

Appendix 4.4 – Additional EIA Consultee Responses

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix 4.4 – Additional EIA Consultee Responses

Executive Summary

Following receipt of the EIA Scoping Opinion the Applicant has continued to consult with key statutory and non-statutory consultees on the Proposed Development and the EIA. This Appendix provides a summary of that consultation with further details provided within the relevant technical chapters.

Table 1 – Summary of EIA Consultation

Consultee	Technical Discipline	Consultation	Response in EIA Report
Scottish Natural Heritage	Landscape and Visual	SNH have amended their service level statement and no longer advise on landscape where the development is outwith a National Scenic Area (NSA) or Wild Land Area or unlikely to have an adverse effect on either	The site is located outwith all NSAs and WLAs and is unlikely to have significant effect on the Orkney – Hoy and West Mainland NSA and Hoy WLA, owing to separation distances and limited visibility (refer to Chapter 6).
Scottish Natural Heritage	Landscape and Visual, Ecology and Ornithology	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
Orkney Island Council	Landscape and Visual	OIC recommended a number of different view points to those proposed by the Applicant.	The Applicant has considered the viewpoints requested by OIC and is satisfied that the chosen viewpoints as shown in Chapter 6 provide adequate representation of the views of the Proposed Development (refer to Chapter 6).
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	Cultural Heritage	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
		HES welcomed the proposed visualisations and requested a visualisation from St. Mary’s Chapel on Damsay and a visualisation from the south-terrace of Balfour Castle GDL.	Unfortunately, it was not feasible to prepare a photomontage from St. Mary’s Chapel as Damsay is uninhabited and is not served by Orkney’s public ferry service.. It was also decided to substitute the suggested visualisation from the south terrace at Balfour Castle with a wireframe from the carriage

Consultee	Technical Discipline	Consultation	Response in EIA Report
			drive to the east of the castle. This was to broaden the spread of viewpoints within the IGDL (refer to Chapter 10).
SEPA	Geology & Hydrology	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
OIC Environmental Health Officer (EHO)	Noise	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
		Environmental Health Officer (EHO) accepted locations in principle and agreed to meet on site at set up to agree micro-siting of turbines.	Met on site, micro-siting agreed (refer to Chapter 9).
		EHO queried candidate turbine model and method of predicting 35 dB contour. EHO queried proposed allocation of proxies to NSRs and suggested alternative and noted that logic for allocating proxies to NSRs would have to be carefully discussed in the final report.	Accepted EHO comments on use of baseline data. Confirmed candidate turbine model (refer to Chapter 9).
		EHO confirmed use of reported data is appropriate in this instance, provided turbine data treated in accordance with requirements of Institute of Acoustics Good Practice Guidance for Crowness Business Park single turbine.	Assessment has been undertaken on this basis (refer to Chapter 9).
	Agreement on derivation of Proposed Development noise limits	Assessment has been undertaken on this basis (refer to Chapter 9).	
	Air quality	EHO confirmed that air quality could be scoped out of the EIA Report.	Refer to Chapter 4.
OIC (County Archaeologist)	Cultural Heritage	Issued PAN – no response	N/A

Consultee	Technical Discipline	Consultation	Response in EIA Report
		<p>AOC attended a meeting with the Orkney County Archaeologist on the 6th of October 2019.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist noted the confirmed presence of archaeological remains on the Site itself including a late-Neolithic settlement and a Bronze Age funerary structure. Given the clear potential for further remains to be present she stated that she would wish to see a structured programme of mitigation that would include geophysics.</p> <p>The geophysics would be followed by trial trench evaluations and if necessary, mitigation excavations and would be in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which would contain a clear method statement for post-excavation analysis and reporting.</p> <p>The potential for indirect effects were also discussed and the County Archaeologist noted that the core setting of Cuween Hill includes the view along the axis of the bay as well as its linkage with the Wideford Cairn to the east.</p>	<p>The confirmed presence of buried archaeological remains on the site was acknowledged at the design stage and the turbines have been positioned so as to allow for buffers surrounding the recorded locations of the three archaeological sites that have previously been identified on the site.</p> <p>The potential for previously unrecorded remains to be present on the site is also acknowledged and a detailed mitigation strategy, which would include geophysics, trial trenching and if need be further investigations is included in section 10.8 of this chapter.</p> <p>The potential for indirect effects upon the settings of heritage assets is included in section 10.9 and Technical Appendix 10.2 and photomontages have been prepared for both the Cuween Hill and Wideford Hill Chambered Cairns.</p>
OIC (Roads Services)	Transport	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
		The study area will need to include the A965 and Grainshore Road. The use of Low National Road Traffic Forecasts (NRTF) is	The transport assessment has been undertaken on this basis (refer to Chapter 12).

Consultee	Technical Discipline	Consultation	Response in EIA Report
		acceptable in accounting for traffic growth and committed development traffic.	
OIC (Harbours)	Transport	Recommend abnormal load delivery via the Hatston pier. Request that swept path assessment is undertaken of the pier to the public road and that a Port Management Plan is implemented during construction.	Transport route for abnormal loads will be as requested and a swept path assessment is included in Appendix 12.1. A requirement for a Port Management Plan is included in the mitigation detailed in Chapter 12.
OIC (Planning Department)	Landscape and Visual	OIC recommended a number of different view points to those proposed by the Applicant.	The Applicant has considered the viewpoints requested by OIC and is satisfied that the chosen viewpoints as shown in Chapter 6 provide adequate representation of the views of the Proposed Development (refer to Chapter 6).
	Shadow Flicker	OIC 'Energy' Supplementary guidance requires that the applicant prove that there will no adverse impacts on the amenity of residential properties, the assessment should advise which factors determining the occurrence and/or perception of shadow flicker nuisance at a residential properties where considered within the methodology, also indicate how they have taken account of the northern latitude of this site.	Chapter 15 assess the occurrence of shadow flicker at the residential properties.
		OIC 'Energy' Supplementary guidance refers to assessing adverse impacts on the amenity of residential properties, therefore 1 and 2 Quanterness Farm Cottages should be considered as separate	1 and 2 Quanterness Farm Cottages are considered as separate receptors (refer to Chapter 15).

Consultee	Technical Discipline	Consultation	Response in EIA Report
		residential properties not one building. Micro siting is not included within this methodology so has not be assessed.	
		I am generally satisfied with the use the standard separation distance of 10 rotor diameters and the shadow flicker study area submitted, however the study area need to cover the cumulative impacts with existing turbine at Rennibister.	The assessment is based on a study area of 10 rotor diameters from the turbines and includes a cumulative assessment (refer to Chapter 15).
Scottish Water	Hydrology	Issued PAN. Scottish Water requested that a Pre-Development Enquiry be submitted for an assessment of clean water capacity. Scottish Water informed that there is no waste water infrastructure present so the Applicant must investigate private treatment options.	The Proposed Development will have no clean water connection and no foul water requirement so no further consultation has been undertaken (refer to Chapter 3).
Development & Marine Planning	General	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
Marine Services	Marine Radar	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
		Marine Services raised concerns regarding the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on marine radar.	The Applicant has held a number of meetings with Marine Services to discuss the potential impacts and agree appropriate mitigation as set out in Chapter 16.
Airfield Superintendent	Aviation	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
Kirkwall & St Ola Community Council	General	Issued PAN – no response	N/A

Consultee	Technical Discipline	Consultation	Response in EIA Report
Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd	Aviation	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
		HIAL requested that an assessment on VOR is undertaken to determine any potential impacts by the Proposed Development on the navigational radio beacon located at the airport.	The Applicant has commissioned NATS to undertake an assessment of potential impacts.
Kirkwall Airport – Senior Pilot	Aviation	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
Ministry of Defence	Aviation	Issued PAN – no response	N/A
National Air Traffic Services (NATS)	Aviation	Issued PAN – no objection to the Proposed Development	Refer to Chapter 14.

This page is intentionally blank.