 45km Study Area (LLTNP and Knapdale NSA)				
250 – Steep Ridges and Hills	High	Low-Very Low, to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
251 – Highland Summits	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
43 - Upland Parallel Ridges – Argyll	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
56 - Flat Moss and Mudflats	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
55 - Coastal Parallel Ridges	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Indirect Effects on Landscape Planning Designations				
Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park (LLTNP)	High	Low-Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.

Knapdale NSA	High	Low-Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to None	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA	High- Medium	Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	There would be a ***reduction*** in the magnitude and level of effect on the East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA due to the removal of five turbines.

Note: Significant effects as a result of the Revised Development are indicated in bold text and shaded dark grey.

Table 4.4 Summary of Visual Effects

Visual Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Level of Effect	Comments
Visual Effects on Views from Settlements				
Eredine	High	Very Low to Zero	**Minor** to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Dalavich	High	Medium to Zero	**Major** to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Ford	High	Low-Very Low to Zero	**Moderate to Minor**, to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Strachur	High	Very Low to Zero	**Minor** to No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines.
St. Catherine's	High	Very Low to Zero	**Minor** to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Visual Effects on Views from Transport Routes				
A886	Medium	Medium-Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate and Significant for 0.4km) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines resulting in a reduction in the number of hubs visible and a **Not Significant** effect
B840	Medium	Medium to Zero	**Moderate** (1km) to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
B8000	Medium	Medium-Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate and Significant for 0.7km) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines resulting in a reduction in the number of hubs visible and a **Not Significant** effect.
Minor road along western shore of Loch Awe (C29 and C30) (overlapping with The Caledonia Way and Core Path C173 (a-d) Ford to Annat via Loch Avich and Inverinan)	High / High-Medium	High-Medium to Zero	**Substantial to Major** (4.6km) to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Visual Effects on Views from National Recreational Routes				
The Caledonia Way (North of Inverinan to Oban, and south-west of Ford to Achahoish)	High-Medium	Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Loch Lomond and Cowal Way	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	There would be a ***reduction*** to the visual effect (previously Moderate) due to the removal of five turbines.
Visual Effects on Views from Local Recreational Routes				
Core Path C119 (b-c) Braevallich, Loch Awe to Furnace / Scottish Hill Track 104	High	High to Zero	**Substantial** to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C173 (a-d) Ford to Annat via Loch Avich and Inverinan	This route overlaps with the Caledonia Way / minor road along western shore of Loch Awe and is assessed as part of the minor road along the western shores of Loch Awe above.			There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C305 Dalavich to Barnaline Lodge	High	Medium to Zero	**Major** to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C120 Brainport Circular, Minard	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.

Core Path C220 (a-b) Strachur Village Back Road	High	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate to No View) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines.
Core Path C172(c) - Loch Scammadale to Loch Avich (overlapped with Scottish Hill Track 107)	High	Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Core Paths C486 – Dun Dubh, Ford	High	Medium-Low to Zero	**Major to Moderate**, to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C201 - Dun Na Cuaiche, Inveraray	High	Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Scottish Hill Track Right of Way 105 / 106 Furnace to Ford / Kilmichael Glassary	High	Medium to Zero (105) Low to Zero (106)	**Major** to No View (105) **Moderate** to No View (106)	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment. There would be a ***slight reduction*** to the visual effect (previously **Major to Moderate** to No View) due to the removal of five turbines.
Visual Effects on Views from Recreational and Tourist Destinations				
Lachlan Bay and Castle	High	Zero	No View	The Revised Development is no longer visible in the view.
Inveraray Castle GDL (including the folly at Dun na Cuaiche)	High	Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Ardkinglas and Strone GDL	High	Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Hill Summits - Munros				
Beinn Bhuidhe	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Group of four Munro's within the LLTNP north of Arrochar (Beinn Ime, Beinn Narnain, Ben Vane and Ben Vorlich)	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Group of four Munro's to the north of Loch Awe and the A85 (Ben Cruachan, Stob Daimh, Beinn a'Chochuill and Beinn Eunaich)	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Beinn a'Chleibh, part of the Ben Lui Munros	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Hill Summits - Corbetts				
Beinn a'Bhuiridh	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Meall an Fhudair	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Cowal Corbetts (Beinn Bheula, Beinn Lochain, Ben Donich, The Brack, Beinn an Lochain and Cnoc Coinnich)	High	Low	Moderate	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Beinn Luibhean and The Cobbler (part of the Arrochar Alps)	High	Very Low	Minor	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.
Offshore (water-based) recreational receptors				
Loch Awe	High	High to Zero	**Substantial** (~4.5km) to No View	There would be ***no change*** to the assessment.

Loch Fyne	High	Low – Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor (between 10-12km) to No View	There would be a ***reduction*** (previously Moderate and Significant) to the visual effect due to the removal of five turbines resulting in **no significant** effects.

Note: Significant effects as a result of the Revised Development are indicated in bold text and shaded dark grey.

Table 4.5 Summary of Cumulative Landscape Effects

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			**Cumulative Scenario 2:**			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
Direct Cumulative Landscape Effects on the 'host' Craggy Upland LCT							
Construction Effects: Craggy Upland LCT	Cumulative effects would increase from None at the start of construction to the operational levels of **Major** (due to the RD and other wind farms within this LCT).						***No change*** to the assessment.
Operational Effects: Craggy Upland LCT	High to Zero	**Major to Moderate** (up to 2km) to None	**Major** (RD, An Suidhe, A'Chruach, Blargour, A'Chruach Phase II, Glasvaar) to None	High to Zero	Moderate to None	**Major** (RD, An Suidhe, A'Chruach, Blargour, A'Chruach Phase II, Glasvaar, An Carr Dhubh) to None	***No change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
Decommissioning Effects: Craggy Upland LCT	The residual cumulative effects post decommissioning would be Negligible.						***No change*** to the assessment.
Cumulative effects on the Surrounding Landscape Character within 10km (and 12km south-west)							
AGC 1 – Steep Ridgeland and Mountains	High to Zero	Minor to None	**Substantial to Major** (Cruach Mhor, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield, and Clachan Flats and not the RD) to None	Low to Zero	Minor to None	**Substantial to Major** (Cruach Mhor, Creag Dhubh, Clachan Flats, Ladyfield and not the RD) to None	***No change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			Comments
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
AGC 6a – Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic (two units)	High to Zero	**Major to Moderate**, to None	**Major** (RD, A'Chruach / Phase II, Ladyfield) to None	High to Zero	**Major to Moderate**, to None	**Major** (RD, A'Chruach / Phase II, Ladyfield, An Carr Dubh) to None	***No change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
AGC 20 – Rocky Mosaic (four out of seven units)	Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to None	Moderate to None	Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to None	Moderate to None	***No change*** to the assessment.
AGC 10 – Upland Parallel Ridges	Medium to Zero	Minor, to None	**Major** (Glasvaar and not the RD) to None	Low to Zero	Minor to None	**Major** (Glasvaar and not the RD) to None	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented). This reduces the level of effect from the RD (previously Moderate to Minor). Scenario 2 magnitude is reduced to reflect Glasvaar and remaining influence of An Carr Dubh and High Brenfield application wind farms.
Cumulative effects on the Surrounding Landscape Character within the 45km Study Area (LLTNP and Knapdale NSA)							
250 – Steep Ridges and Hills	Low-Very Low, to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	***No change*** to the assessment.
251 – Highland Summits	Low-Very Low, to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	Low to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to None	***No change*** to the assessment.
43 - Upland Parallel Ridges – Argyll	Low-Very Low, to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	Low to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to None	***No change*** to the assessment.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			Comments
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
56 - Flat Moss and Mudflats	Low-Very Low, to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	Low to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to None	***No change*** to the assessment. Potential effect of High Brenfield application.
43 - Upland Parallel Ridges – Argyll	Zero	No cumulative effect		Medium to Zero	Minor to None	**Major** to None (High Brenfield and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Introduction of High Brenfield application in adjacent LCT, but close proximity resulting in a **significant** effect in Scenario 2.
Cumulative effects on Landscape Planning Designations							
Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park (LLTNP)	Low to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate (Creag Dhubh, Clachan Flats and not the RD) to None	Medium-Low to Zero	Minor to None	**Major to Moderate** to None (Giant's Burn and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Introduction of Giant's Burn application in adjacent LCT, but close proximity resulting in a **significant** effect in Scenario 2.
Knapdale NSA	Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to None	Moderate to None (Glasvaar and not the RD)	Medium to Zero	Minor to None	**Major** to None (High Brenfield, Glasvaar and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented). Introduction of High Brenfield application in adjacent LCT, but close proximity resulting in a **significant** effect in Scenario 2.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA	Low to Very Low to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	Low to Very Low, to Zero	Minor to None	Moderate to Minor, to None	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar and Blarghour Variation has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented).

Note: Significant effects as a result of the Revised Development are indicated in bold text and shaded dark grey.

Table 4.6 Summary of Cumulative Visual Effects

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
Cumulative Effects on Views from Settlements							
Eredine	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Minor to No View	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Minor to No View	***No change*** to the assessment.
Dalavich	Medium to Zero	**Major** to No View	**Major** to No View (Blarghour, RD)	High-Medium to Zero	**Major** to No View	**Substantial to Major** (Blarghour, An Carr Dubh, RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.
Ford	Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Moderate to Minor, to No View	***No change*** to the assessment.
Strachur	Low	Minor	Moderate (Ladyfield and not the RD)	Very Low	Minor	Moderate (Ladyfield and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previously application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Cumulative effects in Scenario 2 are

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
							reduced. Level of effect from RD also reduced.
St. Catherine's	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Minor to No View	Low-Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Moderate to Minor, to No View	***No change*** to the assessment.
Cumulative Effects on Views from Transport Routes							
A886	Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Moderate to Minor (RD and High Brenfield), to No View	***Change*** to the assessment. The High Brenfield application is now visible and introduces a cumulative effect in Scenario 2.
B840	Low to Very Low, to Zero	**Moderate** (1km) to No View	**Moderate** (RD) to No View	Medium to Zero	**Moderate** (1km) to No View	**Moderate** to No View (RD, An Carr Dubh)	***No change*** to the assessment.
B8000	Low to Very Low, to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	Moderate to Minor, to No View	***Change*** to the assessment. The level of effect as a result of the introduction of the RD is reduced.
Minor road along western shore of Loch Awe (C29 and C30) (overlapping with The Caledonia Way and Core Path C173 (a-d) Ford to Annat via Loch Avich and Inverinan)	Medium to Zero	**Substantial to Major** (4.6km) to No View	**Substantial to Major** (Blarghour, RD)	High-Medium to Zero	**Substantial to Major** (4.6km) to No View	**Substantial to Major** (Blarghour, An Carr Dubh, RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.
Cumulative Effects on Views from National Recreational Routes							
The Caledonia Way (North of Inverinan to	Medium to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	**Major** (Blarghour and not the RD)	High - Medium to Zero	Moderate to Minor, to No View	**Substantial to Major** (Blarghour, An Carr Dubh, Corr Chnoc, and Cruach	***Change*** to the assessment. Introduction of Corr Chnoc, and Cruach Clenamacrie applications adjacent to the

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
Oban, and south-west of Ford to Achahoish)						Clenamacrie and not the RD)	route sequentially to the west of Oban, resulting in a **significant** effect in Scenario 2.
Loch Lomond and Cowal Way	High-Medium to Zero	Minor to No View	**Substantial to Major** to No View (Cruach Mhor and not the RD)	Low-Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	**Substantial to Major** to No View (Cruach Mhor and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. The level of effect as a result of the introduction of the RD is reduced.
Cumulative Effects on Views from Local Recreational Routes							
Core Path C119 (b-c) Braevallich, Loch Awe to Furnace / Scottish Hill Track 104	Medium to Zero	**Substantial** to No View	**Substantial** to No View (An Suidhe, RD)	Very Low to Zero	**Substantial** to No View	**Substantial** to No View (An Suidhe, RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C173 (a-d) Ford to Annat via Loch Avich and Inverinan	This route overlaps with the Caledonia Way / minor road along western shore of Loch Awe and is assessed as part of the minor road along the western shores of Loch Awe above.						***No change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C305 Dalavich to Barnaline Lodge	Medium to Zero	**Major** to No View	**Major** to No View (Blarghour, RD)	High-Medium to Zero	**Major** to No View	**Substantial to Major** to No View (Blarghour, An Carr Dubh, RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C120 Brainport Circular, Minard	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Minor to No View	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Minor to No View	***No change*** to the assessment.
Core Path C220 (a-b) Strachur Village Back Road	Very Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Minor to No View	Low to Zero	Minor to No View	Moderate to No View	***Change*** to the assessment. The level of effect as a result of the introduction of the RD is reduced.
Core Path C172(c) - Loch Scammadale to Loch	Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	**Moderate** to No View (Blarghour and not the RD)	Medium-Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	**Major to Moderate**, to No View (Blarghour,	***No change*** to the assessment.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
Avich (overlapped with Scottish Hill Track 107)						An Carr Dubh and not the RD)	
Core Paths C486 – Dun Dubh, Ford	Medium to Zero	**Major to Moderate**, to No View	**Major** to No View (Glasvaar, RD)	Low to Very Low, to Zero	**Major to Moderate**, to No View	**Major** to No View (Glasvaar, An Carr Dubh, RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Glasvaar has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented). Scenario 2 magnitude is reduced to reflect Glasvaar and the remaining influence of An Carr Dubh wind farm.
Core Path C201 - Dun Na Cuaiche, Inveraray	Medium to Zero	Moderate to No View	**Major to Moderate**, to No View (Ladyfield and not the RD)	Medium to Zero	Moderate to No View	**Major to Moderate**, to No View (An Carr Dubh, Ladyfield and not the RD)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented). Scenario 2 magnitude remains the same due to the influence of An Carr Dubh wind farm.
Scottish Hill Track Right of Way 105 / 106 Furnace to Ford / Kilmichael Glassary	High to Zero	**Major / Moderate** to No View	**Substantial** (A'Chruach / Phase II, Glasvaar, RD) to No View	High to Zero	**Major / Moderate** to No View	**Substantial** (A'Chruach / Phase II, Glasvaar, RD) to No View	***No change*** to the assessment level of effect. Glasvaar (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
Cumulative Effects on Views from Recreational and Tourist Destinations							
Lachlan Bay and Castle	No cumulative effect						***Change*** to the assessment. The Revised Development is no longer visible in the view.
Inveraray Castle GDL (including the folly at Dun na Cuaiche)	Low- Very Low, to Zero	Moderate to No View	Moderate to No View (Blarghour)	Medium to Zero	Moderate to No View	**Major to Moderate** (An Carr Dubh and not the RD) to No View	***No change*** to the assessment.

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
Ardkinglas and Strone GDL	Very Low to Zero	Moderate to No View	Moderate to No View	Zero	No cumulative effect		***No change*** to the assessment.
Cumulative Effects on Hill Summits - Munros							
Beinn Bhuidhe	Medium-Low	Minor	**Major to Moderate** (Clachan Flats, Ladyfield)	Low-Very Low	Minor	**Major to Moderate** (Clachan Flats, Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1. Magnitude of effect in Scenario 2 has been reduced.
Group of four Munro's within the LLTNP north of Arrochar (Beinn Ime, Beinn Narnain, Ben Vane and Ben Vorlich)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Clachan Flats, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Clachan Flats, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield (previous application - now consented) has moved to Scenario 1.
Group of four Munro's to the north of Loch Awe and the A85 (Ben Cruachan, Stob Daimh, Beinn a'Chochuill and Beinn Eunaich)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Carraig Gheal, Ladyfield, Blarghour)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Carraig Gheal, Ladyfield, Blarghour, Corr Chnoc)	***Change*** to the assessment level of effect. Corr Chnoc application has been added to Scenario 2. Ladyfield moved to Scenario 1.
Beinn a'Chleibh, part of the Ben Lui Munros	Low to Very Low	Minor	Moderate to Minor (Ladyfield)	Very Low	Minor	Moderate to Minor (Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented). Scenario 2 magnitude is slightly reduced as a result of the move.
Cumulative Effects on Hill Summits - Corbetts							

Receptor	Revised Development (RD) and other wind farms						Comments
	Cumulative Scenario 1:			Cumulative Scenario 2:			
	Magnitude (Existing and Consented)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	**Magnitude** (Applications)	**Additional Level of Effect (RD)**	**Combined Level of Effect**	
Beinn a'Bhuiridh	Low	Minor	Moderate (Carraig Gheal, Ladyfield, Blarghour)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Carraig Gheal, Ladyfield, Blarghour)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield and Blarghour Variation have moved to Scenario 1 (now consented).
Meall an Fhudair	Low to Very Low	Minor	Moderate to Minor (Clachan Flats, Ladyfield)	Low to Very Low	Minor	Moderate to Minor (Clachan Flats, Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented).
Cowal Corbetts (Beinn Bheula, Beinn Lochain, Ben Donich, The Brack, Beinn an Lochain and Cnoc Coinnich)	High-Medium	Moderate to Minor	**Substantial to Major** (Creag Dhubh and not the RD)	Low-Very Low	Moderate to Minor	**Substantial to Major** (Creag Dhubh and not the RD)	***No change*** to the assessment.
Beinn Luibhean and The Cobbler (part of the Arrochar Alps)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Clachan Flats, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield)	Low	Minor	Moderate (Clachan Flats, Creag Dhubh, Ladyfield)	***Change*** to the assessment. Ladyfield has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented).
Cumulative Effects on Offshore (water-based) recreational receptors							
Loch Awe	High to Zero	**Substantial** (~4.5km) to No View	**Substantial** (RD, Blarghour, Carraig Gheal) to No View	High to Zero	**Substantial** (~4.5km) to No View	**Substantial** (RD, Blarghour, Carraig Gheal, An Carr Dubh) to No View	***No change*** to the assessment.
Loch Fyne	Low	Moderate to Minor to No View	**Moderate** (Glasvaar and not the RD) to No View	Very Low to Zero	Moderate to Minor to No View	**Moderate** (Glasvaar and not the RD) to No View	***Change*** to the assessment level of effect. The level of effect of the RD is slightly reduced. Glasvaar has moved to Scenario 1 (now consented).

4.4 Consultation

NatureScot

4.4.1 NS provided a consultation response to the Eredine Wind Farm application (dated 18 February 2025) and a response to that, taking account of the deletion of five turbines, is provided in **Table 4.7**.

4.4.2 NS do not object to this application, and they do not comment on the wider planning balance. A summary of the NS consultation response is exacted from page 2 of its response as follows:

"The Proposal will result in significant adverse landscape and visual effects, however we consider that it does not meet the threshold of national interest in line with our guidance.

We consider that the nature and scale of the Proposal at this location are such that it cannot be accommodated without significant adverse landscape and visual effects including cumulative effects (in combination with the consented Blarghour/Variation and application An Carr Dubh wind farms). This would include significant adverse effects on areas of the underlying Craggy Uplands, nearby landscapes, a wide geographical extent of the open waters of Loch Awe and its settled fringes, eastern areas of the open waters of Loch Fyne and from some lower and higher elevations on the eastern side of the loch. We anticipate that significant adverse individual and cumulative day time effects would extend into significant adverse night-time effects on the Craggy Uplands and on Loch Awe and it's settled fringes.

We note that given the proposed siting, scale and type of development, it would be challenging to overcome the significant adverse effects identified within the site parameters. We would encourage the Applicant to reconsider the design of the Proposal, particularly where the Proposal would have significant adverse effects on Loch Awe and Loch Fyne. This is likely to require a reduction in the vertical height, horizontal extent, and the removal/relocation of turbines 9, 11 and 20, which may reduce the severity of some of the effects."

4.4.3 It is noted that NS agree with much of the assessment in the LVIA with the following exceptions, primarily in relation to the geographical extent of significant effects:

- Increased geographical extent of significant effects on the following LCTs:
  - AGC 7 Craggy Upland – extending beyond 2km up to 4-6km from the Proposed Development; and
  - AGC 6a – Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic – extending beyond 2km up to 3-5km from the Proposed Development.
- Significant effects on Loch Awe extending beyond 10km to the south-west and significant effects on Loch Fyne extending beyond 15km;
- Significant visual effects extending beyond 9.8-11.8km, up to 15km from the Proposed Development;
- Increased geographical extent of significant cumulative effects on landscape and visual receptors; and
- Increased geographical extent of significant night-time effects.

Each of the points raised by NS are discussed in **Table 4.7** below.

Table 4.7 Response to NatureScot Consultation Comments

NatureScot Consultation Comment	Applicant Response to Consultation
We would encourage the Applicant to reconsider the design of the Proposal, particularly where the Proposal would have significant adverse effects on Loch Awe and Loch Fyne. This is likely to require a reduction in the vertical height, horizontal extent, and the removal/relocation of turbines 9, 11 and 20, which may reduce the severity of some of the effects.	The design of the Revised Development has been updated with the removal of T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20. This has significantly reduced the landscape and visual effects from Loch Fyne including a number of significant effects previously assessed in the EIA Report. Turbine T9 has not been removed, reduced in height or relocated, as it is considered that this removal would have a lesser landscape and visual effect than the removal of turbines noted.
While we agree with the conclusions of the LVIA that the introduction of the Proposal would result in significant adverse landscape effects on the south-eastern unit of AGC 7 Craggy Upland and AGC 6 a – Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic, we consider that, given the vertical height and horizontal extent of the proposed turbines, these effects would extend notably beyond the approximate 2km reported across a wider geographical extent.	The revised LVIA has been reconsidered, and further clarification is provided in Section 4.3, paragraphs 4.3.10 to 4.3.17.
AGC 7 Craggy Upland - The Proposal extends the presence and influence of wind farm development immediately south-west of operational An Suidhe, with the proposed turbines being notably larger. We consider that significant adverse landscape effects would cover a minimum of 6km to the north and north-west extending into the second north-western unit of AGC 7 Craggy Upland on the western side of Loch Awe (as shown by Viewpoints 3. Kilmaha and 4. Dalavich), a minimum of 4km within the open upland moorlands to the west and south-west, north of operational A'Chruach and approximately 2km south and east either up to or close to the LCT boundary. We disagree that there would be no effect on AGC 7 Craggy Upland north of An Suidhe (north-east of the proposed development) despite its existing influence given that the proposed turbines are at least 120m taller than this operational wind farm and that significant adverse landscape effects would extend to a minimum of 4km directly north of the Proposal.	It is considered that the Revised Development would **not significantly** affect AGC 7 beyond approximately 2km. There would be **no significant** effects to the north-east beyond approximately 2km, as explained in the revised LVIA, due to the presence of the existing An Suidhe Wind Farm which already has an influence on this part of the LCT. Any potential landscape effects, beyond approximately 2km resulting from the Revised Development would **not be significant** and would overlap with this development and its effects on the existing LCT. Beyond An Suidhe Wind Farm, ZTV coverage is also fragmented and overlapping with forestry. Additionally, a reduced number of turbines would be theoretically visible and turbine bases would also be partly screened by landform reducing their apparent height. For these reasons significant effects could not extend to 6km in this direction. Significant landscape character effects would not extend to the "*second north-western unit of AGC 7 Craggy Upland on the western side of Loch Awe (as shown by Viewpoints 3. Kilmaha and 4. Dalavich)".* Although there is greater ZTV coverage, this overlaps with extensive forestry which is an established, strong characteristic of this part of the landscape. The existing baseline illustrates that while part of the forestry would be felled at any one time, the character of a mature forest remains overall. Viewpoints 3 and 4 are representative of particular points or small areas within this landscape where there are open views. As such, they are not representative of the landscape character overall (although they are representative of significant visual effects likely to be experienced by people at these specific locations). Considering the landscape effects to the west and south-west, again the ZTV peters out and becomes fragmented to the west. Beyond 1-2km to the south-east, significant effects would be limited by the recently constructed Inveraray to Crossaig 275kV Overhead Line that crosses this landscape, limiting any significant effects beyond it in this direction.
AGC 6a – Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic - The Proposal extends the presence and influence of wind farm development and electricity infrastructure south and west of operational An Suidhe (within AGC 7 Craggy Upland) and north of the Inveraray to Crossaig overhead line. We consider that significant adverse effects on this LCT would	The Revised Development would **not significantly** affect AGC 6a beyond approximately 2km for the following reasons. The Revised Development has further reduced the influence of wind farm development on this unit through the removal of five turbines at the south-eastern edge of the wind farm (T3, T5, T7, T11, and T20). The nearest remaining turbine (T19) would be located approximately 1.6km from the boundary of the *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor*

affect a wider geographical extent than reported in the LVIA, extending to cover a minimum of 3km south of the Proposal within the western unit of the LCT, and extending beyond 5km into the northern parts of the eastern unit on the eastern side of Loch Fyne near Strathlachlan Forest.	*Mosaic LCT* (western unit). Within 2km of T19, the *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic LCT* is heavily forested and there would be **no significant** effects within the LCT. This is because of the location of T19, in combination with the other remaining turbines, which would be set back from the eastern edge of the upland plateau where they would be mostly screened by intervening landform. This is illustrated in the ZTV (**Figures 4.3** and **4.4**) which shows very limited or patchy theoretical visibility within *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic LCT* within 2km of the turbines. The limited visibility extends to over 3km to the south of the turbines. There would be **no significant** landscape effects on the *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic* LCT eastern unit. This is because the Revised Development would be seen in a different part of the landscape, separated by intervening landscape features, including Loch Fyne and two units of *Rocky Mosaic* LCT. As such, it is impossible for the Revised Development to have any direct impact on the physical features of the *Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic* LCT eastern unit. Indirect effects would also be limited by the screening effects of extensive forestry within the LCT. Where there would be visibility of the proposed turbines from open areas of the LCT, it would be perceived as a visual effect, related to the visibility of the Revised Development present within a separate upland character area. The Revised Development is also reduced in scale and magnitude by the removal of five proposed turbines when viewed from this LCT.
Loch Awe - Accounting for the site location and the vertical height and horizontal extent of the proposed turbines we consider that there will be a significant adverse effect experienced from the open waters of Loch Awe where the proposed turbines, hubs and blades will be seen in eastward looking views against the skyline, therefore extending the presence and influence of wind farm development south-west of operational An Suidhe. The greatest effects will be experienced within 5km (as shown by Viewpoint 2. Loch Awe Waters). *However, given the extent of theoretical visibility shown, we consider that significant adverse effects on Loch Awe and its scenic settled fringes would extend beyond 10km across south-western parts of the loch.*	Visual effects on views, including scenic views and visual amenity experienced from the shores and open water of Loch Awe are assessed (in both the EIA Report and this FEI Report) as **Significant** in Viewpoint 2 (3.4km distance) and on the settled fringes at Dalavich (Viewpoint 4) (6km distance). Views from the settlement of Ford at the south-western extent of the loch (9.4km distance) are assessed as **not significant.** This is because of the screening effects of intervening landform and forestry, and the limited horizontal and vertical extent of the visible turbines, as well as the presence of other human development in the view. Further wireline and site analysis has been undertaken to further test the potential for significant visual effects on views from Loch Awe, including its scenic settled fringes within 10km. This analysis aligns with the conclusions of the above viewpoint analysis and visual assessment that significant visual effects would be contained within approximately 7.5km (and not 10km), as indicated by Viewpoint 5, overlooking Loch Awe.
Loch Fyne - In westward looking views from the open waters of Loch Fyne and from some lower and higher elevations on the eastern side of the loch the Proposal would either introduce visibility of large scale wind farm development or notably extend the influence of wind farm development and electricity infrastructure west of operational An Suidhe and north of the Inveraray to Crossaig overhead line. Where the proposed turbines, hubs and blades would be seen against the skyline the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the perceived scale of the underlying Craggy Uplands and small scale settlements on the western side of the Loch Fyne including Furnace and Inveraray as shown by loch side Viewpoints 8. Leanach and 20. Ardkinglas Woodland Garden. We consider that some significant adverse effects on Loch Fyne would extend beyond 15km.	The Revised Development has removed five turbines (T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20) and this has significantly reduced the level of effect on the views and visual effects at Loch Fyne. From Viewpoint 8 the Revised Development would appear 'set back' from the upland plateau edge, relating to the interior of the upland setting. Mostly blades would be visible from this viewpoint with three hubs visible behind forestry and no upper towers visible. The scale of the turbines appears to fit well with the undulating upland skyline. The removal of turbines, where towers were visible, has reduced the scale differences in relation to small scale settlements. The Revised Development would also reduce the horizontal spread of turbines in views from the north of Loch Fyne (Viewpoint 20). It is not agreed that significant effects would extend to or beyond 15km and the design modifications of the Revised Development would significantly reduce the visual effects on Loch Fyne. Viewpoints encompassing Loch Fyne include viewpoints 6-10, 12-14, 18, 20 and 21, none of which would be significantly affected by the Revised Development, as noted in **Table 4.1**.
For visual receptors on the eastern side of Loch Fyne represented by Viewpoints 9.	**Figure 4.17 (a-e)** Viewpoint 9 Strachur - The receptor at this location has been assessed as of High sensitivity and the Revised

Strachur, 18. Hell's Glen Road (B839) near A815, 20. Ardkinglas Woodland Garden, we consider that effects will be higher than those reported, accounting for the vertical height and horizontal extent of the proposed turbines and the high sensitivity of receptors at Strachur and Ardkinglas.	Development would reduce the magnitude of change to Very Low. The effects would **not be significant**. **Figure 4.22 (a-e)** Viewpoint 18 Hell's Glen Road (B839) – From this viewpoint, the Revised Development would reduce the horizontal extent of the development in comparison with the Proposed Development and magnitude of change would be Low and **not significant.** **Figure 4.23 (a-e)** Viewpoint 20 Ardkinglas Woodland Garden – The receptor at this location has been assessed as of High sensitivity and although the Revised Development would reduce the horizontal extent of the development, the magnitude would remain Low and the effect **not significant**.
From some lower elevations on Loch Fyne the Proposal will introduce a large vertical man-made focal point seen against the skyline formed by the underlying craggy uplands. *From some higher elevations on the eastern side of Loch Fyne, including from a section of the A815 east of Ardno, the Proposal will be seen to extend the presence and influence of wind farm development west of operational An Suidhe.*	The Revised Development has removed five turbines (T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20) and this has significantly reduced the level of effect on the views and visual effects at Loch Fyne, including those at a lower elevation as illustrated by the comparative wirelines in Viewpoints 6, 9 and 14 (**Figure 4.24a-z**). Views from higher elevations east of Ardno are represented by Viewpoint 18. As noted above, the visual effects would **not be significant.** An Suidhe would be decommissioned in approximately 7 years, limiting the period when both this wind farm and the Revised Development would be visible.
The size of the proposed turbines will adversely affect the perceived scale of the underlying landscape and the small scale settlement on the western side of Loch Fyne, including Inveraray and Furnace. Where visible from higher elevations the Proposal will become the dominant feature in westward looking views given the vertical height and horizontal extent of the Proposal.	Inveraray is visible from Viewpoints 13, 14, 18 and 20. None of these viewpoints are assessed as significant, as a result of either the Proposed or the Revised Development. Therefore, the turbines in the Revised Development do not represent "dominant" features'. This is particularly the case for Viewpoints 13 and 14 where the settlement of Inveraray would be closer to the viewpoints and more visible. Furnace is visible in **Figure 4.16 (a-g)** Viewpoint 8 Leanach and the view would **not be significantly** affected, due to the removal of five turbines in the Revised Development. Consequently, the turbines in the Revised Development do not represent "dominant" features' and would not affect the perceived scale of settlement which includes a large quarry and associated industrial buildings.
We consider that, while some SLQs of the LLTNP and Knapdale NSA will be adversely affected by the Proposal, these effects are unlikely to be significant. However, it should be noted that the proposed turbines will be notably larger than other operational and consented wind farms in this area. This will be particularly apparent from elevated positions such as that represented by Viewpoints 19. Beinn an Lochain and 24. Beinn Ìme within the LTTNP, and Viewpoint 22: Cruach Mor Dunardry within the Knapdale NSA.	As agreed with NS none of the SLQs and related viewpoints would be significantly affected. It is also incorrect to suggest that the "*proposed turbines will be notably larger than other operational and consented wind farms in this area"* as this is not illustrated in the wirelines for each of these viewpoints for either the Proposed or the Revised Development, due to the effect of perspective.
Cumulative Effects - While we agree with some of the significant adverse cumulative effects reported, we consider that the geographical area of effects will be wider, affecting a wide geographical extent for landscape receptors and visual receptors. This will include the majority of the south-eastern unit of AGC 7 Craggy Upland, extending into the north-western unit AGC 1 Steep Ridgeland the western unit of AGC 6a Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic, extending into the southern unit, Loch Awe and Loch Fyne and will extend beyond 15 km for visual receptors. The introduction of the Proposal to either LVIA cumulative	The NS description of "*significant adverse cumulative effects"* appears to consider a combined cumulative effect, accounting for all existing, and consented wind farms and wind farm applications and accounting for landscape character and visual receptors (within 15km) which are not affected or not significantly affected by the Revised Development. As noted previously the Revised Development would have a more limited significant effect on the *AGC 7 Craggy Upland and part of the AGC 6a Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic.* Visual effects would be contained generally within approximately 7.5km with a further isolated significant effect illustrated at Viewpoint 15 Beinn Bhan (**Figure 4.21 (a-e)**) at approximately 11.8km distance. When considering the combined cumulative effects (see **Figure 4.7**) there are 'gaps' and breaks between separate wind farms and clusters of development, rather than a continuous development and these gaps

Scenarios 1 or 2 will extend the presence of wind farm development south and west of operational An Suidhe. The introduction of the proposed development to the existing10 and potential emerging11 pattern of wind farm development within the south-eastern unit of AGC 7 Craggy Upland south of Loch Awe will notably alter this landscape to Craggy Upland with wind farms with potential effects extending across Loch Awe into the north-western unit of AG7.	or breaks partly mitigate and reduce the magnitude of these effects. Equally, the levels of cumulative effect between multiple schemes vary in magnitude and level of effect. It is therefore not considered that the effects would be as extensive or universally significant as suggested.
Night-time Effects - We largely agree with some of the effects reported for visible aviation lighting on visual receptors but consider that the geographical extent of effects will be wider than reported. We disagree that there would be no significant adverse effects on landscape receptors. We anticipate that either individually or cumulatively under both cumulative Scenarios 1 and 2 that the potential for significant day time effects on AGC 7 Craggy Upland would extend into the night, given the existing role that the site currently plays in helping form the backdrop to the eastern side of Loch Awe. *Particularly where the proposed aviation lights will be seen in eastward looking views from the settled fringes of Loch Awe above the enclosing ridge formed in part by the site of the Proposal.*	The Revised Development includes a revised Lighting Strategy which has been reconsidered and assessed to accord with NS's recent *Guidance on Aviation Lighting Impact Assessment*, November 2024. However, the revised night-time assessment (**Appendix 4A**) does not agree with NS's contention of significant effects on an individual basis and concludes that there would be **no significant** night-time effects on the views from any visual receptors. This is due to the varying levels of artificial light present in most of these locations and / or associated with the activity of travelling through the landscape, and the mitigating factors including viewing angle and distance of perceived light intensity. Allowing for the additional mitigating effects of angle intensity mitigation, the visibility of the lights would reduce further when viewed from low lying receptors, although this would not provide mitigation for elevated receptors (for example, hill walkers camping on summits). In respect of cumulative effects, the revised night-time assessment (**Appendix 4A**) agrees with NS and identifies **significant** combined cumulative night-time landscape and visual effects. These result from the consented Blarghour, the An Carr Dubh application and the Revised Development and would affect the 'host' Craggy Upland LCT and views from a small number of visual receptors in the Loch Awe area, including the parts of the settlement of Dalavich, a minor road along the western shore of Loch Awe and recreational users of the waters of Loch Awe.

Argyll and Bute Council

4.4.4 ABC provided a consultation response to the Eredine Wind Farm application (dated April 2025) and a response taking account of the Revised Development is provided in **Table 4.8**. It is noted that ABC's landscape advisor broadly agreed with the LVIA conclusions and methodology. They make no comment on the wider planning balance or whether ABC should object to this application. A summary of its advice is provided as follows:

"*In summary, the Proposed Development would not have widespread landscape and visual effects with significant adverse effects on landscape character and views largely concentrated in the Loch Awe area. The Proposed Development would also not introduce substantial new visibility of wind farm development into views from Loch Awe or from its immediate surrounds. However, what it would do is introduce a considerably more prominent wind farm seen in key views from the lower half of Loch Awe and it would also significantly intensify the cumulative landscape and visual effects of large wind turbines in this area.*"

4.4.5 The Revised Development has reduced some significant landscape and visual effects as assessed in the revised LVIA and it is agreed that there would be **no significant** effects on designated landscapes. Nonetheless, the Revised Development would not mitigate significant effects on views from some parts of Loch Awe and would also contribute towards significant cumulative effects.

4.4.6 Each of the points raised by ABC are responded to in **Table 4.8** below.

Table 44.88 Response to Argyll and Bute Council Consultation Comments

ABC Consultation Comment	Applicant Response to Consultation
Landscape Effects: *The introduction of additional wind farm development into a part of the backdrop to the loch which is currently undeveloped would diminish the sense of naturalness and seclusion that can be experienced. I consider that significant adverse effects would occur on the character of the middle section of Loch Awe, extending broadly between the promontory of Kames Bay to the north of Dalavich to around Liever Island. The LVIA does not address effects on the character of Loch Awe.* *Visible aviation lighting would introduce lighting to the dark skies of the sparsely settled Loch Awe area diminishing its remote and little developed character.*	Loch Awe is not identified and described as a landscape character type within the *Argyll and Bute Landscape Wind Energy Capacity Study* (2017). Nor is it identified as a Landscape Character Type within the NatureScot LCTs (2019). No assessment of Loch Awe has been made in the LVIAs for either the An Càrr Dubh Wind Farm application or the consented Blarghour Variation and no associated requests for such an assessment have been made in any corresponding consultation requests from NS. As noted previously, no reference is made in NS guidance on landscape character assessment of large water bodies or lochs. Therefore, the revised LVIA includes landscape assessment of the LCT's which include the shoreline of Loch Awe and views across the Loch. **No significant** landscape character effects are identified in respect of these receptors (*North Loch Awe Craggy Upland* or *Rocky Mosaic* LCTs). Views from within water bodies and across lochs from shorelines are assessed as recreational receptors and included within the visual assessment. Visual effects (as opposed to landscape character effects) from Loch Awe are assessed as **Significant** in Viewpoint 2 (3.4km distance) and on the settled fringes at Dalavich (**Figure 4.14 (a-h)** Viewpoint 4 Dalavich) (6km distance) and encompass views from the north of the 'middle section' of Loch Awe (**Figures 4.12 (a-d) to 4.15 (a-g)**, Viewpoints 2-5). Views from the settlement of Ford at the south-western extent of the loch (9.4km distance) are assessed as **Not Significant**. This assessment is supported by further wireline analysis, as noted previously. The visibility of aviation warning lights is acknowledged in the revised night-time assessment in **Appendix 4A:Night-time Assessment**.
I consider that the proposed development would not have significant adverse effects on the special qualities of nationally important landscapes including the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park and the Knapdale National Scenic Area. I also consider that effects on the character and special qualities of the Local Landscape Areas covering the head of Loch Awe and the Loch Fyne area would not be significant.	Noted, the same conclusion is made in the revised LVIA for the Revised Development.
Visual Effects: *Significant adverse effects on views would principally occur from:* • *The west side of Loch Awe, from the minor road (C29/C30), sections of which also form the Caledonia Way cycle route where occasional open views occur and also from recreational routes particularly concentrated in the Kilmaha area and on the shores of Loch Awe. This is illustrated by Viewpoint 3 at Kilmaha, although similar and more open views will occur from the newly created Forestry Land Scotland (FLS) footpath and viewing area at the start of the car park for the promoted Tall*	• It is agreed that significant visual effects, as indicated by viewpoint 3 (**Figure 4.13 (a-g)** Viewpoint 3 Kilmaha), would occur at other locations on the west side of Loch Awe. However, much of this area is also forested / wooded and views would tend to be screened or partly screened by intervening vegetation.

ABC Consultation Comment	Applicant Response to Consultation
Trees Trail and also along sections of the trail itself.	
• *The settlement of Dalavich where this proposal would be seen principally from the shores of Loch Awe together with the operational An Suidhe wind farm with the proposed 200m high turbines (and particularly the closer Turbines 9, 13 and 14) being significantly more dominant than the 83m high turbines within this older scheme (see Viewpoint 4).*	• This is illustrated in **Figure 4.14** (a-h) Viewpoint 4 Dalavich.
• *From the waters of Loch Awe, experienced by people using watercraft and where, if the long length of the loch is traversed, sequential cumulative effects would occur with the operational wind farms of Carraig Gheal and An Suidhe. The accolade of longest freshwater loch in Scotland has led to a number of challenges for enthusiasts including the Loch Awe Challenge for 'paddlers' of all sorts and the Three Lakes Challenge (paddling the longest lakes in England, Wales and Scotland). The loch is also well-used by fishermen.*	• This observation is noted and considered as part of the revised LVIA in Section 4.3.
• *From the A886 where elevated views are possible over Loch Fyne at Leanach (Viewpoint 8) and also from the waters of Loch Fyne in the Newton to Strachur area where the proposal would be seen at distances of 6-7km.*	• The visual effects of the Revised Development from Viewpoint 8 (**Figure 4-16** (a-g) Viewpoint 8 Leanach) and the Newton to Strachur area would be significantly reduced in comparison to the Proposed Development.
Cumulative Effects: *The combination of the Proposed Development with the consented Blarghour wind farm (and the operational An Suidhe wind farm which lies between them) would substantially increase the extent of wind turbines seen on the skyline of uplands which enclose the eastern side of Loch Awe.* *The An Suidhe, consented Blarghour and proposed An Carr Dubh wind farms would be seen simultaneously and in close sequential views affecting the bottom two-thirds of the Loch Awe area (EIAR **Figure 8.15**). The combined effect of all four wind farms would result in a dominant effect on the character of the middle part of Loch Awe and on views as a near continuous band of wind turbines would be seen on the eastern skyline of craggy hills which contain Loch Awe, giving an impression of a landscape dominated by wind energy development (commonly termed a 'wind farm landscape').*	Significant cumulative visual effects resulting from these wind farm developments on the views from Loch Awe and associated recreational receptors is confirmed in the Revised LVIA. Whilst significant visual effects are noted from some locations along the western shores of Loch Awe (Viewpoints 2-5), there are clear 'breaks' in the succession of visible wind farm development on the skyline to the far side of Loch Awe as shown on the wirelines. These 'breaks' would become greater with the decommissioning of the An Suidhe Wind Farm. Moving sequentially along the western side of Loch Awe, there is also a variable magnitude of change between each viewpoint such that different wind farms would become more or less visible on the skyline, when viewed from different locations along the western side of Loch Awe.
The Proposed Development would also contribute to combined significant adverse cumulative effects on views from Dun na Cuaiche at Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL) (Viewpoint 10) where an arc of development of large turbines would be visible on the hills enclosing Loch Fyne and forming a backdrop to the GDL.	This viewpoint is illustrated by **Figure 4.18 (a-g)** Viewpoint 10 Dun na Cuaiche. Although visible, the Revised Development would not be significantly visible from this location and would not make a significant contribution to visual effects, which would largely result from other wind farm developments and the overhead transmission line that would appear more prominently in this view.
Recommendations: *Removal of Turbines 9, 13 and 14 to reduce the prominence of the development in views from the west side of Loch Awe represented by*	These recommendations are noted. The design of the Revised Development has been updated and turbines T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20 have been removed. This has significantly reduced the

ABC Consultation Comment	Applicant Response to Consultation
Viewpoints 2, 3, 4 and 5 (but also when seen from recreational routes on the western side of Loch Awe where no representative visualisations have been produced in the EIA-R). The aim of this mitigation measure would be to more strongly associate the proposed wind farm with a lower and less prominent part of the skyline and to also minimise current and potential future cumulative landscape and visual effects. The removal of Turbines 9 and 14 would additionally improve views of the proposal from the lower part of Loch Awe in the vicinity of Ford (as represented by Viewpoint 11).	landscape and visual effects from Loch Fyne, including a number of significant effects previously assessed in the EIA Report. Turbines T9, T13 and T14 have not been removed, reduced in height or relocated and so there would be ***no change*** to the effects of the Revised Development on the views from the Loch Awe area.
*While acknowledging the Clachaig Glen II reporter's finding on conditions requiring periodic review of aviation lighting, the large number of wind farm proposals across Argyll and Bute requiring aviation lighting is a **major** concern and a condition requiring future implementation of an Aircraft Detection Lighting System should be put in place in order to reduce the cumulative landscape and visual effects of such lighting.*	No Aircraft Detection Lighting System is currently proposed as part of the Revised Development.

4.5 Conclusions

4.5.1 To conclude, the removal of five turbines to mitigate concerns raised by NS and ABC in relation to effects on Loch Fyne has been included in the Revised Development.

4.5.2 The reduction in the number of turbines from 22 to 17 would reduce the landscape and visual effects from the Loch Fyne area in comparison to the Proposed Development. Notably, a number of receptors will either no longer view the Revised Development or have limited visibility of the Revised Development. This includes the views from Lachlan Castle and Bay, Inveraray (Old Military Road), settlements of Strachur, Ardnagowan, Loch Fyne Waters and the B8000 and A886.

4.5.3 Significant and cumulative visual effects would however remain and affect a localised and reduced area of generally 7.5km, affecting Loch Awe including part of Dalavich, part of the B840, and the minor road along the western shore of Loch Awe (overlapping with the Caledonia Way and Core Path C173 (a-d) and recreational users on Loch Awe as previously described in the conclusion to Section 4.3.

4.5.4 Modern turbines are unavoidably large structures and NPF4 Policy 11 (part 'e') notes specifically that significant landscape and visual impacts are to be expected and advises that "*Where impacts are localised and/or appropriate design mitigation has been applied, they will generally be considered to be acceptable*". When compared to other wind farm developments, the effects may be considered as localised and the mitigation incorporated into the Revised Development has reduced the extent and number of significant effects.

5. Ornithology

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The Chapter considers how the Revised Development differs from the Proposed Development, as assessed in the EIA Report (2024), and provides an assessment of its impacts on ornithological features. It also addresses consultation responses received from NatureScot (NS) and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). It is supported by **Figures 5.1-5.5** and should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 11: Ornithology** of the EIA Report and its associated figures and appendices.

5.1.2 This assessment and the responses to consultee comments have been prepared by Full Members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM).

5.1.3 The key design changes to the Proposed Development that relate to ornithology are:

- The removal of five turbines (T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20) and their associated tracks; and
- The repositioning and shortening of access tracks associated with Turbines 2, 4, 13 and 22.

5.1.4 As well as taking account of the design changes noted, this revised assessment also takes account of additional baseline information for golden and white-tailed eagles that was obtained subsequent to the completion of the EIA Report. A Bird Protection Plan (**Appendix 5B**) has also been produced to provide further detail of mitigation measures.

5.1.5 For some species, the design changes noted above result in little or no change to the magnitude of impacts and predicted effects set out in the EIA Report and, where this is the case, this is noted. For species where impact magnitude and effects are considered to have changed, these are considered alphabetically (black grouse, black-throated diver, golden eagle, red-throated diver, white-tailed eagle). Where relevant, updates to mitigation measures proposed and cumulative effects assessments are also provided.

5.2 Updated Baseline

5.2.1 For the purposes of this revised assessment, baseline conditions are in general considered to be unchanged from that described in the EIA Report. The exception to this concerns golden and white-tailed eagle and the following additional survey and tagging data have been used to inform the revised assessment:

- Satellite tagging data for both eagle ranges that overlap the Site until 10 August 2025 (i.e., an additional two years and 10 to 11 months following on from the original data gathered for the EIA Report; see **Confidential Appendix 5A:GET Wind Farm Assessment**); and
- An additional breeding season of surveys of the Site and a surrounding 6km buffer in 2025 (see **Confidential Appendix 5D: Updated Ornithology Baseline**).

5.2.2 The additional tagging data showed that the two golden eagle ranges both continued to be used between 2022 and 2025 and the boundaries of each range were very similar to those defined in **Chapter 11: Ornithology** of the EIA Report. The total home range of the G/LAE3 adult appears to have expanded slightly in the North and East. However, both these areas of expansion are over 2km from the nearest proposed turbine (see

Confidential Appendix 5A:GET Wind Farm Assessment, notably its embedded **Figures 5 and 6**, and **EIA Appendix 11F** for further details).

5.2.3 Golden eagles were seen across the Site during surveys in 2025, though predominantly between March and May, and flight activity during the breeding season was lower than in previous survey years. Furthermore, flights were mainly in the southwest of the Site, away from the turbine array.

5.2.4 In contrast, white-tailed eagle activity recorded during vantage point surveys increased. Twenty-two flights were recorded during these surveys, compared to a previous breeding season maximum of 12 flights (in 2021). However, the increase in flight time at collision risk height across the breeding season was minimal (1 minute and 35 seconds).

5.2.5 Two white-tailed eagle breeding attempts were also recorded during the 2025 surveys. Further details of these can be found in **Confidential Appendix 5D, Annex B**.

5.2.6 In addition, NatureScot correspondence reviewed in relation to the Ladyfield Wind Farm application suggests that the regional golden eagle population has increased. The Revised Development is situated in NatureScot Natural Heritage Zone (NHZ) 14. The NHZ 14 was previously considered to hold 44 pairs (Wilson *et al.,* 2015), but this has now increased to 51 pairs (Whitford, 2024).

5.3 Consultation

5.3.1 Further to the submission of the EIA Report, consultation responses have been received from NS and the RSPB. These have been addressed with a combination of design changes and the provision of further information on the key bird sensitivities identified. Details of the responses are provided in.

Table 5.1 Ornithology Consultation Responses

Consultee	Summary of key issues	Response and how considered in this Chapter	Section reference
NatureScot	Recommended relocating or removing Turbines 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 16 and 19 to help reduce disturbance, displacement and collision impacts on red-throated divers.	Turbines 3, 5, 7 and 11 have been removed. Disturbance, displacement and collision impacts have been re-assessed based on this.	**5.4.16-5.4.17, Table 5-2 and Appendix 5C**
	Advised that the Applicant should carry out another year of survey work for white-tailed eagle and completes a cumulative assessment at a national level.	As this issue relates to breeding eagles, an additional breeding season of survey work (March to August 2025) has been performed. Cumulative assessment at a national level is not considered practical or necessary. This is due to the lack of a relevant threshold, lack of productivity data accepted by NatureScot, and lack of sufficiently precise annual survival rates for eagles in the UK.	**5.2.1, 5.2.4-5.2.5 and Confidential Appendix 5D**
	Requires a detailed BPP, including mitigation for impacts on black grouse, red-throated diver and black-throated diver during construction and operational phases, and potential impacts from the oHMP.	A draft BPP is provided as an appendix, addressing all these NS requests.	**Appendix 5B: Bird Protection Plan**

RSPB	Recommends that Turbines 3, 5 and 7 are removed from proposal or set back ≥ 750m from all loch shores and plantation edges.	Turbines 3, 5 and 7 have been removed.	**5.4.10, 5.4.17, Table 5-2**
	Recommends submitting an updated oHMP prior to determination, including full justification for, and further detail on, mitigation and enhancement measures proposed to support breeding black-throated diver and red-throated diver on site.	Updated oHMP covering these matters is provided as an appendix to **Chapter 6: Ecology**.	**Appendix 6D**

5.4 Revised Assessment

5.4.1 The Revised Development has a reduced footprint, without any potential for additional adverse effects on birds to those described in the EIA Report (2024). The EIA Report (2024) scoped out some potential impacts on birds, including direct habitat loss for black-throated divers, impacts on the Glen Etive and Glen Fyne Special Protection Area (SPA) golden eagle population, disturbance and displacement of white-tailed eagles, and potential collision risk for black grouse and whooper swans as significant effects were unlikely. **Table 5.2** provides a high-level overview of the potential effects that remain unchanged in the Revised Development, while the combined conclusions of the EIA Report (2024) and FEI Report on ornithological receptors are summarised in **Table 5.4** along with an updated list of residual effects as a result of the Revised Development.

5.4.2 The potential for black grouse colliding with turbines was raised during consultation and this aspect is therefore considered further in this Chapter. Updates to relevant aspects of the assessments for black-throated diver, golden eagle and red-throated diver are also detailed.

5.4.3 Both the baseline survey records and the regional population size for white-tailed eagle have increased. However, the new records alter the overlap with potential impacts by a negligible degree (see **Table 5.2** and **Confidential Appendix 5D: Updated Ornithology Baseline**). As the regional population of white-tailed eagle has also increased, the resultant effects are considered to be materially no worse, and perhaps better, than described in the EIA Report (2024). Therefore, as per the EIA Report (2024), habitat loss, disturbance and displacement of this species are considered to be scoped out. Based on the updated collision risk calculations in **Appendix 5C: Ornithology Collision Risk Models**, potential collisions with operational turbines are considered to remain low. Due to the minimal changes to impacts upon osprey and whooper swan, no further assessment of the Revised Development's impacts on these species alone is required. Nonetheless, owing to the inclusion of new cumulative developments, cumulative assessments have been updated for these species if potential for an in-combination effect was identified in the EIA Report (2024).

Table 5.2 Summary of Ornithology Effects Unchanged from the EIA and Requiring No Further Detailed Assessment

Receptor	Effects	Magnitude	Significance	Comments
Black grouse: breeding	Direct habitat loss	Very low	Not Significant	Reduced footprint of Revised Development near leks would lead to a slight decrease in habitat loss, disturbance and potential displacement effects for black grouse in comparison with Proposed Development.
	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Low	Not Significant	
	Operational disturbance and displacement	Low	Not Significant	
Black-throated diver: breeding	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Very low	Not Significant	Reduced footprint near breeding loch would lead to a slight decrease in disturbance during construction and decommissioning.
Golden eagle: breeding/wintering	Direct habitat loss	Very low	Not Significant	Losses of 0.6%-1.9% for one range and 2.2%-3% of the second range were predicted for the Proposed Development. These figures drop to 0.3% and 0.7% respectively for the Revised Development.
	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Negligible	Not Significant	Night-time roost events within 300m of the Revised Development turbine positions fell from 0.81% to 0.5% of nights for one eagle range and changed negligibly for the second range. Potential disturbance around sunrise and sunset therefore decreases further.
	Potential collision with operational turbines	Low	Not Significant	Predicted collisions drop slightly from 0.098 birds per year (Proposed Development) to 0.093 (Revised Development).
Osprey: breeding	Potential collision with operational turbines	Low	Not Significant	Predicted collisions rise very slightly from 0.078 birds per year

				(Proposed Development) to 0.079 (Revised Development)[5].
Red-throated diver: breeding	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Low	Not Significant	Reduced footprint near breeding lochs would lead to a slight decrease in potential disturbance during construction, operation and decommissioning. Nearest turbine now lies over 675m from breeding loch (previously 399m). Nearest access track now lies 362m (previously 130m) from breeding loch and circa 440m (previously circa 240m) from breeding location. See **Bird Protection Plan** (BPP; **Appendix 5B**) for measures proposed to avoid disturbance.
	Operational disturbance and displacement	Low	Not Significant	
White-tailed eagle: breeding	Direct habitat loss to wind turbine bases, tracks and ancillary structures.	Scoped out	Not Significant	No evidence of white-tailed eagle nesting within 1km of any turbines, tracks or ancillary structures[6]. Given the large home ranges of white-tailed eagles, the Revised Development footprint is a negligible proportion of these ranges.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes. Includes barrier effects.	Scoped out	Not Significant	Effects during the operational phase are predicted to be less than those experienced during the construction phase.
	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of	Scoped out	Not Significant	No evidence of white-tailed eagle nesting within 1km of the

[5] Although fewer turbines are now proposed, collision estimates can go up as well as down. This is due to factors such as a reduction in vantage points relevant to the Revised Development (i.e., fewer data points now fall near the turbines), and the release of new NatureScot collision risk modelling guidance (Band, 2024).

[6] Based on disturbance distances as described by Goodship and Furness (2022).

	workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement of breeding and foraging white-tailed eagles.			Revised Development footprint[2].
	Potential collision with operational turbines	Low	Not Significant	Predicted collisions rise very slightly from 0.109 birds per year (Proposed Development) to 0.111 (Revised Development).
Whooper swan: passage/wintering	Construction, operational and decommissioning disturbance	Very low	Not Significant	Reduced footprint near lochans and Loch Dubh-ghlas would lead to a slight decrease in disturbance during construction, operation and decommissioning.

5.4.4 Other bird species would be affected to a negligible degree by the design changes since the EIA Report (2024). These include the common gull, golden plover, peregrine, snipe and teal that were scoped out during the EIA process (see **Appendix 11B of the EIA Report** (2024)). These species and effects have therefore also been scoped out of further assessment in this FEI Report.

Updates to Effects on Black Grouse

5.4.5 No black grouse flights at rotor height were identified during the baseline surveys supporting the EIA Report. However, NatureScot have raised concerns around potential collisions with lower structures such as the fences proposed as part of habitat management and enhancement. Black grouse are known to suffer mortality from collisions with turbine bases and deer and stock fencing (Trout and Kortland, 2012). In some areas of northern Europe, this can amount to a significant source of mortality.

5.4.6 The Revised Development features five fewer, turbines, with two of those removed from the Proposed Development (T11 and T20) being within 750m of black grouse leks. For the Revised Development, three turbines (rather than five) remain within 750m of a lek.

5.4.7 It is noted that scrub enhancement design in the outline Habitat Management Plan (oHMP) will consider whether fence installation can be avoided. This would eliminate the risk of black grouse mortality from fencing collisions as a result of the Revised Development. If fencing is used, the required length would be circa 3km to 4km – within a Site of over 4,203ha, this would be relatively limited in spatial extent. Moreover, fence locations will avoid areas of past black grouse activity wherever feasible and, where it cannot, fences will be marked to reduce the likelihood of collisions. Fencing would be removed once the habitat management objectives have been attained. Please refer to **Appendix 6D: Outline Habitat Management Plan** for context and full details.

5.4.8 In the absence of mitigation, the magnitude of change resulting from collisions during operation of the Revised Development is considered to be very low. The resultant adverse effect on the regional (NHZ) conservation status of black grouse is thus **Not Significant**.

Updates to Effects on Black-throated Diver

5.4.9 The EIA Report predicted an adverse but not significant effect on breeding black-throated divers from operational disturbance and displacement. This was associated with a very low magnitude of change for the species' regional (NHZ) population.

5.4.10 The Revised Development has a reduced footprint with five turbines removed, in part, to address concerns raised by consultees over effects on black-throated divers. The RSPB's request to remove turbines 3, 5 and 7 has been followed. The waterbody on which black-throated divers were observed nesting lay 260m from the closest section of access track and 425m from the closest turbine of the Proposed Development. The distance between the closest track and turbine of the Revised Development and the waterbody where breeding was recorded is approximately 900m.

5.4.11 The EIA Report assessed the magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development with respect to potential disturbance and displacement of black-throated divers as being very low. This was the case for the construction, operation and decommissioning phases.

5.4.12 Due to the design changes, the magnitude of change with respect to potential disturbance and displacement is now considered to be negligible. The resultant effect on the regional conservation status of black-throated divers remains **Not Significant**.

Updates to Effects on Golden Eagle

5.4.13 The EIA Report predicted an adverse but not significant effect on resident (breeding and wintering) golden eagles from operational disturbance and displacement. This was associated with a very low magnitude of change for the species' regional (NHZ) population.

5.4.14 The additional data from tagged birds has been assessed against the Revised Development's reduced footprint. The updated Golden Eagle Territory (GET) modelling carried out in 2025 (**Confidential Appendix 5A**) now shows a decreased overlap with golden eagle ranges for the Revised Development compared to the Proposed Development. Both eagle ranges overlap less than 1% with the Revised Development. Very few recorded flights cross the forested gap from Abhainn a' Bheallaich to Loch Leacann in which the Revised Development would be situated.

5.4.15 Based on the modelling and analysis detailed in **Confidential Appendix 5A:GET Wind Farm Assessment**, it is concluded that the Revised Development would present a reduced risk of eagle disturbance and displacement during the operational phase in comparison with the Proposed Development. The overlap in this typically low-disturbance operational phase is now so limited that the magnitude of change with respect to potential disturbance and displacement is considered to reduce from very low to negligible. The resultant effect on the regional conservation status of golden eagles remains **Not Significant**.

Updates to Effects on Red-throated Diver

5.4.16 The EIA Report predicted an adverse but not significant effect on breeding red-throated divers from potential collision with operational turbines. Collision risk modelling for the

Proposed Development predicted an annual collision estimate of 0.051 birds. This equated to 0.03% of the NHZ population.

5.4.17 Design changes in the Revised Development (e.g. removal of T3, T5, T7 and T11) were made partly due to concerns raised by consultees over adverse effects on red-throated divers. Collisions are predicted to decrease to 0.036 birds per year, or 0.02% of the NHZ population, for the Revised Development (see **Appendix 5C: Ornithology Collision Risk Models**). The amendments to the Proposed Development have resulted in an ~30% decrease in predicted collisions and the effect on the regional conservation status of red-throated divers remains **Not Significant**.

Cumulative Effects

5.4.18 Cumulative effects of the Revised Development would be very similar to the Proposed Development. This is due to no change in significance for most ornithological effects and, where changes to impact magnitude are predicted, these in most cases result in a reduced likelihood of any significant cumulative effects.

5.4.19 In the EIA Report (2024), a cumulative effects assessment was carried out for black grouse, black-throated diver, golden eagle, osprey, red-throated diver and white-tailed eagle. This focused on one or more non-significant adverse residual effects for each species. Potential cumulative impacts included disturbance/displacement during construction and/or operation and collision mortality. As described above, the reduced number of turbines in the Revised Development materially reduces the magnitude of impact on black grouse, black-throated diver, golden eagle and red-throated diver. However, as additional cumulative schemes will now need to be assessed, cumulative data for all six species has been gathered in **Table 5.3**.

Cumulative Effects on Black Grouse

5.4.20 Cumulative assessment for black grouse in the EIA Report revealed neutral to minor adverse effects on the species predicted at two operational, two consented and two application stage wind farms. When the updated cumulative effect data is incorporated, negligible to minor adverse effects on black grouse are predicted at two operational, three consented and four application stage wind farms. The main effect predicted remains disturbance during construction. It is unlikely that construction at all of these sites would occur at the same time as the Revised Development. However, even if it did, the effect would be spread out across different individuals and leks. It is considered that **no likely significant** cumulative effects would arise in respect of black grouse in combination with the relevant cumulative schemes.

Cumulative Effects on Black-throated Diver

5.4.21 Cumulative assessment for black-throated diver in the EIA Report (2024) identified negligible cumulative effects in combination with other wind farms, and a minor cumulative effect when considering forestry operations. As shown in **Table 5.3**, no additional cumulative effects on the species have been identified for the Revised Development. Thus, the Revised Development will result in **no likely significant** adverse cumulative effects on the NHZ14 black-throated diver population in combination with other schemes.

Table 5.33 Updates to Cumulative Assessment for Ornithology

Wind farm*	Change since EIAR	No. of turbines	Black grouse	Black-throated diver	Golden eagle	Osprey	Red-throated diver	White-tailed eagle
A'Chruach	No change (operational)	21	Low-magnitude disturbance at site level only.	Negligible effects.	Low-level local effects are not material at regional scale.	Occasionally reported, but no material effects.	Low-magnitude effects via collision risk, but not material at the regional scale. Effects negligible otherwise.	Not recorded during surveys.
Allt Dearg	No change (operational)	12	No information.	No information.	Minor displacement effect on sub-adults. 0.071 collision-related deaths per year.	No information.	No information.	No information.
Beinn Ghlas	No change (operational)	14	No information.	No information.	0.170 annual collision-related deaths.	No information.	No information.	No information.
Carraig Gheal	No change (operational)	20	No information.	No information.	0.015 annual collision-related deaths.	No information.	No information.	No information.
A'Chruach Phase 2	No change (consented)	2	Negligible effects.	No effects.	Negligible effects.	No effects.	Negligible effects.	Negligible effects.
Blarghour	No change (consented)	17	No residual effects.	No effects.	Negligible to minor effects during construction and operation. 0.069	Negligible effects during construction and operation.	Negligible residual effects.	Negligible to minor effects during construction and operation.

Wind farm*	Change since EIAR	No. of turbines	Black grouse	Black-throated diver	Golden eagle	Osprey	Red-throated diver	White-tailed eagle
					annual collision-related deaths.			
Creag Dhubh	No change (consented)	9	Low-magnitude minor adverse displacement effect during construction.	No effects.	Minor adverse displacement effects during all phases. 0.015 annual collision-related deaths predicted during operation.	No effects.	No effects.	No effects.
Sròndoire	No change (operational)	3	Species recorded, but no adverse effects predicted.	Species recorded, but no adverse effects predicted.	Minor effects via construction disturbance and habitat loss/operational displacement. 0.021 collision-related deaths per year.	No effects.	Minor, low-magnitude disturbance effect during construction.	No effects.
Glasvaar	Previously at application stage, now consented with three fewer turbines after revised Collision Risk Modelling	8	Negligible effects after mitigation.	Negligible effects.	Negligible effects due to construction. Low-magnitude operational disturbance or displacement effects. 0.067 annual collision-related deaths.	Negligible effects.	Assessed as of local importance, with no effects predicted.	Negligible effects due to construction. Low-magnitude operational disturbance or displacement effects. 0.137 annual collision-related deaths.
Ladyfield	Previously at application stage, now consented with	13	Minor adverse construction disturbance, habitat loss and	Not recorded during surveys.	Minor adverse habitat loss, construction disturbance and	No effects.	Not recorded during surveys.	0.017 annual collision-related deaths.

Wind farm*	Change since EIAR	No. of turbines	Black grouse	Black-throated diver	Golden eagle	Osprey	Red-throated diver	White-tailed eagle
	one fewer turbine		operational displacement effects after mitigation.		operational displacement effects. 0.072 annual collision-related deaths.			
An Càrr Dubh	No change (application)	13	No potential for likely significant effects	No potential for likely significant effects.	Medium-magnitude range loss effect assessed as of minor significance, though NatureScot state a high risk of abandonment of one territory. Minor, low-magnitude effect on dispersing young due to habitat loss. Up to 0.063 annual collision-related deaths.	No potential for likely significant effects. Collision mortality risk assessed as negligible but queried by NatureScot.	No potential for likely significant effects. Negligible collision mortality risk.	1.228 collision-related deaths per year. No potential for other likely significant effects.
Corr Chnoc	New application that has arisen since EIAR	12	Minor adverse effects from construction and decommissioning disturbance and operational displacement after mitigation. Negligible effect from collision risk.	Not present.	Negligible disturbance and displacement. 0.015 annual collision-related deaths predicted but NatureScot believe this may be an underestimate.	No breeding and only one flight record, thus scoped out.	Negligible construction and decommissioning disturbance, minor operational displacement. 0.009 annual collision-related deaths predicted but NatureScot	Negligible disturbance and displacement. 0.643 annual collision-related deaths predicted but NatureScot believe this is an underestimate.

Wind farm*	Change since EIAR	No. of turbines	Black grouse	Black-throated diver	Golden eagle	Osprey	Red-throated diver	White-tailed eagle
							believe this is an underestimate.	
Cruach Clenamacrie	New application that has arisen since EIAR	6	Residual effects negligible at worst.	Not present.	Negligible effects during construction, negligible to minor operational displacement and habitat loss, negligible operational disturbance and no collision mortality effect.	Low number of records; scoped out.	Only one flight record; scoped out.	No breeding and low number of records, thus scoped out.
Giant's Burn	New application that has arisen since EIAR	7	No lekking and no flights recorded, thus not taken forward to full assessment.	Not present.	Negligible effects.	Low number of records; scoped out.	No flight activity: scoped out.	Low number of records; scoped out.
High Brenfield	New application that has arisen since EIAR	10	Negligible effects after mitigation.	Scoped out due to lack of plausible impacts.	Negligible effects; 0.018 annual collision-related deaths.	Scoped out due to lack of plausible impacts.	Scoped out due to lack of plausible impacts.	Negligible effects; 0.045 annual collision-related deaths.

*** Schemes with no more than negligible predicted effects on these species, or no available data, have been excluded.**

Cumulative Effects on Golden Eagle

5.4.22 The cumulative number of annual theoretical collisions for golden eagle is 0.593 individuals, based on operational and consented schemes. The figure constitutes 0.67% of the NHZ population, however. While there is a lack of information from some cumulative sites, all data available at the time of assessment have been used. If all five application stage schemes were also built, an additional 0.524 deaths would result per year above this cumulative total. Mortality for this species within NHZ14 is 5.1 individuals per year (considering adult survival[7]). In this context, it is considered that the resultant adverse cumulative effect in respect of collision-related mortality on the favourable conservation status of the golden eagle NHZ population is unlikely to be significant.

5.4.23 Other neutral to minor adverse effects on golden eagle are predicted at four operational, four consented and two application wind farms. Comparing with the cumulative assessment presented in the EIA Report (2024), one application site with negligible effects during construction and minor effects during operation (Glasvaar Wind Farm) has now been consented. NatureScot's concerns over displacement risk and territory loss at Glasvaar appear to have been alleviated by a reduction in the footprint of the Glasvaar proposal. The Revised Development is predicted to have negligible to very low habitat loss and disturbance effects. There is little potential for any significant temporal overlap in effects that would lead to a decline in the regional population.

5.4.24 In summary, cumulative effects on the favourable conservation status of the golden eagle NHZ population are **unlikely to be significant**.

Cumulative Effects on Osprey

5.4.25 Osprey collision risk has increased by 0.001 predicted deaths per year under the Revised Development (i.e., from 0.078 to 0.079 birds per year; **Appendix 5C: Ornithology Collision Risk Models**). This very small rise means that the annual increase in mortality for its regional population would remain at 1.6% for the Revised Development (i.e., the same as for the Proposed Development). None of the new cumulative schemes identified for the Revised Development identified any plausible impacts on ospreys. The EIA conclusions for potential cumulative impacts on osprey are therefore still applicable. **No significant** cumulative effect from the Revised Development is predicted for osprey.

Cumulative Effects on Red-throated Diver

5.4.26 Negligible to minor adverse effects on this species are predicted for two operational, two consented and two application wind farms. One of these relates to a new application (Corr Chnoc Wind Farm) where negligible construction and decommissioning disturbance and minor operational displacement are predicted.

5.4.27 Considering the reduced level of effects predicted from the Revised Development and the geographical spread of the relevant cumulative projects, a significant effect on the regional population remains very unlikely. It is considered that **no significant** adverse cumulative effects on the NHZ14 red-throated diver population will arise in conjunction with the schemes considered.

[7] The golden eagle adult mortality rate is 5%; the juvenile (up to age 4) mortality rate is 85% (BTO Bird Facts, 2023). 5% of 51 pairs (102 adults) is 5.1 birds.

Cumulative Effects on White-tailed Eagle

5.4.28 White-tailed eagle collisions have increased by 0.002 predicted deaths per year (from 0.107 to 0.109 birds per year) under the Revised Development (**Appendix 5C: Ornithology Collision Risk Models**). The cumulative number of annual theoretical collisions is now 0.266 individuals, based on operational and consented schemes (**Table 5.3**). The figure constitutes 0.67% of the NHZ population of 20 breeding pairs[8].

5.4.29 If all five application stage schemes were also built, an additional 1.916 deaths would result per year, mostly at An Càrr Dubh Wind Farm (see **Table 5.3**). However, the regional and national white-tailed eagle populations are continuing to grow, with immatures forming a large proportion of this. Further comments on white-tailed eagle mortality thresholds, modelling and carrying capacity are given in **Confidential Appendix 5D: Updated Ornithology Baseline**.

5.4.30 In this context, the EIA conclusion for potential cumulative impacts on the species remains applicable. **No significant** cumulative effect on white-tailed eagle is predicted from the Revised Development in combination with other schemes.

5.5 Mitigation

5.5.1 Additional mitigation to reduce the likelihood of black grouse collisions with new fencing under the oHMP is proposed; any fenced enclosures deemed necessary for the success of proposed habitat management set out in the oHMP would be marked to alert black grouse to the hazard. This would involve the use of flight diverters, snow-fence netting or similar high-visibility solutions, as specified in research by the Forestry Commission[9].

5.5.2 These measures are anticipated to reduce the likelihood of black grouse collisions and the residual effect on the NHZ black grouse population is predicted to be negligible.

5.5.3 As per **Table 11.10** in **Chapter 11: Ornithology** of the EIA Report (2024), embedded mitigation would comprise of pre-construction surveys, work exclusion zones, timing restrictions, vehicle speed limits, 50m stand-offs from all waterbodies and watercourses (aside from where watercourse crossings are required) and sensitive working practices (wherever surveys identify this need).

5.5.4 Furthermore, protection measures have been incorporated into the BPP (**Appendix 5B**) accompanying this FEI Report. The BPP will be implemented in a timely manner to minimise effects on birds.

5.6 Conclusions and Summary

5.6.1 Additional surveys and tagging data have been used to form a revised baseline for golden eagle and white-tailed eagle. The boundaries of the two identified golden eagle ranges were similar to those defined in **Chapter 11: Ornithology** of the EIA Report (2024). Golden eagle flight activity in 2025 was lower than in previous breeding seasons. White-tailed eagle activity increased, but the increase in flight time at collision risk height was minimal. Two white-tailed eagle breeding attempts were recorded.

5.6.2 The overall level and significance of the effects on osprey, white-tailed eagle and whooper swan remains unchanged. Collision-related mortality for black grouse has been reassessed; the potential effect on the regional population is considered **Not Significant**. Effects on black-throated diver, golden eagle (specifically resulting from operational

[8] 0.266 / 40 (the number of adults in 20 pairs) x 100 = 0.665

disturbance and displacement) and red-throated diver (from potential collision with operational turbines) are expected to **reduce in magnitude** as a result of the deletion of five turbines. The remaining ornithological effects remain low to negligible and **Not Significant**.

5.6.3 With regards to cumulative effects of the Revised Development in combination with those of other wind farm developments, overall significance would also remain unchanged. **No significant** cumulative impacts are predicted for any bird species.

5.6.4 **Table 5.4** below provides a summary of the residual effects of the Revised Development on ornithological features.

Table 5.44 Summary of Significance of Residual Effects

Ornithological feature	Summary of predicted effects	Importance of Ornithological Feature[10]	Magnitude[11]	Significance[12]	Comments
Black grouse: breeding	Direct habitat loss	Regional	Very low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Operational disturbance and displacement	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Potential collision with fences and turbine bases	Regional	Very low	Not Significant	HMP will minimise fencing as far as practicable and this will be marked for increased visibility. Likelihood of collisions with turbines further reduced by deletion of turbines (two less turbines now remain within 750m of a known lek.)
Black-throated diver: breeding	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Regional	Very low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.

[10] The importance of the feature is defined as per Table 11.9, Section 11.7 of the EIA Report, using the criteria and method referenced in Table 11.16 of the EIA Report.

[11] The magnitude of environmental change on an ornithological feature resulting from activities relating to the development is defined using the criteria set out in Section 11.9 and Table 11.11 of the EIA Report, and is defined as neutral, very low, low, medium, or high.

[12] The significance of an environmental effect is either 'significant' or 'not significant,' subject to the evaluation methodology outlined in Section 11.9 of the EIA Report.

Ornithological feature	Summary of predicted effects	Importance of Ornithological Feature[10]	Magnitude[11]	Significance[12]	Comments
	Operational disturbance and displacement	Regional	Negligible	Not Significant	Impact magnitude reduced from very low (as assessed in EIA Report) due to reduced footprint and updated oHMP measures.
Golden eagle: breeding/wintering	Direct habitat loss	Regional	Very low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Regional	Negligible	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Operational disturbance	Regional	Negligible	Not Significant	Impact magnitude reduced from very low (as assessed in EIA Report) based on new tag data and modelling based on reduced footprint (see **Confidential Appendix 5A:GET Wind Farm Assessment**).
	Potential collision with operational turbines	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
Osprey: breeding	Potential collision with operational turbines	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
Red-throated diver: breeding	Construction and decommissioning disturbance	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Operational disturbance and displacement	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
	Potential collision with operational turbines	Regional	Very low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude reduced from low (as assessed in EIA Report) due to removal of turbines and reduced collision risk.

Ornithological feature	Summary of predicted effects	Importance of Ornithological Feature[10]	Magnitude[11]	Significance[12]	Comments
White-tailed eagle: breeding	Potential collision with operational turbines	Regional	Low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.
Whooper swan: passage/ wintering	Construction, Operation and decommissioning disturbance	Regional	Very low	Not Significant	Impact magnitude and significance unchanged since EIA Report.

6. Ecology

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This section forms an update to the **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology**. Only sections which require updating following the redesign of the Proposed Development are included here and existing information which is not subject to change is not repeated.

6.2 Consultation

6.2.1 **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments** includes a summary of comments received from consultees following submission of the EIA Report relating to the **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology** and the response to these comments. Comments relevant to this environmental topic have been received from NatureScot (NS), Argyll and Bute Council (ABC) and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Scotland (RSPB Scotland).

6.2.2 These comments and responses are in addition to those received prior to the submission of the EIA Report and summarised in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.6**.

6.3 Scope of the Assessment

6.3.1 The spatial and temporal scopes of the assessment are as summarised in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.7 Scope of the Assessment**.

Important Ecological Features

6.3.2 The important ecological features (IEFs) that are scoped into the assessment are unchanged from those identified in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.8 Likely Effects, ZoIs and Justification for Scoped in Ecological Features**:

- Blanket Bog (priority peatland communities including M17, M18, M19, M20 and M25);
- Otter;
- Bats (commuting and foraging); and
- Red squirrel.

6.3.3 In response to the **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology**, NatureScot made the following comments with regard to protected species:

- *"A number of potential otter holts and couches have been found within the red line boundary of the site. We would advise that the Applicant does further work to confirm their usage, including camera trapping or further field surveys".*
- *"The bat surveys were carried out in 2020 and would now be considered invalid. Additionally, no mitigation measures for bats have been proposed by the Applicant. The recorded level of activity may be sufficient to indicate that there is potential for bat mortalities at this site and therefore we would advise that feathering of the turbine blades below cut in speed is implemented at this site".*

6.3.4 Updated otter and bat surveys have been undertaken and this FEI presents an updated assessment of the potential impacts of the Revised Development upon these IEFs (see

Appendix 6A:Otter Survey Baseline Report and **Appendix 6B: Bat Survey Baseline Report** respectively).

6.3.5 This chapter also updates the potential impacts of the Revised Development upon priority peatland communities including revised habitat loss calculations (**Appendix 6C: Habitat Loss Calculations**) and includes an updated Outline Habitat Management Plan (OHMP) (**Appendix 6D**).

6.3.6 The Revised Development is expected to result in either no change or reduced impacts upon other important ecological features and they are not, therefore, considered further within this FEI.

6.4 Otter

2025 Otter Survey

6.4.1 An otter survey was carried out in 2025 in accordance with standing advice (NatureScot, 2024) and with reference to emerging guidance (Findlay *et al.*, 2022). This covered watercourses intersected or adjacent to proposed infrastructure locations including access tracks, turbine platforms and 200m up and downstream of these points and is hereafter referred to as the "Survey Area". Full details are provided in **Appendix 6A:Otter Survey Baseline Report.**

6.4.2 The purpose of the 2025 baseline otter survey was to confirm if potential resting sites within the Development Site (recorded during the 2020 and 2022 surveys) showed signs of otter activity, to inform a mitigation strategy.

6.4.3 The survey was undertaken between 29 April and 01 May 2025 by field surveyors with appropriate qualifications, training and experience of otter survey methods, particularly for renewable energy projects in upland habitats. All signs of otter observed during the surveys were recorded.

6.4.4 Due to the presence of spraints, it was concluded that one potential resting site recorded during the 2020 surveys and located approximately 27m west of a proposed access track associated with the Revised Development, is actively used by otter. However, no other potential resting sites recorded during the 2020 and 2022 surveys showed any sign of being actively used (due to the lack of field signs, including pathways, bedding or spraints).

6.4.5 An additional confirmed otter resting site was identified during the 2025 survey. This is located at the edge of a loch and surrounded by woodland, but more than 90 m from the nearest proposed works and therefore outside a 30 m zone of influence. This resting site is considered suitable for supporting one individual otter at a time.

Otter Assessment

6.4.6 The 2025 survey found two resting sites used by otters, one 27 m west of a proposed access track and the other >90m from the closest proposed access track.

6.4.7 However, most of the other potential/confirmed resting sites recorded during the 2020 and 2022 surveys have been lost due to bank erosion and/or windfall damage from adjacent forestry plantation. Those that have not been lost still have the potential to be used but were considered not used/ in use due to the lack of field signs. Due to the lack of evidence of otter use of these features during the 2020, 2022 or 2025 surveys, it is most likely that they simply provide potential shelter opportunities which would likely be infrequently used for short periods of time.

6.4.8 The number of potential resting sites recorded the Survey Area demonstrates that the habitat within the Development Site has some suitability to provide otter with shelter opportunities; however, potential holt features are limited, these being of limited depth and shelter coverage.

6.4.9 With the adoption of embedded mitigation outlined in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.9 Summary of the Embedded Environmental Measures and How these Influence the Ecological Assessment**, it is concluded that, during the construction phase, the Revised Development would have a low magnitude of change on otters due to disturbance, loss and/or fragmentation of foraging and commuting habitat and mortality and the effects would be **Not Significant**.

6.4.10 Potential effects during the operational phase are likely to be limited to occasional maintenance activities, which would result in a negligible magnitude of change and the effects on otters would be **Not Significant**. Decommissioning activities will be of a similar nature to those during construction and the resultant effects on otters would be **Not Significant**.

6.4.11 These outcomes are unchanged from the assessments presented in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.10 Assessment of Effects**.

6.4.12 As noted in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology Table 10.14: Summary of Environmental Measures to be Implemented, a**n Otter Species Protection Plan (SPP) will be required due to the presence of otter on Site and, given that the location of otter holts and couches can change over time, pre-construction surveys would be a requirement 2-3 months prior to construction.

6.5 Bats

2024 Bat Surveys

6.5.1 Bat detector surveys were undertaken in 2024 in accordance with standard guidance (NatureScot et al., 2021). Full details are provided in **Appendix 6B: Bat Survey Baseline Report**. The purpose of these surveys was to update the baseline information for all bat species recorded at the Development Site to inform potential mitigation strategy and provide data to compare with the 2020 survey effort.

6.5.2 Sixteen automated bat detectors were deployed within a variety of habitat types for the following time periods:

- Spring: 02 to 24 May 2024;
- Summer: 06 to 21 August 2024; and
- Autumn: 12 to 26 September 2024.

6.5.3 Bat calls registered by the automated detectors were recorded for later analysis using specialist built-in auto-identification software (Wildlife Acoustics Kaleidoscope Pro 5.1.3). Manual checks were also incorporated into the analysis for calls that could not be identified by the software and to sample a percentage of bat calls to verify the accuracy of the auto-identification software.

Bats Assessment

6.5.4 In 2024, automated detector surveys recorded 5,476 bat passes across 437 monitoring nights. These were split as follows, with the number of passes of each species/group and percentage of total passes shown in brackets:

- Soprano pipistrelle (3,885 – 70.55%);
- Common pipistrelle (1,016 – 18.55%);
- *Myotis* species (Daubenton's or natterer's (447 – 8.16%);
- Pipistrelle species (92 – 1.68%);
- Brown long-eared (33 – 0.60%); and
- Nathusius' pipistrelle (3 – 0.05%).

6.5.5 To allow an objective assessment of bat activity across the Development Site, bat activity was quantified using Bat Activity Index Values (BAIV) to collate Bat Passes per Night (BPpN) and Bat Passes per Hour (BPpH). Further details are provided in **Appendix 6B: Bat Survey Baseline Report, Section 3**. The project risk to each recorded bat species was then calculated using activity level categories, adapted from Dowse *et al*, (2015). Using BPpN data for each species, activity was split into 'low', 'typical' and 'high'. Taking account of bat species populations trends and activity recorded within the Development Site, the results of the 2024 surveys were as expected for its geographical location and habitats present.

Construction/Decommissioning Period Assessment

6.5.6 With the adoption of embedded mitigation outlined in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.9 Summary of the Embedded Environmental Measures and How these Influence the Ecological Assessment**, it is concluded that, during the construction phase, the Revised Development would have a very low magnitude of change on bat populations due to habitat loss and/or roost loss and the effects would be **Not Significant**. The potential for disturbance and/ or displacement of commuting and foraging bats during the construction period as a result of increased noise and artificial lighting levels within the Development Site would be low and the resultant effect on bat populations **Not Significant**.

6.5.7 Decommissioning activities will be of a similar nature to those during construction and the effect on bat populations will be **Not Significant**.

6.5.8 The outcome of this assessment is unchanged from that presented in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.10 Assessment of Effects**.

Collision Risk Assessment

6.5.9 The main risks to bats from operational wind farm developments relate to:

- Direct collision with fast-moving turbine blades resulting in trauma injuries; and
- Barotrauma (i.e. internal haemorrhaging in the lungs resulting from rapid changes in air pressure behind moving turbine blades).

6.5.10 A collision risk assessment for bats has therefore been carried out using the data collected during the 2024 surveys adapting the steps outlined in the NatureScot guidance (NatureScot *et al*., 2021). Full details can be found in **Appendix 6B: Bat Survey Baseline Report.**

6.5.11 The following high collision risk species were recorded on the Development Site during the 2024 survey:

- Soprano pipistrelle - Bat activity for soprano pipistrelle scored an average across the Site of 'Typical' per Dowse *et al.,* (2015). The median was 'Low' levels of activity, but some outliers indicated 'Moderate' levels of activity;
- Common pipistrelle - Bat activity for common pipistrelle scored an average across the Site of 'Low' per Dowse *et al.,* (2015). The median was 'Low' levels of activity, but an outlier indicated a 'Low/Moderate' level of activity; and
- Nathusius' pipistrelle – this species was not included in the risk assessment due to the sporadic nature of the calls recorded and the low number of records. Only three instances of this species were recorded across the Development Site and therefore significant effects on this species are unlikely.

6.5.12 The overall risk assessment for both common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle is low based on median activity levels. However, for both species, this increases to medium based on the highest activity levels recorded. As a result, the following additional mitigation will be adopted:

- Pitching turbine blades out of the wind to reduce rotation speeds while idling ('Feathering') will be implemented, to reduce the risk of bat injury/ mortality. In accordance with the request from argyll and Bute Council, this will be included within a Bat SPP that will be produced to ensure that impacts on bats are minimised as far as possible.

6.5.13 With the adoption of embedded mitigation outlined in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.9 Summary of the Embedded Environmental Measures and How these Influence the Ecological Assessment** and the additional mitigation outlined in paragraph 6.5.14, the potential magnitude of change in respect of populations of common and soprano pipistrelles as a result of collisions is considered to be low. The resultant effect on the population of these species is therefore **Not Significant**.

6.5.14 This is unchanged from the outcome of the assessment presented in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.10 Assessment of Effects**.

6.6 Habitats

6.6.1 Phase 1 and National Vegetation Classification (NVC) surveys were carried out between July 2020 and November 2023 (see **EIA Appendix 10B: Phase 1 Habitat Survey, National Vegetation Classification and Peatland Condition Report**). As the Revised Development has fewer turbines and associated tracks than the Proposed Development, the overall magnitude of change with respect to habitat loss will be reduced. Habitat Loss Calculations have therefore been updated (see **Appendix 6C: Habitat Loss Calculations**).

6.6.2 The following figures have been also updated to show the Revised Development:

- **Figure 6.1 - Phase 1 Habitat Survey and NVC Plan**;
- **Figure 6.2 – NatureScot Peatland Classification**; and
- **Figure 6.3 – Peatland Condition Assessment**.

Habitats Assessment

6.6.3 The Revised Development would result in permanent habitat loss due to land take associated with the construction of access tracks, wind turbine foundations, crane pads, construction compounds, and other associated infrastructure. The area of habitat loss in the Revised Development is, however, reduced from that of the Proposed Development as a result of the design changes.

6.6.4 Areas of temporary habitat loss expected during construction have also been identified. These include temporary working areas (works laydown areas, temporary construction compound and borrow pits) which will be subject to physical disturbance by machinery and workforce operating outside the permanent footprint of any infrastructure component. These areas would be subject to restoration, details of which would be provided within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (see **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.9 Summary of the Embedded Environmental Measures and How these Influence the Ecological Assessment**). For the purpose of deriving temporary habitat loss /disturbance calculations, a 4 m buffer has been applied to permanent land take areas.

6.6.5 Some habitats adjacent to the zone of direct construction disturbance, particularly those sensitive to changes in surface hydrology such as blanket mire, wet heath and flush communities, may be indirectly affected due to hydrological changes. For the purposes of this assessment, a 10m hydrological disturbance zone has been assumed around all permanent infrastructure comprising access crane pads and turbine foundations, new access tracks and the substation.

6.6.6 In total, for the Revised Development, 16.57 ha of all habitats will be permanently lost, equating to 0.55% of the habitats recorded in the Habitats Study Area (3,034 ha) (as defined in **EIA Report, Technical Appendix 10B, Section 2.2 Study Area and Buffers**). This is a reduction of 2.73ha (14%) from the area of all habitats that would have been lost due to the Proposed Development.

6.6.7 In terms of absolute loss, coniferous plantation woodland and recently felled woodland accounts for approximately 95% of total loss. Bare ground accounts for approximately 4% of total loss. Wet heath and blanket bog each account for approximately 1% of total habitat loss.

6.6.8 **Table 6.1** sets out the percentage of habitat loss, disturbance and / or modification by habitat type within the Study Area.

Table 6.1 Habitat Loss, disturbance or modification from Revised Development during construction

Phase 1 habitat type	NVC communities	Total areas of habitat within Study Area (ha)	Direct Habitat Loss (ha)	Temporary habitat loss /disturbance (ha)	Indirect habitat modification (ha)	Total area of habitat affected (ha)	% of total habitat in footprint affected by construction
Wet heath	M15b	12.2	-	-	-	-	-
	M15c	177	-	-	-	-	-
	M15d	542	0.18	1.11	0.53	1.82	0.34
Blanket bog/Wet modified bog/Bog pool	M17a	126.8	-	-	-	-	-
	M19a	104.9	0.12	0.14	0.37	0.63	0.60
	M25a/b	150.2	-	-	-	-	-
	M20	1.94	-	-	-	-	-
Acid flush	M6b	4.79	-	-	-	-	-
	M29	0.36	-	-	-	-	-
Base-rich flush	M10	0.08	-	-	-	-	-
Acid grassland	U4a/e	10.96	-	-	0.06	0.06	0.55
Recently felled coniferous plantation	-	243	3.40	4.48	n/a	7.88	3.24
Coniferous plantation	-	1,632	12.27	13.01	n/a	25.28	1.55
Bare ground	-	27.9	0.60	0.26	n/a	0.86	3.08

Blanket bog communities (M19)

Direct habitat loss as a result of the Revised Development:

6.6.9 In the Revised Development, no turbine locations are located on blanket bog habitat; however, proposed access tracks will result in the direct loss of 0.12 ha of M19 *Calluna vulgaris – Eriophorum vaginatum* blanket mire, *Erica tetralix* sub-community. This figure is a 0.643ha (84%) reduction in blanket bog direct habitat loss when compared to the area of blanket bog that would have been lost due to the Proposed Development.

6.6.10 A Peatland Condition Assessment (**Appendix 6C: Habitat Loss Calculations, Table 3.2**) provides an additional approach for helping to determine peatland condition and therefore helping to avoid or reduce impacts to the best quality blanket bog habitat. This approach bases the condition of blanket bog on indicators such as bog-moss cover, bare peat and evidence of grazing and burning (Further detailed methodology for peatland condition assessment is provided within **EIA Report, Technical Appendix 10B: Vegetation Survey**).

6.6.11 The least modified blanket bog community recorded within the Vegetation Study Area was the M18a. There are no impacts upon this community as it is located outside the developable area and zone of influence (likely connectivity) from the Revised Development.

6.6.12 Most of the blanket bog recorded was considered to be modified through association with nearby forestry, drainage, grazing and possibly other historic management practices such a burning. This includes much of the M19a community that will be impacted by the Revised Development. The Revised Development avoids most of the actively eroding hagg/gulley systems that were recorded, particularly within the open areas of blanket bog and wet heath communities within the area from which the turbines have been removed.

6.6.13 Effects would be reduced through the implementation of good practice embedded mitigation (**EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.9 Summary of the Embedded Environmental Measures and How these Influence the Ecological Assessment**), including the re-instatement of temporarily disturbed blanket bog habitat (totalling 0.14 ha) and the re-use of excavated peat within the Development Site as set out within **Appendix 7A: Outline Peat Management Plan Addendum**.

6.6.14 The direct loss of 0.12 ha of the blanket bog communities resulting from the Revised Development represents 0.03 % of the blanket bog resource within the Study Area (compared to 0.2% for the Proposed Development). Direct, indirect and temporary disturbance of blanket bog during construction activities is anticipated to be of a low magnitude of change in the short to medium term and effects are considered **Not Significant**.

Reduction in habitat quality as a result of hydrological connectivity and pollution incidents including dust deposition

6.6.15 **EIA Chapter 12: Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology** notes that measures would be included to ensure that pre-development runoff rates are maintained and that rates of runoff to watercourses are not increased. Effects would be further minimised through the implementation of embedded mitigation (**EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.9 Summary of the Embedded Environmental Measures and How these Influence the Ecological Assessment**) for full habitat re-instatement or restoration of temporarily disturbed habitat and the re-use of excavated peat within the Revised Development (as set out within **Appendix 7A: Outline Peat Management Plan Addendum)**.

6.6.16 The Revised Development is therefore anticipated to cause temporary (short-term) change to the local hydrology regime (low magnitude), with likely short-term changes in the composition of blanket bog vegetation up to ten metres from proposed infrastructure, totalling approximately 0.37 ha. This figure is a 3.08ha (89%) reduction in blanket bog indirect habitat modification when compared to the area of blanket bog that would have been indirectly modified due to the Proposed Development.

6.6.17 Although the magnitude of change and duration of the impact would depend on the nature of any pollution event that occurred, any adverse effects would be localised; primarily at watercourse crossing areas, with most standing or running water habitat protected from construction activities by a 50m buffer. As such, effects are considered **Not Significant**.

Combined effects on priority peatland communities

6.6.1 Combined effects (direct loss, temporary loss and indirect modification) on priority peatland communities (only M19a) totals 0.63 ha. This figure is a 2.28ha (78%) reduction in direct loss, temporary loss and indirect modification of priority peatland communities when compared to the total area of priority peatland communities that would have been subject to direct loss, temporary loss and indirect modification due to the Proposed Development.

6.6.2 As a result of the design changes in the Revised Development, the area of habitat loss has reduced when compared to the Proposed Development. However, the habitats assessment remains unchanged from the assessment presented **in EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.10 Assessment of Effects**.

Biodiversity Enhancement

6.6.3 A summary of biodiversity enhancement measures is set out below. Further details are provided in **Appendix 6D: Outline Habitat Management Plan**.

- Through the application of NatureScot's guidance[13] of a 10:1 offset, it is planned that 6.3 ha of peatland will be restored across the Development Site. In addition, a further 23.9 ha of the extent of priority peatland habitat will be restored in order to deliver a 'significant level of enhancement' under NPF4. This will result in a combined peatland restoration area of **30.2 ha**.
- Regenerating conifers will be removed within an area to be determined.
- Broadleaf tree planting is proposed within approximately 13.9ha of identified habitat, comprising both riparian habitats along core watercourses and non-riparian planting primarily to benefit black grouse along forestry edges (See **Appendix 6D: Outline Habitat Management Plan, Annex A, Figure 6D.1**).
- Low-density montane scrub planting is proposed comprising small pockets of scrub growth and, in places, a richer ground flora that has evaded deer pressure (see **Appendix 6D: Outline Habitat Management Plan, Annex A, Figure 6D.1**).

6.7 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

6.7.1 Cumulative effects of the Proposed Development were presented in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.12 Assessment of Cumulative Effects**. This concluded that

the implementation of peatland restoration measures would ensure that cumulative effects on the conservation status of priority peatland communities and upon other important ecological features (otter, bats and red squirrels) would be **Not Significant**.

6.7.2 The Revised Development has a smaller footprint than the Proposed Development and affects a reduced area of priority peatland. It is therefore considered that the cumulative assessment of potential effects on important ecological features will be unchanged and **Not Significant**.

6.8 Conclusions and Summary

6.8.1 The summary of residual effects presented in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Section 10.13 Mitigation and Residual Effects** is still applicable for the Revised Development. There are **no significant** adverse effects related to the Revised Development in isolation or cumulatively with other developments.

6.8.2 One additional mitigation measure has been identified as set out in **Table 6.2**.

Table 6.2 Additional Ecological Mitigation Measure to be implemented

Environmental Measure	Responsibility for implementation	Compliance mechanism
Pitching turbine blades out of the wind to reduce rotation speeds while idling ('Feathering') will be implemented, to reduce the risk of bat injury/ mortality.	Developer	Planning Condition

6.8.3 This will be implemented in addition to the list of environmental measures presented in **EIA Report Chapter 10: Ecology, Table 10.14 Summary of Environmental Measures to be implemented**

7. Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management

7.1 Background

7.1.1 This section forms an update to the **EIA Report Chapter 6: Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management**. Only sections which require updating are included here and existing information which is not subject to change is not repeated.

7.2 Consultation

7.2.1 **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments** includes a summary of comments received from consultees following submission of the EIA Report relating to the **EIA Report Chapter 6: Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management** and the response of the Applicant and its consultant to these comments. Comments relevant to this environmental topic have been received from the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA).

7.3 Scope of the Assessment

7.3.1 The scope of the assessment is as summarised in **EIA Report Chapter 6: Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management, Section 6.3 Scope and Receptors**.

7.4 Potential Contribution of the Revised Development to Government Objectives

7.4.1 The installed capacity of a wind turbine is a measure of its maximum rated output, which in the context of the Revised Development is conservatively estimated at 81.6 megawatts (MW) (assuming 17 x 4.8MW turbines). The Revised Development also includes a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) of up to 50MW to support generation output management.

Electricity Generation and Carbon Dioxide Savings

7.4.2 Calculations of the likely electricity generation of wind farms are dependent on the capacity factor[14], which involves an assessment of the actual output of the development against its installed capacity. The onsite BESS allows for the storage of wind farm generated power and allows an increased output of generated electricity, even during times of no or low wind power generation; and therefore, increases the site-specific capacity factor.

[14] The net capacity factor of a wind farm is the ratio of its actual energy output (after energy losses within the wind farm have been accounted for) over a defined period of time (typically a year) to its energy output, had it operated at maximum power output continuously over the same period of time. At Eredine, this has been assessed by utilising wind data collected from the temporary anemometer mast, extrapolated to turbine hub height and adjusted for turbine performance, site characteristics, and operational losses. The exact capacity factor is commercially sensitive, so the figure is illustrative rather than exact.

7.4.3 On this basis, and with an estimated capacity of 81.6MW, the amount of electricity produced by the Revised Development annually is estimated to be 286 gigawatt hours (GWh), using an illustrative site-specific capacity factor of 40%[15].

7.4.4 While there has been much debate about the actual level of emissions savings that might arise from a wind farm development, it is widely accepted that electricity produced from wind energy has a positive benefit with regard to reducing carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions.

7.4.5 In estimating the actual CO_2 emissions saving, it is important to consider the mix of alternative sources of electricity generation including fossil fuel and nuclear sources. Digest of UK Energy Statistics (DUKES) (DUKES, 2025 (A)) estimates the emissions related to electricity generated by 'all non-renewable fuels' at 448 tonnes (t) of CO_2 for every GWh generated for 2024. This figure of 448t of CO_2 savings per GWh has therefore been used for the purposes of this assessment.

7.4.6 The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero produces a range of statistics detailing electricity consumption across the UK. The average domestic consumption in the UK, was 3,264kWh per household in 2023 (DUKES, 2025 (B)).

7.4.7 The electricity generated by the Revised Development will enter the National Grid and therefore cannot be tracked to the individual consumer. As such, it is relevant to consider electricity demand in the context of the UK as a whole, rather than within the area surrounding the Revised Development.

7.4.8 The potential annual electricity generation and 'Homes Equivalent' electricity generation (based on 3,264kWh average annual domestic consumption in UK) are provided in Table 6.1. The potential CO_2 savings as a result of the Revised Development generating electricity instead of non-renewable fuelled generators is also presented.

Table 7.1 Potential Electricity Generation and CO_2 Savings

Capacity Factor	Electricity Generation (MWh per year)[16]	Homes Equivalent (based on average annual UK domestic consumption)	CO_2 savings (tonnes per year)
40%	285,926	87,600	128,095

7.5 Peat Management and Landslide Risk

Peat Management Plan

7.5.1 An outline Peat Management Plan Addendum (oPMP Addendum) has been compiled for the Revised Development (**Appendix 7A: Outline Peat Management Plan Addendum**), with a summary as follows:

- The predicted volume of excavated peat is 222,035m^3 which represents a reduction of approximately 12% when compared with the Proposed Development (252,199m^3);
- The reduction is approximately 14% for the deeper catotelmic peat when compared with the Proposed Development, reflecting the reduction in the number of turbines and associated infrastructure in deeper peat for the Revised Development. More details

[15] Site specific capacity factor provided by RWE UK Onshore Wind Limited 18 September 2025.

[16] Figures are derived as follows: 81.6MW (17 × 4.8MW turbine) × 8,760 hours/year × 0.40 (capacity factor) = 285,926MWh

are set out within **Appendix 7A, Table 2.2: Change in predicted peat excavation compared to the EIA PMP**;

- All excavated peat can be re-used within the Development Site in ways that are ecologically beneficial and minimise carbon impacts; and
- The oPMP Addendum sets out how peat will be managed prior to, during and after construction of the Revised Development and also outlines:
  - Peat protection measures that will minimise effects upon excavated peat as far as possible;
  - Roles and responsibilities; and
  - Monitoring and inspection measures that will be adopted to allow any corrective actions to be taken where necessary.

Landslide Risk

7.5.2 It has not been necessary to update the **EIA Report Appendix 6B: Peat Landslide Risk Assessment** as a result of the design amendments as this accurately reflects the position for the Revised Development. However, a response to Ironside Farrar's Stage 1 Checking Report has been provided in **Appendix 7C: Stage 1 Checking Report Response**.

7.6 Carbon Balance

Overview

7.6.1 The carbon balance figures for the Revised Development differ from those for the Proposed Development which were presented in the **EIA Report Chapter 6: Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management**. The following sections summarise the specific values for the carbon losses and carbon gains associated with the Revised Development, as presented in the **Technical Appendix 7B: Carbon Payback Tables**.

7.6.2 Calculations reflect the potential impact of the basket of greenhouse gases (GHGs) and are therefore presented in terms of tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO_2e). This is the common metric used in national and international reporting, reflecting the different global warming potentials (GWPs) of each of the individual GHGs.

7.6.3 The carbon balance has been obtained by use of the Scottish Government Carbon Calculator Tool[17]..

7.6.4 The input parameters, values for each scenario and the justification for the values used for the carbon balance calculations are presented in **Appendix 7B: Carbon Payback Tables**, which also compare the data used for the Revised Development against the data used for the Proposed Development.

Carbon Losses

7.6.5 The manufacturing, construction and installation (including concrete) of the Revised Development wind turbines has an associated carbon cost. Using figures from the Scottish Government Carbon Calculator Tool[17], the expected case carbon emission

[17] Version 2.14.1 of the offline, Microsoft Excel, Scottish Government Carbon Calculator Tool mirrors the web version (v1.8.1) which is no longer accessible.

losses associated with the manufacture, construction and decommissioning of the 17 turbines of 81.6MW installed capacity, is 73,446t CO_2 equivalent (t CO_2e), which equates to approximately 23% of total CO_2e losses.

7.6.6 The carbon payback model attributes carbon losses due to the requirement for extra capacity to back up wind power generation at times of peak demand. Since wind generated electricity is inherently variable, accompanying backup power from conventional plants is required to stabilise the supply to the consumer. This is quantified as a percentage of total capacity, which was input as 5% of the rated capacity in this case (the recommended figure within the model) and equates to 56,042t CO_2e (i.e. approximately 18% of total CO_2e losses).

7.6.7 Peatlands are a very high conservation priority because of their function in storing carbon in addition to their biodiversity value. The Revised Development has been designed to minimise the excavation of peat as far as practicable, but the construction process will involve disturbance of a volume of peat, which is quantified within the oPMP Addendum (**Appendix 7A**).

7.6.8 Carbon losses associated with CO_2 release from soil organic matter for the expected case amount to 96,786t CO_2e which equates to approximately 30% of total CO_2e losses. These losses result from peat removal and drainage effects following excavation for items of infrastructure, notably turbine foundations, hard standings and access tracks, as well as borrow pits. It is worth noting that this figure assumes 100% loss of CO_2 from removed/disturbed peat, as this is the default value within the carbon model and cannot be amended. In reality, losses are likely to be considerably less than this, as it is expected that the full amount of the disturbed peat would be used in reinstating the Revised Development Site (see **Appendix 7A: Outline Peat Management Plan Addendum**).

7.6.9 Small carbon losses are generated by the reduction of carbon fixing potential which occurs due to the loss of bog plants as a result of construction activities. For the expected case, this is 4,810t CO_2e, which equates to approximately 1% of total CO_2e losses.

7.6.10 The Revised Development will require the felling of plantation woodland around most of the turbines (see **EIA Report Chapter 4: Description of the Proposed Development**). Re-planting would be undertaken within the felled area, but a buffer (dependent on specific turbine size) would be maintained between the turbine and the re-planted woodland (and existing woodland to be retained). The loss of forestry as a result of the Revised Development would be approximately 192.3 hectares (ha), a reduction of 71.7 ha compared to the Proposed Development. Associated losses due to forestry felling in the expected case equate to 88,851t CO_2e, which equates to approximately 28% of total losses.

7.6.11 Total CO_2e losses due to the Revised Development are anticipated to be 319,013t CO_2e.

Carbon Gains

7.6.12 There are no carbon gains expected as part of the revised development.

Carbon Payback

7.6.13 To calculate the carbon payback period for the Revised Development the Scottish Government Excel-based Carbon Calculator Tool[17] uses three different fossil fuel displacement scenarios, which are updated automatically using data from DUKES (DUKES, 2025(A) and DUKES, 2025(B)):

- Grid mix, the mix of electricity sources supplying the UK as a whole;

- Coal fired for coal fired electricity generation; and
- Fossil fuel mix for fossil fuel sourced electricity generation alone.

7.6.14 The carbon calculator guidance[18] recommends using the fossil fuel sourced grid mix scenario as the most appropriate for calculating the carbon payback time (the counterfactual). Based on this scenario, the payback for the Revised Development is predicted to be 2.5 years for the expected outcome (compared to 3.1 years for the Proposed Development). Based on the fossil fuel sourced grid mix scenario, the payback period could be as low as 1.3 years for the minimum scenario (compared to 1.43 years for the Proposed Development) but increases to 6.3 years for the maximum scenario, which is a maximum worst-case scenario based on varying expected inputs (compared to 6.2 years for the Proposed Development).

7.6.15 The carbon payback time for each scenario is shown in **Table 7.2**.

Table 7.2 Potential Electricity Generation and CO_2 Savings

Fuel source	Carbon payback time (years) Expected value	Carbon payback time (years) Minimum value	Carbon payback time (years) Maximum value
Coal fired	1.2	0.6	3.1
Grid mix	7.2	3.7	18.4
Fossil fuel mix	2.5	1.3	6.3

7.7 Conclusions and Summary

7.7.1 Conclusions remain unchanged from **EIA Report Chapter 6: Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management.** That is to say that the Revised Development would have a beneficial effect, resulting in an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on achievement of carbon budgets and targets for Scotland and a 1.5°C compatible trajectory.

7.7.2 On the basis of potential annual CO_2 savings of 128,095 t CO_2/year (based on a figure of 448t of CO_2 savings per GWh and a capacity factor of 40%), the Revised Development could result in a total carbon saving of approximately 4.5 million tonnes (Mt) over its 35-year operational life and generate electricity to annually supply the equivalent of 87,600 homes.

7.7.3 It is predicted that the carbon loss in developing the Revised Development would be paid back in ~2.3 years (~7% of of the 35-year operational life) based upon the expected outcome under the fossil fuel mix scenario. Considering the maximum scenario against the fossil fuel mix, the Revised Development would have achieved the carbon balance within ~6.1 years (~17% of the 35-year operational life).

8. Historic Environment

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This chapter has been prepared to provide further information relevant to the Eredine Wind Farm EIA Report (2024) and application to the Energy Consents Unit (ref. ECU00004517), following the receipt of stakeholder comments and the revision of the design.

8.2 Consultation

8.2.1 Historic Environment Scotland (HES) responded to the application on 19 February 2025. This chapter responds to the consultation response from HES and also takes account of the subsequent changes to the design of the Proposed Development since the application submission, including the removal of turbines T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20 and amendments to associated infrastructure. Further information on the 'Revised Development' is presented in **Chapter 2: Project Description**.

8.2.2 **Table 8.1** includes a summary of the HES comments to the application for the Proposed Development and the associated responses:

Table 8.1 Consultee Comments and Response

HES Comments	Response
HES object to the application owing to insufficient information provided in the EIA Report chapter and request additional information, noting that if this information satisfies its information requirements the objection may be removed.	The detailed information requests are addressed in this chapter. See the table entries below.
A wireframe visualisation was requested to accompany the assessment of effects detailed in the EIA Report on the Scheduled Monument An Dun fort (HA16/SM3522).	A wireframe visualisation has been produced for An Dun reflecting the Revised Development. This is presented in **Section 8.2**.
Other Scheduled Monuments scoped in: While there would be impacts to the settings of Scheduled Monuments that had been scoped into the detailed EIA Report assessment, the visualisations provided in support indicate that the impact of the Proposed Development would be below the level at which HES would object to the proposals.	This feedback is noted.
It is unclear from the information provided in EIA Report Section 9.7.8 why some of the assets were scoped out. HES believe the assets should be scoped in for further assessment, with visualisations provided to support this. These assets are as follows: ● Tom nan Clach, Cup & Ring Marked Rock 560m ENE of Hazelbank (HA15/SM3426) ● Ford, Cupmarked Rock,130m NNW of Forestry Houses (HA65/SM5709) ● Auchinellan, Cupmarked Rocks, 1150m N of (HA67/SM5516) ● Auchinellan, Cupmarked Rocks And Enclosure,1250m N of (HA68/SM5669)	Justification text for the six monuments is provided in **Section 8.3**.

- Stroneskar, Cupmarked Rock and Cairns W of (HA69/SM5710)
- Cairnbaan, Prehistoric Rock Art 230mm N & 215m NNE of Cairnbaan Hotel (HA74/SM13211)
- Ford, STtone Setting 270m SW of Ford Hotel (HA66/SM202)
- Creagantairbh Beag, Standing Stone at S end of Loch Ederline (HA70/SM194)

HES request justification text for the scoping out of a further six Scheduled Monuments.	
HES are content the methodology used in the assessment is mostly appropriate and welcome references to the EIA Handbook and Managing Change Guidance, though note that it would expect any assets not subject to a visit to be justified in text and for assessors to seek permission for access to assets where site visits for setting assessments are required, and it is not clear this was the case from information provided in the EIA Report.	This feedback is noted and will be applied in future assessments.
With reference to EIA Report Section 9.7.4 and discussion of temporal scope for the operation of the wind farm, HES note that wind farm sites are expected to be suitable for use in perpetuity and they would therefore expect the assessment to assume that operational effects would be permanent. HES note that this is taken into account in the assessment (Section 9.7.7) but that it would be helpful to confirm this in section 9.7.4 to avoid any confusion in future assessments.	This feedback is noted. The requested clarification will be applied in future assessments. All additional setting effects assessments provided in **Section 8.4** assume operational effects would be permanent.
HES noted an openness to further discussion or consultation to clarify its response and request for information.	The requests for information were sufficiently clear to act upon and we trust that the further information provided in this chapter addresses HES's comments.

8.3 Assets Scoped Out of Further Assessment

8.3.1 The designated heritage assets set out in **Table 8-2** were not taken forward for further assessment in EIA Report Chapter 9. In response to HES' request for additional information, justification in the case of each asset is provided in **Table 8-2**.

Table 8.2 Assets not taken forward for further assessment, with justification text

EIA Report Asset reference	HES asset reference	Name	Justification
HA72	SM198	Dunamuck cairn and two standing stones 460m ENE of	This Scheduled Monument comprising a burial cairn and standing stones is located 16.8km south-west of the closest proposed turbine position (T19) outwith the blade tip ZTV . The monument is sited in a pastoral field overlooking the River Add. The primary, north-south routeway through Kilmartin Glen contributes to the monument's character and highlights the importance on the Glen as a historic landscape, characterised by local topography as defining the outer boundary of the landscape-as-perceived. The Revised Development is considered unlikely to result in a significant effect on this asset, owing to lack of visibility

			(i.e. the monument is no longer within the blade tip ZTV).
HA73	SM11053	Dunamuck, chambered cairn 350m SSE of	This Scheduled Monument comprises a Neolithic-Bronze Age burial cairn located 17.3km south-west of the closest turbine position (T19), with a pastoral field. The monument's location at the lower extents of a north-facing slope within Kilmartin Glen orients outward views northward along the A816 road, characterising the landform component of the monument's setting with the valley floor, bounded by rising topography on the east and west. The Revised Development is considered unlikely to result in a significant effect, owing to lack of visibility (i.e. the monument is no lnger within the blade tip ZTV).
HA75	SM187	Carnasserie, two standing stones 500m SW of	These scheduled standing stones are located 13.5km west of the closest proposed turbine (T22) in a blade tip ZTV for 1-4 turbines. The stones' hillside location orients views to the east and north-east in the short-medium distance to the Kilmartin Glen valley floor and tributary watercourse to the Kilmartin Burn. The presence of turbines in long distance views, behind the ridgelines on the eastern side of Kilmartin Glen, is not considered to have a significant effect on the importance of this monument via setting.
HA76	SM186	Carnasserie Castle, cairn 550m WSW of	This scheduled Neolithic-Bronze Age cairn is located 13.8km south—west of the closest turbine (T22), located in a blade tip zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) for 9-12 turbines. The cairn's position overlooking the floor of Kilmartin Glen Valley from the west characterises this monument's setting. The presence of turbines in long distance views, behind the ridgelines on the eastern side of Kilmartin Glen is not considered to have a significant effect on the importance of this monument via setting.
HA77	SM201	Dun mac Samhainn, cairn	Dun mac Samhainn cairn Scheduled Monument is located 14.2km west of the closest proposed turbine (T22), in a wooded area within a blade tip ZTV for 13-17 turbines. The cairn's position overlooking the valley floor in Kilmartin Glen to the east characterises the monument's setting through these views, with the sense of place associated with Kilmartin Glen bounded by ridgelines to the east and north-east. This would not be disrupted by the addition of turbine blade tips in long-distance views to the north-east behind ridgelines, and it is not considered that this would result in a significant effect on the importance of this monument via setting.
HA79	SM211	Lady's Seat, cairn 420m WNW of Ballygowan	This Scheduled Monument is a prehistoric burial cairn located 16.7km south-west of the closest turbine (T22) on an east-facing hillside within a wooded area within a blade tip ZTV for 1-4 turbines. The positioning of the cairn orients outward views east and south-east toward the valley floor. This heightened position and orientation relative to middle-distance topography characterises the setting of the cairn. These key elements of setting would not be disrupted by the addition of turbine blade tips in long-distance views to the north-east behind ridgelines. Consequently, it is not

considered that this would result in a significant effect on the importance of this monument via setting.

8.4 Assessment Methodology

8.4.1 The methodology applied to the assessment of effects on the below heritage assets is as applied in the **EIA Report Section 9.9: Assessment Methodology,** and shown **in EIA Report Figure 9.1**. No new potentially significant effects have been noted in association with the Construction Phase of the Revised Development and the assessments below are concerned with impacts during the operation of the Revised Development, via the addition of modern power generation infrastructure within the existing landscape occupied by these assets.

An Dun Fort (HA16 SM3522) Visualisation

8.4.2 As requested by HES, a wireframe visualisation has been produced for outward views from An Dun Fort and accompanies this chapter. Note that all wireframe visualisations presented use a colour-coding scheme to distinguish between the Revised Development and other wind farms considered for cumulative effects: Turbines and associated numbering in blue denote the Revised Development, black turbines reflect existing wind farms, green turbines reflect consented wind farms and amber turbines reflect wind farms at application stage.

8.4.3 The assessment of setting effects with respect to An Dun Fort remains unchanged; **no significant** effects are predicted.

8.5 Additional Assessment of Effects

Tom Nan Clach, Cup & Ring Marked Rock 560m ENE of Hazelbank (HA15/SM3426)

Importance and Present Setting

8.5.1 The Tom nan Clach cup & ring-marked rock is a Scheduled Monument located 8.6km south-east of the nearest turbine (T1) comprising prehistoric rock art carved on an area of outcropping bedrock. The carvings include two cups, each with two accompanying rings, a further eight cups with one associated ring each, and over 20 other cups. No secure date has been provided for the carved panel, but the rock art was likely created in the early prehistoric period, between about 3500 BC and 1800 BC. A site visit to the monument in 2012 noted the exposed area of rock measured about 4m north-south by 3m transverse, with potential for additional carvings noted on parts of the rock that remain below ground level. Most of the carvings are quite deep but rather weathered, which suggests additional rings may once have been present. The largest visible cup and ring motif has a diameter of 0.28m, with the cup being about 50mm deep. There is also a long groove that may be a man-made feature. The carvings occur in a row, aligned approximately north-east to south-west, running roughly parallel to the rock strata.

8.5.2 The present setting of this monument is characterised by its proximity to Loch Fyne and elevated location. The monument is located at 110m above sea level on relatively flat ground, part way up steep west-facing slopes that rise above the east shore of Loch Fyne, which is 450m to the north-west. The rock outcrop is now located in a forestry plantation, but there were probably long views across Loch Fyne to the north and south-west from this site when the art was carved. This setting and character contribute to the National

Importance of the monument through associative and contextual characteristics. Associative characteristics include the monument's enhancement of the natural landscape and particular attractiveness of the carvings when viewed in low evening sunlight. Contextual characteristics include the monument's connection to regional examples of this particular type of non-figurative rock art and the proximity of the Achnagoul chambered cairns, potentially contemporary features forming part of a shared prehistoric landscape, at around the same height above sea-level on the opposite side of Loch Fyne, 4km west/north-west of the monument.

Change to Setting

8.5.3 The Tom nan Clach cup & ring-marked rock Scheduled Monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 5-8 turbines, with the uphill approach from the A815 at Ardnagowan providing theoretical visibility for 1-4 turbine blade tips. The proposed turbines would appear as visibly modern, utilitarian features in far distance views (over 8.6km) to the west and north-west on the opposite side of Loch Fyne, within a context of mountainous ridgelines and intermittent tree cover.

8.5.4 A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.2.** Viewed outward from the centre of the monument in the bare earth visualisation, the seven visible turbines would largely appear as blade tips appearing behind the ridgeline, with the exception of turbines T2 and T19 which may be exposed to hub height.

Significance of Effect

8.5.5 The addition of the proposed turbine array in long-distance views would largely, in effect, be beyond the visual edge of Loch Fyne and the surrounding topography characterising the near-medium distance views of the monument. The existence of modern, utilitarian infrastructure within these views would be overt, but the visual relationship with the opposite side of Loch Fyne would be preserved and the integrity of the monument's setting through association with the immediate surrounding natural landscape and low evening sunlight would not be compromised. The Revised Development would therefore result in a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. While the turbines' presence in outward views from the asset would be clear, the effect would be **Not Significant** as, as illustrated in **Figure 8.2**, this presence would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations, as experienced from the carved outcrop.

Ford, Cupmarked Rock,130m NNW of Forestry Houses (HA65/SM5709)

Importance And Present Setting

8.5.6 The Ford, cup-marked rock, is a Scheduled Monument located 9.8km west of T22, comprising prehistoric rock art carvings on an area of outcropping bedrock adjacent to a forestry track. The rock outcrop measures 22m from north-east to south-west by 5.5m transverse. The scheduling record notes two cup-marks surrounded by two and three rings respectively at the south-west of the outcrop, with most of the remainder covered with moss and vegetation, which may obscure further examples of panel carvings. Reports in the early 1960s stated that cup and cup-and-ring markings extend over the entire surface of the rock outcrop in two main groups. A visit to the monument as part of the Scotland's Rock Art Project in 2019 divided the carved outcrop into two panels: Ford 7a (the outcrop referenced in the scheduling record) and Ford 7b (a further exposed area on the same outcrop, 10m to the south of 7a). In the case of 7a, the following carvings

were recorded: ten cupmarks, some of which may have a single or partial ring, and four cups with two rings each, forming a rough alignment with some outer rings intersecting along a raised ridge running through the centre of the panel. Other cupmarks are recorded to the north and east of the cup and ring carvings. The carvings on 7a are noted as being heavily weathered and difficult to see. In the case of 7b, carvings consist of one cup with three rings, one cup with one ring, and two cupmarks, one of which is clearer than the other.

8.5.7 The present setting of this monument is characterised by its prominent location on a hillside slope overlooking a tributary of the River Ford with open views to the south, west and east and south-east over the village of Ford. Further, the monument is located in close proximity to carved panels at Auchinellan to the west and north-west (HA67/SM5516, HA68/SM5669) and cairn at Ford (HA64/SM5442), though these features are not perceptible in outward views from this monument. The monument's setting contributes to its national importance through its associative and contextual characteristics, relating to the landform and contemporary monuments respectively.

Change to Setting

8.5.8 The monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 5-8 turbines. The proposed turbines would appear as visibly modern, utilitarian features in far distance views 9.8km to the south-east, on the opposite side of Loch Awe, within a context of undulating hills and ridgelines with intermittent tree cover.

8.5.9 A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.3**, showing six turbines would be visible from the monument. Viewed outward from the centre of the monument in the bare earth visualisation, three of the six visible turbines (T9, T14 and T13) would be visible beyond largely obscured blade-tips and all turbines would be visually separated from the immediate landscape context of the monument.

Significance of Effect

8.5.10 The addition of the proposed turbine array in long-distance views to the south-east would largely, in effect, be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by intervening, undulating topography. The existence of modern, utilitarian infrastructure within these views would be clear in the case of three turbine positions (T9, T14 and T13), but the sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings would be largely unchanged and the integrity of the monument's setting through association with the surrounding natural landscape and nearby contemporary monuments would not be compromised. The Revised Development would therefore result in a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. While the turbines' presence in outward views from the asset would be perceptible, the effect would be **Not Significant**, as this presence would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations as experienced from the carved outcrops as illustrated in **Figure 8.3**.

Auchnellan, Cupmarked Rocks 1150m of (HA67/ SM5516)

Importance And Present Setting

8.5.11 Auchinellan, cupmarked rocks is a Scheduled Monument centred 10.1km west of T22, comprising two cupmarked rocks and an enclosure in open moorland north of the village of Ford. The scheduled areas cover three discrete areas, positioned around a rocky knoll. The first is a boulder on the west flank of the knoll with eight plain cupmarks. The second

scheduled area, a rock outcrop on the north side of the knoll with one cup with two rings; five cups with single rings; one dumb-bell; and six plain cups. The eastern scheduled area is a second outcrop to the north-east of the knoll, with two plain cupmarks on its upper surface.

8.5.12 The monument's national importance derives from the carved panels' status as examples of a group of similar and related monuments in the vicinity of the southern end of Loch Awe and associated potential to provide information about later Neolithic and Bronze Age activity. The monuments display a similar range and density to better known examples in Kilmartin Glen. The present setting is characterised by the panels' location within an area of relatively high ground, in a sheltered valley with topography rising to the north-east, north and north-west, overlooking Ford village to the south-east. This setting contributes to the monument's importance chiefly through the proximity of contemporary monuments (HA68/SM5669, HA65/SM5709) and features.

Change To Setting

8.5.13 The monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 9-12 turbines. The proposed turbines would appear as visibly modern, utilitarian features in far distance views to the south-east, within a context of undulating hills and ridgelines with intermittent tree cover.

8.5.14 A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.4**. Viewed outward from the centre of the monument in the bare earth visualisation, ten turbines would be visible with three (T9, T14 and T13) potentially visible to hub height. The turbines would be visually separated from the immediate landscape context of the monument, due to intervening topography over the 10.1 km distance.

Significance Of Effect

8.5.15 The addition of the proposed turbine array in long-distance views from 10.1km to the south-east would largely be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by distance and rising topography. The existence of modern, utilitarian infrastructure within these views would be clear in the case of three turbine positions (T9, T14 and T13) as illustrated in **Figure 8.4**, but the current sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings would be largely unchanged and the integrity of the its setting through association with the surrounding natural landscape and nearby contemporary monuments would not be compromised. The Revised Development would therefore result in a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. While the turbines' presence in outward views from the asset would be perceptible, the effect would be **Not Significant**, as this presence would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations as experienced from the carved outcrops.

AUCHINELLAN, CUPMARKED ROCKS AND ENCLOSURE,1250M N OF (HA68/SM5669)

Importance And Present Setting

8.5.16 This asset is a Scheduled Monument located 10km west of T22, comprising two cupmarked rocks and an enclosure situated in open moorland north of Ford village. The enclosure is considered to be a surviving remnant of a prehistoric settlement. This structure is roughly circular in plan, measuring 17m in diameter within a stone revetted bank 1.5m in thickness and 0.5m in height. Considerable numbers of outer facing stones are visible, particularly on the west, but only two stones of the inner face can be identified.

The enclosure entrance was likely located on the north-east, though this is not certain. Three sides of a recent turf-and-stone walled building are visible in the enclosure's interior, with a fourth side having been robbed to provide stone for a nearby wall. A prostrate slab is located 3m north-east of the enclosure, with a faint cup-and-ring mark at its south-west extent. A carved boulder measuring 2.4 by 1.1m featuring eight plain cup-marks and two dumb-bells on its upper surface, is located 35m west of the enclosure.

8.5.17 This monument's setting is characterised by rising topography to the north-east, west and north-west, open views toward Ford village to the south-east and the proximity of nearby similar and contemporary features, including other rock art carvings (HA67/SM5516, HA65/SM5709) though the lack of immediate perceptibility of these carvings beyond a close distance makes intervisibility unclear. The monument's national importance derives from potential for the enclosure to provide information about prehistoric/early historic settlement in the area and the carvings forming part of a notable concentration of similar and related monuments around Ford and the Kilmartin area.

Change To Setting

8.5.18 The monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 9-12 turbines. The proposed turbines would appear as visibly modern, utilitarian features in far distance views,10km to the south-east on the opposite side of Loch Awe, within a context of undulating hills and ridgelines with intermittent tree cover.

8.5.19 A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.5**. Viewed outward from the centre of the monument in the bare earth visualisation, three of the ten visible turbines (T9, T14 and T13) would be visible beyond largely obscured blade-tips and all turbines would be visually separated from the immediate landscape context of the monument.

Significance Of Effect

8.5.20 The addition of the proposed turbine array in long-distance views to the south-east would largely, in effect, be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by rising topography. The existence of modern, utilitarian infrastructure within these views would be more overt in the case of three turbine positions (T9, T14 and T13) as illustrated in **Figure 8.5**, but the sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings would be largely unchanged and the integrity of the monument's setting through association with the surrounding natural landscape and nearby contemporary monuments would not be compromised. The Revised Development would therefore result in a a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. While the turbines' presence in outward views from the asset would be perceptible, the effect would be **Not Significant**, as this presence would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations as experienced from the carvings or enclosure structure.

Strokenskar, Cupmarked Rock and Cairns W of (HA69/SM5710)

Importance and Present Setting

8.5.21 This Scheduled Monument, located 10.7km south-west of T22, comprises three burial cairns and a cupmarked rock situated in an area of rough pasture on the south side of a public road from Glennan to Stroneskar, opposite a farmstead named Tigh a'Charnain. The westernmost cairn is situated on a rise 100m south-west of the farmstead and 150m east of the scheduled Creagantairbh Beag (HA70/SM194) standing stone. This cairn has

been reduced by robbing to a spread of stone about 15m in diameter and up to 0.3m in height, to which field clearance has been added. The central cairn of the group is also heavily robbed. It is situated on the crest of a slight rise 70m east of the farmstead and about 170m north-east of the above cairn. It measures about 31m in diameter and up to 0.6m in height. The northern side has been clipped by a road, and field-cleared stones have been dumped elsewhere on it. The easternmost cairn is situated 500m east/north-east of the farmstead on a flat-topped ridge. The grass-covered stony mound measures 13m in diameter and 0.4m in height.

8.5.22 The monument's national importance derives from the potential of each element to provide information about Bronze Age ritual and social practices. Each of the cairns has the potential to provide environmental data which may contribute to a reconstruction of the contemporary landscape and environment. The cairns and the cupmarking are also important because of their relationship with a cluster of similar related monuments which are to be found in the area of Kilmartin.

8.5.23 The monument's setting is characterised by open outward views from the constituent features, the presence of Lochan Ceann a'Choin in views to the north-east, rising topography in the middle distance to the north, north-west and south, rising topography from 1.5km to the north-east and the close proximity of a modern track and farmstead. The situation of the monument's constituent features in proximity to contemporary and related monuments (HA70/SM194), though intervisibility is not clear, and relatively open outward views make a positive contribution to its importance.

Change to Setting

8.5.24 The central scheduled cairn is located within a blade tip ZTV for 1-4 turbines. A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.6**. Viewed outward from the centre of the cairn in the bare earth visualisation, one turbine blade tip (T22) would be partly visible behind a ridgeline in the far distance, 10.7km to the north-east.

Significance Of Effect

8.5.25 The addition of the partially visible T22 blade tip in long-distance views 10.7km to the north-east, when perceptible, would be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by rising topography as illustrated in **Figure 8.6**. The sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings would be largely unchanged and the integrity of its setting through association with the surrounding natural landscape and nearby contemporary monuments would not be compromised. The Revised Development would therefore result in a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. The effect would be **Not Significant**, as the presence of a turbine blade tip in long-distance views outward would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations as experienced from the cairn.

CAIRNBAAN, PREHISTORIC ROCK ART 230M N & 215M NNE OF CAIRNBAAN HOTEL (HA74/SM13211)

Importance and Present Setting

8.5.26 This Scheduled Monument located 18.3km south-west of T19, comprises prehistoric rock art carved onto two areas of outcropping bedrock. The monument is located on high ground, 60m above sea level partway up hillsides that form the western side of the Badden Burn valley. The rock outcrops form two groups, which differ in style. The easternmost comprises three substantial outcrops, adjacent to each other and now

enclosed by metal railings. The largest decorated rock panel measures approximately 8m by 2m. It is decorated with a pair of cups surrounded by three partial rings, one cup with two rings, three cups within a single ring, sixteen single cups with single rings, at least sixty plain cups, and several lengths of grooving. A particular feature of this panel is the long gutters that run downslope from seven of the cups at the south end of the outcrop. The other two outcrops measure 3.5m by 2m and 2.6m by 2m. Their carvings comprise mainly plain cupmarks: six on the outcrop towards the centre of the enclosure; and three cups with double rings and six plain cups on the outcrop at the north-west of the enclosure. The panel located around 100m to the west measures 2m by 3m and is not enclosed by railings. It is decorated with a complex series of markings, the most distinctive of which are a number of conjoined multiple-ringed cups. Six of these are surrounded by four rings, one by three rings, seven by two rings, and eight by single rings; several of the ringed cups have gutters. There are also at least fifteen plain cups and stretches of wandering grooves. At the bottom right of the outcrop is a badly weathered, unusual carving, consisting of a broad shallow cup surrounded by a single ring, which is linked to the cup by a series of rays.

8.5.27 The monument's national importance derives from the variety of carved motifs and relative complexity of the carving collection, its association with similar and contemporary monuments in mid-Argyll, including Achnabreck 1.6km east of the eastern outcrop (SM12957, SM900006), in addition to the potential for further evidence of contemporary rock art in the area immediately surrounding the exposed outcrops. The setting of the monument is characterised by the outcrops' position overlooking the valley floor to the east, the surrounding pastoral and managed woodland land-use, the presence of prehistoric monuments including other rock carvings further north in Kilmartin Glen and the burial cairn of Carn Ban (SM13211), 330m south of the eastern outcrop. The association of prehistoric rock art and its position in the landscape results in the setting making a major contribution to the importance of this and similar monuments, inclusive of lighting conditions in addition to topography and land-use: The carvings at this monument are considered best-appreciated in low evening sunlight.

Change To Setting

8.5.28 The monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 1-4 turbines. Two of the proposed turbines would appear as visibly modern, utilitarian features in far distance views 17km to the north-east, beyond ridgelines on the opposite side of the valley, within a context of undulating hills and ridgelines with intermittent tree cover.

8.5.29 A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.7**. Viewed outward from the centre of the eastern outcrop in the bare earth visualisation, the two turbines (T13 and T19) would be visible as blade tips obscured by topography.

Significance Of Effect

8.5.30 The addition of the proposed turbine array in long-distance views 17km to the north-east would be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by rising topography in the intervening distance, with the two visible turbines appearing as blade tips behind the ridgeline as illustrated in **Figure 8.7**. The sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings would be largely unchanged and the integrity of its setting through association with the surrounding natural landscape and nearby contemporary monuments would not be compromised, with evening lighting conditions unchanged. The Revised Development would therefore result in a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. While the turbines' presence in outward views from the asset would be perceptible, the effect would be **Not**

Significant, as this presence would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations as experienced from the carved outcrops.

FORD, STONE SETTING 270M SW OF FORD HOTEL (HA66/SM202)

Importance and Present Setting

8.5.31 This Scheduled Monument is located 9.9km west of T22 in a pastoral field, comprising a surviving standing stone of two originally in situ. The stone measures 0.7m by 0.55m at the base and rises with straight sides to a flat top at a height of 3m. The original pairing of stones was thought to mark the "site of an ancient grave" as per the Ordnance Survey record entry (NM865026), with the second stone having been removed to Auchinellan House.

8.5.32 This monument's national importance is derived from its status as one of a group of standing stones and settings in Mid-Argyll, including several in the vicinity of Ford. Additionally, the monument has potential to provide information about Bronze Age social and ritual practice including, potentially, astronomical observations. The contribution of setting to this importance is chiefly through the monument's proximity to similar or contemporary monuments and its position set back from and slightly overlooking the valley floor associated with the Ford River, Loch a'Choire and Loch Ederline to the east.

Change to Setting

8.5.33 The monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 1-4 turbines. A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.8**. Viewed outward from the centre of the monument in the bare earth visualisation, four turbines (T9, T13, T14 and T22) would be visible as blade tips intermittently emerging from behind a ridgeline in the far distance, from 9.9km to the east.

Significance of Effect

8.5.34 The addition of the turbine blade tips in long-distance views 9.9km to the east would be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by rising topography as illustrated in **Figure 8.8**. The spatial relationship between the standing stone and its localised topography would be largely unchanged and the sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings maintained. The Revised Development would therefore result in a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, producing a minor adverse effect. While the turbines' presence in outward views from the asset would be perceptible, the effect would be **Not Significant**.

CREAGANTAIRBH BEAG, STANDING STONE AT S END OF LOCH EDERLINE (HA70/SM194)

Importance and Present Setting

8.5.35 This Scheduled Monument is located 11km west of T22 in a pastoral field on the eastern side of the public B840 road, and consists of a broken standing stone. The stone stump is aligned east-west and measures 1.4m by 0.5m at the base and rises to a height of 1.8m. The broken portion of the stone, blown down in the late 19th century, sits immediately to the east of the stone stump and indicates an intact height of 5m.

8.5.36 The monument's national importance is derived from potential for the feature to yield evidence of Bronze Age social and ritual practice, inclusive of astronomical observances, and its potential association with the three burial cairns at Stroneskar to the east. The setting of this monument is characterised by its roadside location in a valley floor, surrounding pastoral land use with intermittent mature tree cover, rising topography to the east, west and south in the middle distance and to the north in the far distance. With the exception of visible modern farm and transport structures in close proximity, this setting makes a positive contribution to the importance of the monument.

Change to Setting

8.5.37 The monument is located within a blade tip ZTV for 1-4 turbines. A wireframe for outward views from this heritage asset is presented in **Figure 8.9**. Viewed outward from the centre of the monument in the bare earth visualisation, the proposed turbine would mostly be completely obscured with one (T22) appearing as blade tips behind a ridgeline in the far distance, 11km to the north-east.

Significance Of Effect

8.5.38 The addition of the T22 blade tips in long-distance views 11km to the north-east would largely, in effect, be visually separated from the legible landscape context of the monument by rising topography and otherwise affected by any intervening vegetation. The existence of modern, utilitarian infrastructure within these views would not tangibly affect the sense of place associated with the monument's surroundings as outward views from the monument are largely framed by the rising topography of the valley in which it is located and effectively oriented along the road alignment, as shown in **Figure 8.9**. The Revised Development would therefore have a negligible magnitude of change on a heritage asset of high sensitivity, resulting in a minor adverse effect. While the presence of T22 blade tips in outward views from the asset would be perceptible, the effect would be **Not Significant**, as this presence would not detract from or disrupt the key landscape associations as experienced from the carved outcrops.

8.6 Conclusions

8.6.1 This assessment has found **no significant** effects on the heritage assets assessed as a result of the operation of the Revised Development. (and no effects associated with the Construction Phase, as noted in **Chapter 2 of the FEI Report**).

8.6.2 The assessment within the EIA Report stated that the cumulative effects arising from the addition of the Revised Development to a baseline including other operational, consented or submitted schemes would be of insufficient magnitude to give rise to a significant effect. The wind farms that could contribute to cumulative indirect effects on the historic environment considered within the EIA Report have not changed and none of the assets assessed in this chapter have been identified as potential receptors for significant cumulative effects.

9. Further Considerations

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 **Chapters 3 - 7** capture the environmental topics that are most pertinent to the design changes to the Proposed Development. The environmental topics which were less influential in driving the design changes, or where these result in little change to the magnitude of impacts presented in the EIA Report (2024) are captured in this chapter.

9.1.2 Responses to consultee comments are summarised in **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments**.

9.2 Forestry

9.2.1 Advanced felling is required to create adequate space for the footprint of the Revised Development. The total felling required to accommodate construction of the Revised Development totals 192.3 ha.

9.2.2 The Baseline Restocking Plan has been amended to integrate the Revised Development infrastructure requirements into the forest design and to take account of the site conditions. The changes in the structure of the woodlands due to the Revised Development can be summarised as follows:

- there would be a net reduction in the area of conifer woodland of 91.9 ha (mixed conifer, Sitka spruce and Sitka spruce/open ground combined);
- broadleaf woodland would decrease by 0.3 ha;
- open ground as part of the forest design would decrease by 3.8 ha;
- Long term wind farm permanent open ground would total 96.0 ha; and
- the net reduction in stocked woodland area within the FSA would be 93.9 ha equivalent to 1.0% of the FSA.

9.2.3 When comparing the Revised Development and the Proposed Development, the stocked woodland area decreases by 11.4ha and there is a corresponding increase in the unstocked woodland area. This is due to various changes to the infrastructure layout.

9.2.4 Areas of broadleaf planting could be undertaken as part of a Habitat Management Plan, in suitably identified areas (see **Appendix 6D: Outline Habitat Management Plan** for the proposals), these plans are separate to the Wind Farm Forest Plan.

9.2.5 To comply with the criteria of the Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy, compensation planting is required. The Applicant is committed to providing appropriate compensatory planting. The extent, location and composition of such planting is to be agreed with Scottish Forestry, taking into account any revision to the felling and restocking plans prior to the commencement of construction of the Revised Development.

9.2.6 Further information can be found in **FEI Report Appendix 2A: Forestry Assessment** of this FEI Report.

9.3 Noise

9.3.1 No significant noise effects were expected during the construction and decommissioning phases, and no specific mitigation was required with regard to construction noise. However, general guidance for controlling construction noise is given in BS 5228 1:2009+A1:2014, as well as an example planning condition outlining appropriate compliance (**EIA Report Appendix 7B**).

9.3.2 No significant noise effects have been identified based on the candidate turbines utilised for this assessment and therefore the Proposed Development is considered acceptable in terms of the operational noise.

9.3.3 As the Revised Development has less turbines and the amount of track is correspondingly reduced, this will potentially reduce the magnitude of change with respect to noise; though worst case, it would be unchanged. As such, **no significant** effects are predicted for the Revised Development.

9.4 Transport

9.4.1 Following traffic surveys and assessment, the EIA Report (2024) identified eight sections of the A83 which were deemed to have a magnitude of change from negligible to low. This was therefore deemed not significant.

9.4.2 Reducing the number of turbines will reduce the amount of HGV and abnormal loads traffic utilising the road network. This will therefore result in a reduction in the magnitude of change and effects would remain **Not Significant**.

9.4.3 Responses to consultee comments in relation to Transport are provided in **Appendix 1A: Response to Consultee Comments**.

9.5 Aviation

9.5.1 An aviation lighting strategy prepared by Wind Power Aviation Consultants (WPAC) was included in the EIA Report (2024). The lighting arrangement combined Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) approved Air Navigation Order (ANO) visible lighting and Ministry of Defence (MoD) infra-red (IR) lighting. The resulting lighting strategy would therefore involve visible ANO lighting on thirteen turbines and IR lights on all turbines. ANO lighting produces medium intensity red light which is visible to the naked eye but is not visible to pilots flying on Night Vision Goggles (NVG). In contrast, the MoD compliant IR lighting is invisible to the human eye, but highly visible to pilots using NVG.

9.5.2 One turbine (T1) is marginally visible to Lowther Hill radar, but as this is within the margin of error of the digital terrain model and at a distance of almost 130km it was considered that this impact is not significant.

9.5.3 Following implementation of mitigation through design and best practice and the mitigation measures identified above, it is considered that there would be no significant effects on aviation interests.

9.5.4 An updated lighting strategy for the Revised Development is provided in **Appendix 9A: Revised Lighting Strategy**, which has been used to inform the Landscape and Visual assessment in **Chapter 4** of the FEI Report. The reduction in turbines will not alter the assessment outcome set out in the EIA Report (2024) and **no significant** effects are predicted.

9.6 Socio-economics and Tourism

9.6.1 No significant effects were reported in the EIA Report (2024) in respect of the Labour Market and Tourism and Recreation receptors during construction. This was mainly due to the short-term nature of the Proposed Development construction. Any impacts on the economy or on recreational or tourism receptors during operation and decommissioning were expected to be lower than during the construction phase.

9.6.2 A minor to moderate beneficial residual effect for the Labour Market was predicted, though due to the short-term nature of the construction of the Proposed Development, this was deemed as Not Significant.

9.6.3 The Revised Development has will lead to a slight reduction in construction expenditure and effects will remain **Not Significant**. Effects on Tourism and Recreation also remain **Not Significant** (further information of visual effects in relation to Public Rights of Way can be found in **Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual** of this FEI Report).

9.7 Infrastructure and Other Issues

9.7.1 No significant residual effects were reported in the EIA Report (2024) for either Utility Infrastructure, Telecommunications or to Population and Human Health.

9.7.2 The nearest utilities are located over 750m away from the nearest turbine (T18), and approximately 480m from the closet infrastructure asset associated with the Proposed Development – a borrow pit search area. Construction works were not anticipated to encroach on any existing utilities.

9.7.3 It was deemed unlikely that any telecommunications assets would be affected by the Proposed Development, especially following implementation of mitigation measures such as monitoring any interference (within the first 12 months via individual claims).

9.7.4 Noise (Chapter 7 of the EIA Report), Landscape and Visual (Chapter 8 of the EIA Report), and Traffic and Transport (Chapter 13 of the EIA Report) did not predict any significant effects in relation to Population and Human Health.

9.7.5 As T18 is retained for the Revised Development, the distance between construction works for the Revised Development and existing utilities remains unchanged. Therefore, conclusions presented in the EIA Report (2024) remain accurate and **no significant** effects are expected.

10. Summary of Effects

10.1.1 This FEI Report has been developed to address a number of observations set out in consultee comments. The report has further taken consideration of the revisions to the Proposed Development, namely the removal of turbines T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20, as well as changes to related infrastructure, as described in **Chapter 2** of this FEI Report .

10.1.2 **Table 10.1** illustrates the summary of the predicted effects presented in the EIA Report (2024) alongside the predicted changes in effects as a result of the revisions to the Proposed Development.

10.1.3 All effects assessed as not significant in the EIA Report remain **Not Significant** in this FEI Report.

10.1.4 The following adverse effects assessed as significant in the EIA Report remain **Significant** as reported in this FEI Report:

- Significant effects on part of the Craggy Upland and adjacent Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic landscapes, affecting a local area within approximately 2km of the proposed turbine;
- Significant visual and cumulative effects on the views from parts of Dalavich;
- Significant visual effects from transport routes, B840, minor road along western shore of Loch Awe (C29 and C30);
- Significant visual effects from parts of recreational routes Core Path C119 (b-c): Braevallich, Loch Awe to Furnace / Scottish Hill Track 104, Core Path C305: Dalavich to Barnaline Lodge, Core Paths C486 – Dun Dubh, Ford, and Scottish hill track 105 / 106 Furnace to Ford / Kilmichael Glassary; and
- Significant effect on the views from offshore recreational receptors on parts of Loch Awe.

10.1.5 The following adverse effects assessed as Significant in the EIA Report have been revised to **Not Significant** as a result of the amendments to the layout of the Proposed Development:

- visual effects from transport routes A886 and B8000; and
- Effect on the views from offshore recreational receptors on parts of Loch Fyne.

10.1.6 No additional significant effects on environmental receptors have been identified, as a result of the Revised Development.

10.1.7 Proposed mitigation measures set out in the EIA Report (2024) remain unchanged.

Table 10.1 Summary of Effects

EIA Report Chapter / Section	Project Stage	Original Effect as per the Eredine EIA Report (2024)	Significance (2024)	Change as a result of Revised Development, FEI Report (2025)	Updated Significance (2025)
Chapter 6 - Renewable Energy, Carbon Balance and Peat Management	Operational	GHG impact of the Proposed Development would have a **beneficial effect.** The Proposed Development causes an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on achievement of carbon budgets and targets for Scotland and the UK, and a 1.5°C compatible trajectory.	**Not Significant**	No Change. The removal of five turbines would result in reduced GHG emissions saving but the overall effect remains beneficial.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 7 - Noise	Construction and Decommissioning	**No significant** noise effects are expected during the construction and decommissioning phases, and no specific mitigation is required with regard to construction noise. However, general guidance for controlling construction noise is given in BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014. For more details, refer to the Eredine Wind Farm EIA Report (2024).	**Not Significant**	No change in effect predicted. The removal of five turbines would reduce the overall noise levels. As significant effects were not predicted for the Proposed Development, noise modelling has not been undertaken for the Revised Development.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 7 - Noise	Operational	**No significant** noise effects have been identified based on the candidate turbines utilised for this assessment and therefore the Proposed Development should be considered acceptable in terms of the operational noise	**Not Significant**	No change in effect predicted. The removal of five turbines would reduce the overall noise levels. As significant effects were not predicted for the Proposed Development, noise modelling has not been undertaken for the Revised Development.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant effects** on part of the Craggy Upland and adjacent Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic landscapes, affecting a local area within approximately 2km of the proposed turbine.	**Significant**	**Significant** and localised landscape effects (including cumulative effects) would affect part of the 'host' Craggy Upland LCT and part of the AGC 6a – Loch Fyne Upland Forest Moor Mosaic LCT. Both of these effects would be reduced in comparison with the previous assessment for the Proposed Development due to the reduced number of turbines.	**Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant visual and cumulative effects** on the views from parts of Dalavich	**Significant**	The Revised Development would result in **significant visual effects** on the views from parts of one settlement at Dalavich (reflecting no change from the previous assessment of the Proposed Development in this case). The revised cumulative assessment also confirms significant cumulative effects on views from parts of Dalavich as a result of the consented Blarghour Wind Farm the An Carr Dubh application and the Revised Development.	**Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant visual effects** from transport routes, B840, minor road along western shore of Loch Awe (C29 and C30)	**Significant**	There would remain localised and **significant visual effects** on the views from two transport routes, as follows: • Up to approximately 1km of the B840 in oblique inland views at Durran for northbound and southbound users; and • The minor road along western shore of Loch Awe (C29 and C30) (overlapping with the Caledonia Way and Core Path C173 (a-d) Ford to Annat via Loch Avich and Inverinan) for ~4.6km where there would be glimpsed open views at Kilmun and between Dalavich and Acrihamish (subject to intermittent screening from vegetation and local landform).	**Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant visual effects** from transport routes A886 and B8000.	**Significant**	The views from the A886 and B8000 would **no longer be significantly** affected due to the reduction in turbine numbers.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant visual effects** from recreational routes Core Paths C119 (b-c), C305, C486 and Scottish Hill Track Right of Way 105 / 106 Furnace to Ford / Kilmichael Glassary	**Significant**	**Significant visual effects** would remain from parts of the following four recreational routes: • Core Path C119 (b-c): Braevallich, Loch Awe to Furnace / Scottish Hill Track 104. This route passes through the Development Site; • Core Path C305: Dalavich to Barnaline Lodge; • Core Paths C486 – Dun Dubh, Ford; and • Scottish hill track 105 / 106 Furnace to Ford / Kilmichael Glassary.	**Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**No significant visual effects** from Loch Lomond and Cowal Way and Core Path C220 (a-b) Strachur Village Back Road.	**Not Significant**	There would be a reduction in the level of effect on the following two routes as a result of the Revised Development: • Loch Lomond and Cowal Way – reduced from Moderate to No View (Proposed Development), to Minor to No View and **not significant** (Revised Development). This is due to the reduction in turbines visible from this route and particularly the removal of T11 from the views near Strachur which is the closest point on the route to the Revised Development. Core Path C220 (a-b) Strachur Village Back Road - reduced from Moderate to No View (Proposed Development), to Minor to No View and **not significant** (Revised Development). This is due to the reduction in turbines visible from this route and particularly the removal of T11.	**Not Significant**

Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant effect** on the views from offshore recreational receptors on parts of Loch Awe.	**Significant**	The revised LVIA notes **no change** to the previous EIA Report which considered recreational activity on and along the length of the Loch Awe, both from single locations (fishermen) and as part of a sequence (people on watercraft / paddlers). These receptors would be focused on the main activity, with an appreciation of the landscape occurring as a secondary interest. Nonetheless, the revised LVIA confirms that the Revised Development would have a **significant effect** on the views from recreational receptors on Loch Awe.	**Significant**
Chapter 8- Landscape and Visual	Operational	**Significant effect** on the views from offshore recreational receptors on parts of Loch Fyne	**Significant**	The removal of the five turbines in the south and south-east of the Development Site (T3, T5, T7, T11 and T20), as recommended by NS, has resulted in a reduction in visual effects (some from significant to **not significant**) in the Loch Fyne area	**Not Significant**
Chapter 9- Historic Environment	Construction	Following the implementation of pre-works recording and an archaeological watching brief (CH1, CH2) on the drove road remains (HA169, HA224), residual effects are anticipated to be minor adverse and **not significant.**	**Not Significant**	The removal of turbines, as well as modifications to access tracks and peat storage will reduce the area affected by constuction. As mitigation measures are unchanged residual effects remain minor adverse and not significant.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 9- Historic Environment	Operational	Effects are anticipated to vary from minor to moderate adverse and in all cases would be **not significant.**	**Not Significant**	Less turbines will be visible in views from to historic assets, with the potential for a reduction in impact magnitude. As the Proposed Development predicted no significant effects, no further change is predicted for the Revised Development.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 10 -Ecology	Construction, Operational and Decommissioning	**No likely significant** effects were predicted for any Important Ecological Features during construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. The residual effects of the proposed development are classed as not significant.	**Not Significant**	The Revised Development has a smaller footprint than the Proposed Development and affects a reduced area of priority peatland. The assessment of potential effects on important ecological features will be unchanged and not significant.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 11 – Ornithology	Construction, Operational and Decommissioning	An assessment has been made of the likely effects of the Proposed Development during the construction, operation and decommissioning stages. **No significant effects** are predicted for ornithological features scoped into this assessment (black grouse, black-throated diver, golden eagle, osprey, red-throated diver, white-tailed eagle and whooper swan) in terms of the EIA Regulations.	**Not Significant**	The overall level and significance of the effects on osprey, white-tailed eagle and whooper swan remains unchanged. Collision-related mortality for black grouse has been reassessed; the potential effect on the regional population is considered not significant. Effects on black-throated diver, golden eagle (specifically resulting from operational disturbance and displacement) and red-throated diver (from potential collision with operational turbines) are expected to reduce in magnitude as a result of the deletion of five turbines. The remaining ornithological effects remain low to negligible and not significant.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 12 – Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology	Construction and Operation	There are **no likely significant adverse effects** related to the Proposed Development in isolation. There are **no cumulative water effects** with consented developments within the Development Site or wider Study Area or in the same surface catchments.	**Not Significant**	There are no significant adverse effects related to the Revised Development in isolation, and there are no significant cumulative effects with other developments.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 13 – Traffic and Transport	Construction, Operation and Decommissioning	The significance evaluation indicates that the magnitude of change resulted of the Proposed Development is ranging from Negligible to Low. The significance level is also ranging from Negligible to Minor (and therefore **not significant**).	**Not Significant**	Reducing the number of turbines will reduce the amount of HGV and abnormal loads traffic utilising the road network. This will therefore result in a reduction in potential effects, which will remain not significant.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 14 – Socio-Economics and Tourism	Construction, Operation and Decommissioning	**No significant effects** on Labour market and Tourism and Recreation.	**Not Significant**	The Revised Development has will lead to a slight reduction in construction expenditure and effects will remain not significant. Effects on Tourism and Recreation also remain not significant	**Not Significant**
Chapter 15 – Aviation	Construction, Operation and Decommissioning	Following implementation of mitigation through design and best practice and the mitigation measures identified above, it is considered that there would be **no significant effects** on aviation interests.	**Not Significant**	The reduction in the number of turbines will not alter the not significant outcome set out in the EIA Report.	**Not Significant**
Chapter 16 – Infrastructure or other issues	Construction, Operation and Decommissioning	There would be **no significant effects** arising as a result of the Proposed Development in respect of infrastructure and other issues.	**Not Significant**	The distance between construction works for the Revised Development and existing utilities remains unchanged (T18 being the closest). Therefore, conclusions presented in the EIA Report (2024) remain accurate and no significant effects are expected..	**Not Significant**

References

Advising on peatland, carbon-rich soils and priority peatland habitats in development management | NatureScot. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/doc/advising-peatland-carbon-rich-soils-and-priority-peatland-habitats-development-management

Band (2024) NatureScot collision risk modelling guidance. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/doc/guidance-using-updated-collision-risk-model-assess-bird-collision-risk-onshore-wind-farms#:~:text=3.,a%20single%20bird%20rotor%20transit.

BTO Bird Facts (2023). Accessed at: (https://www.bto.org/understanding-birds/birdfacts/golden-eagle

Dowes. D., Daisley. J., Parry. G. (2015) A Technique for Assessing Bat Activity for Ecological Impact Assessment. Heritage Environmental Ltd.

DUKES (2025) (A). Estimated carbon dioxide intensity of electricity supplied (DUKES 5.14) [online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/electricity-chapter-5-digest-of-united-kingdom-energy-statistics-dukes [Accessed 16 September 2025].

DUKES (2025) (B). *Energy consumption in the UK 2024. ECUK 2024: Consumption data tables (Excel)* [online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/energy-consumption-in-the-uk-2024 [Accessed 16 September 2025].

Findlay, M., Briers, R.A., Ingledew, R.P., and White, P.J.C. (2022). An evidence-based approach to identifying resting sites of Eurasian otter Lutra lutra from camera-trap and field-sign data. Accessed at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365074386_An_evidence-based_approach_to_identifying_resting_sites_of_Eurasian_otter_Lutra_lutra_from_camera-trap_and_field-sign_data

Goodship and Furness (2022) Disturbance Distances. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/doc/naturescot-research-report-1283-disturbance-distances-review-updated-literature-review-disturbance#:~:text=The%20disturbance%20distances%20were%20collated,are%20provided%20for%20each%20species.

NatureScot (2024) Standing advice fro palnning consultations – Otters. Available at: Standing advice for planning consultations - Otters | NatureScot

NatureScot, Natural Resources Wales, Natural England, Bat Conservation Trust, Scottish Power Renewables, Renewable UK, University of Exeter and Ecotricity (2021) Bats and Onshore Wind Turbines: Survey, Assessment and Mitigation. Available at: Bats and onshore wind turbines - survey, assessment and mitigation | NatureScot

Newson, S.E., Evans, H.E., Gillings, S., Jarrett, D. & Wilson, M.W. (2017). A survey of high-risk bat species across southern Scotland. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No. 1008. Available at: NatureScot Commissioned Report 1008 - A survey of high risk bat species across southern Scotland | NatureScot

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (2018) Carbon Calculator: technical guidance [online]. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/carbon-calculator-technical-guidance/ [Accessed 16 September 2025].

Trout, R. and Kortland, K (2012). Fence marking to reduce grouse collisions. FCTN019. Forest Research, Inverness. Available at: https://cdn.forestresearch.gov.uk/2012/12/fctn019.pdf

Whitford, E. (2024) The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland)

Regulations 2017, Electricity Act 1989: Application for Section 36 Consent For The Proposed Ladyfield Renewable Energy Park and Battery Storage in the Planning Authority Area of Argyll and Bute Council. Letter dated 5 April 2024.

wsp.com