# 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**

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Landscape and Visual | John Muir Trust (JMT)<br>25/05/20 | *"…we have a particular concern about the impacts on Hoy's Wild Land Area arising from the suggested location of Turbine 4, which is within Hoy's Wild Land Area. We don't object to this turbine, or the total number of turbines, but rather to its siting. The proposed site boundary for the development cuts into the Wild Land Area which has made siting one turbine within this area possible. We note that several turbines that were previously proposed in the Wild Land Area do not now appear in these plans. The rationale for why one remains in a Wild Land Area is not set out at this stage, whilst that may not have been deemed necessary, it means we are left to speculate. Given that the PAN consultation document states, 'The site is being designed with due consideration of landscape designations and wild land' and that 'Care is being taken to minimise impacts', it would be useful to understand why this turbine needs to be located in a Wild Land Area."* | A pre-application meeting was held with representatives of JMT on 4th June 2020, during which the reasons behind the siting of T4 were explained, highlighting the requirement for a minimum of six turbines to make the project viable and describing the multiple technical and environmental constraints that prevent an alternative location being found outwith the WLA. |
| | Orkney Islands Council<br>09/03/20 & 06/05/20 | Requested comment on viewpoint selection. No response received. | Viewpoints agreed in consultation with SNH and HES. Refer to Chapter 6 of the EIA Report. |
| | Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)<br>19/02/20 | *"Many of the key attributes of the whole Hoy WLA relate to the high degree of exposure across the area; the contrast between the east and west (the exposed coast and the remote secluded hinterland); the gently sloped smooth hills with prevailing openness and simple ground cover with an overriding lack of human artefacts; contributing to a strong sense of naturalness; physically challenging with strong sense of remoteness, solitude and sanctuary.*<br>*To further explore impacts of the development on these attributes we request the following viewpoint locations are included in the assessment:*<br>*Photomontage – Bakingstone Hill (GR 254 934) within the WLA; and*<br>*Wirelines – from North Dale and West Dale within the WLA"* | Bakingstone Hill, West Dale and North Dale have been included as representative viewpoints with visualisations and a detailed assessment within the Chapter 6 of the EIA Report. The visualisations are used to inform the assessment of the effects on Hoy WLA in Section 6.12 and Appendix 6.3 of the EIA Report. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Landscape and Visual | SNH<br>19/02/20 | *"In addition, an attribute of the WLA is how the high simple remote hill backdrop contributes to, and is appreciated from the wider Orkney Archipelago. This latter attribute is also reflected in the Location-specific quality of the NSA 'The High Hills of Hoy' where the high, rounded hills are cited as forming a spectacular backdrop to much of the West Mainland.*<br>*To further explore impacts of the development on these attributes we request the following viewpoint locations are included in the assessment*<br>*Photomontage – Clestrain area (views along Clestrain Sound) within the NSA GS 29 07; and*<br>*Photomontage – Hunda (high point) GS 43 96 – views across Scapa Flow."* | Clestrain has been included as a representative viewpoint with visualisations and a detailed assessment within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report.<br>Public access onto Hunda is not permitted and therefore an alternative viewpoint on Burray has been included. The visualisations are used to inform the assessment of the effects on Hoy WLA in Section 6.12 and Appendix 6.3 of the EIA Report. |
| | SNH<br>05/05/20 | Withi Gill is useful to capture and good to include in the WLA assessment. However the reasoning behind including West or North Dale was to capture the extent to which the windfarm may intrude upon the WLA qualities remoteness and sanctuary within the central range of rounded hills and the simplicity of the large rolling interior hills and their sense of naturalness and interlocking forms receding into the distance. Given current lockdown could you include a couple of wirelines to inform this assessment from 'within' the Dales (as opposed to from hill summits) where visibility is displayed? These will be helpful, as and when I am able to conduct my own site work within the WLA. Whether either one of these wirelines is included subsequently in the EIAR (as a photomontage), can be discussed at a later date to ascertain what added benefit they would bring to your assessment (and my appraisal of that assessment).<br>Houton to Lyness Ferry (as opposed to Hunda) 331661 996744 – the reason for choosing Hunda was to represent the large areas of potential visibility along west coasts of the chain of islands that contain the east of Scapa Flow. This was to fully inform the effect of the proposal on the qualities of both the WLA (a distinctive high, simple and remote hill back drop) and the NSA (The high hills of | Wirelines from Withi Gill, North Dale and West Dale have been included, with a written assessment of the effects on Withi Gill presented in Chapter 6 of the EIA Report.<br>As Hunda is not accessible to the public, a viewpoint just south of Churchill Barrier No.3 has been included. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Hoy – the high rounded hills of Hoy form a spectacular backdrop). An alternative location would be at Glimps Holm or along the Churchill Barrier to the immediate north. | |
| Ornithology | RSPB<br>05/06/20 | In response to the pre-application consultation, RSPB commented *"that the scale of the proposed development has been reduced significantly since the proposal's scoping stage in 2018, and our response dated 22 May 2018. We also note that through the design process some turbines have been moved east, slightly further from a number of sites designated for wildlife. However, we continue to have significant concerns about the scale and location of the proposal".* | The ornithology assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report) considers the points raised. |
| | SNH<br>21/08/18 | Second year of bird surveys required; these should focus on refined development scenarios. | A second year of bird surveys was carried out, focussed on a refined development scenario. The scope of the second year of bird surveys, including survey types, survey areas, methods and survey effort were agreed in consultation with SNH. |
| | SNH<br>10/01/19 | SNH requested population modelling be undertaken to determine effect on the great skua and red-throated diver populations over the lifetime of the project. | Population modelling for great skua and red-throated diver Hoy SPA populations has been included in the assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report). |
| | SNH<br>05/02/19 | SNH requested population modelling is also undertaken for hen harrier (*Circus cyaneus*). | Population modelling for the Orkney hen harrier population has been included in this assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report). |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ornithology | SNH<br>04/03/19 | SNH stated in relation to Hoy great skua population modelling that "…using a rough rule of thumb that a population decline of >5 % could be significant in terms of a population trend." | Noted. In the absence of any other available guidance regarding significance thresholds, the assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report) considers population declines of >5 % could be significant in terms of a population trend for great skua. |
| | SNH<br>26/04/19 | Revised 2019 breeding bird survey scope. SNH is satisfied with the approach and explanations given and agrees with the effort levels suggested. | Surveys undertaken in line with the agreed scope of work. |
| | SNH<br>30/08/19 | For great skua, SNH stated that a population decline of >5% could be significant in terms of a population trend. SNH confirmed the acceptability of a decline of up to 5 % (modelled relative to the baseline) would also be applicable to the other species. | Noted. In the absence of any other available guidance regarding significance thresholds, the assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report) considers population declines of >5 % could be significant in terms of a population trend for these and all other species. |
| | SNH<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| | SNH<br>21/02/20 | For hen harrier, SNH stated "the predicted decline in the Orkney/NHZ population of > 5 % in combination with other schemes could potentially represent a significant impact." | Noted. In the absence of any other available guidance regarding significance thresholds, the assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report) considers population declines of >5 % |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | could be significant in terms of a population trend for hen harrier. |
| Ornithology | SNH<br>21/02/20 | The collision risk estimates will need to be integrated into a cumulative impact assessment, especially for hen harrier where the assessment is undertaken at the Orkney/natural heritage zone (NHZ) level. | A cumulative impact assessment for the Orkney/NHZ population has been included in the assessment (refer to Chapter 7 of the EIA Report). |
| | SNH<br>20/04/20 | Collision risk modelling for white-tailed eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*). SNH suggest that the approach is based on distinguishing the age of birds. Adults are most likely to originate from the single breeding pair on Hoy (although other adults may turn up). It would therefore seem appropriate to pool the breeding season data. However, flights involving juvenile or sub-adult birds should be excluded from that analysis and treated separately, assuming there are sufficient flights to undertake collision risk modelling. | Insufficient at-risk flights were recorded to undertake separate age class collision risk modelling, but pooled calculations have been made and apportioned in line with numbers recorded across the flight buffer area (the widest recording area). |
| | | For red-throated diver, where conditions were quite different in the two years, population level effects arising from each year's collision risk should be modelled separately. An average may also be used but using the individual years' data in addition helps to address uncertainty in model predictions. Where additional data can be used to inform interpretation of model predictions then this should be undertaken. | Population modelling has been undertaken separately for 'poor' and 'good' years equivalent to the 2018 and 2019 survey years respectively, and their average. Historical data from 2015 – 2019 has been used to inform interpretation of the model predictions. |
| | | Cumulative impact assessments. Orkney/NHZ assessments are not required for great skua and red-throated diver as these are qualifying SPA species. If the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) flights are from birds associated/connected to Hoy SPA then no NHZ assessment is required. If the peregrine falcon flights are from birds which are not connected to the SPA, then an NHZ assessment would be helpful. | Cumulative assessments have been carried out for the Hoy SPA red-throated diver, great skua and peregrine populations. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ornithology | SNH<br>20/04/20 | Avoidance rates. While it is acceptable to present a range of avoidance rates in an Environmental Report, we have adopted a policy of only amending species avoidance rates after evidence has been peer reviewed. Our default position will be to assess the potential collision risk on the basis of the current, published avoidance rate. | Noted. |
| Ecology | Marine Scotland Science<br>29/04/20 | ECU has confirmed that this development is now not being considered under the Electricity Act 1989 as the generating capacity is likely to be below 50 MW and consequently MSS will not be asked to provide any further advice to ECU in relation to this development. | N/A |
| | Orkney Islands Council<br>24/04/20 | ITP Energised has committed to consulting the local bat group and this approach is welcomed. Bat group members are likely to have the most up to date information on bat activity in the Hoy and Walls area. Turbine T1 is relatively close to the wooded area alongside the access track to Wee Fea so it would be helpful to find out if any bat activity has been recorded there in recent years. | The extended NVC survey (Refer to Chapter 8 of the EIA Report) confirmed that the development area was not suitable roosting or foraging habitat for bats. The desk study, including consultation with the local bat group, returned no records of bat activity within the study area, as such bat survey work was not considered necessary. |
| | | I understand that the proposal has been scaled back and now has potential to affect only the Burn of Ore catchment area. A single water crossing will be required, over the Burn of Longigill which was found to be too small to permit effective electrofishing. However, this doesn't rule out the possibility that the burn provides trout spawning habitat, so the EIA report will need to identify mitigation measures that will enable continued access for migratory fish. Other issues for consideration include effects on the hydrology of the wider area, as well as effects on water quality, water flows and sediment transport along the | Mitigation measures relating to fish are covered in Chapter 8, with consideration to the effects on hydrology covered in Chapter 11 of the EIA Report. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Burn of Longigill and the Burn of Ore, both during both the construction and operational phases. | |
| Ecology | Orkney Trout Fishing Association<br>22/05/20 | The Burn of Ore supports an anadromous brown trout population, one of several burns on the east side of Hoy to do so. These burns are too small to fish in but collectively they support a recreational sea trout fishery at sea, more of which you can read about on the OTFA website. The Burn of Ore, along with all the Hoy burns, are relatively pristine in character, mainly as they drain a landscape which does not lend itself to agricultural improvement. In contrast, on the Orkney mainland, which is dominated by agricultural activity, most spawning burns have been ditched and straightened. This puts a little more value on maintaining the present character of the Hoy burns, the Burn of Ore included. | This is noted and a Local value has been assigned to the Burn of Ore in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the EIA Report. |
| | | While the Burn of Longigill may have been too small for electrofishing during the visit you mentioned, trout could exist here, particularly in its lower reaches. You do not mention a location for the crossing point, but it might be best to assume that the tributary does support trout and proceed accordingly. In any case, the main branch of the burn certainly does support trout and this should influence any instream works accordingly. | As described in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the EIA Report, a watercourse crossing is needed close to the source of the burn, where there is no fish habitat, and potential impacts on fish species are limited to possible effects in the downstream environment. Implementation of embedded mitigation will reduce risks to a minimum. |
| | | One other issue I would draw your attention to is the presence of a dam on the Burn of Ore at ND 29079 93392. I am not sure of the history of the dam but it seems clear that the structure is redundant and presents a hindrance to fish | Removal of the dam would result in a small adverse cultural heritage impact, because a dam has been present in this location for over a century and is likely |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | migration. It would be positive result if the structure could be removed and would count towards the net environmental gain achieved by this project. | to incorporate earlier structural remains. In addition, the dam has some local cultural heritage value as a heritage asset relating to 19th century and possibly earlier land management practices. As noted in Appendix 8.4 of the EIA Report, the dam is considered to be passable for trout. As such we propose to leave the structure in place. |
| Noise | Orkney Islands Council<br>14/10/19 | Agreement of baseline noise survey monitoring locations.<br>Met with Environmental Health on site, micro-siting agreed at each monitoring position. | Refer to Chapter 9 of EIA Report. |
| | Orkney Islands Council<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| | Orkney Islands Council<br>18/05/20 | Confirmed approval that baseline studies undertaken in accordance with guidance.<br>Requested further information regarding treatment of baseline data seeking to minimise noise from existing turbines. | Refer to Chapter 9 of EIA Report. |
| | Orkney Islands Council<br>22/05/20 | Noted that baseline data showed no significant difference in up-wind/ down-wind conditions, accepted proposed approach to subtract predicted level of existing turbines at monitoring positions from measured background levels to derive 'true' background. | Comments noted and accepted. Proposed method adopted (Refer to Chapter 9 of EIA Report). |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Noise | Orkney Islands Council<br>03/06/20 | EHO noted that Binga Fea (consented application using method proposed by Applicant) approach would not work for the Proposed Development, citing difficulty in conditioning cumulative noise limits with multiple turbine operators. | Comments noted and accepted. |
| | Orkney Islands Council<br>23/06/20 | Confirmed Gable End Theatre and Ore Burn Cottage non-residential and therefore do not need to be considered as NSRs.<br>Noted that arguments for proposed use of 40 $dBL_{A90}$ daytime noise limit appears to fit IoA GPG approach and may be valid, but this should be determined through the planning process.<br>Noted concern regarding ability to write enforceable planning conditions to control three developments (assumed to mean Proposed Development and the two existing turbines); this to be determined by Planning Experts and determined at a Planning Hearing (assumed to mean determined through the consenting process). | Comments noted. |
| Cultural Heritage | Historic Environment Scotland (HES)<br>18/12/19 | In their response to draft layout plans and draft visualisations dated the 18th of December 2019 HES stated that they considered that '*the listed World War structures around Lyness have a strong relationship to one another…this contributes to the significance of the buildings and their setting. Consideration should be given in the assessment as to how the proposed turbines will impact on this aspect of their settings.'* They highlighted three designated assets:<br>The Former Naval Headquarters and Communications Centre, Wee Fea, Lyness, Hoy (Category A Listed Building LB48378) (Site 127);<br>Crockness Martello Tower, Long Hope, (Scheduled Monument, List Entry SM2726) (Site 96), and;<br>Hackness, Battery and Martello Tower (PIC and Scheduled Monument, List Entry SM90211) (Site 173) | The assessment (Refer to Chapter 10 of the EIA Report) has taken into account the interrelationship of the assets around Lyness. Detailed assessment is presented in Section 10.9 and Appendix 10.2 and supported by visualisations (Figures 10.12 – 10.27) as appropriate.<br>All of the visualisations include cumulative schemes.<br>In the light of HES'S comments the Applicant commissioned an additional |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | In regard to the latter two designated assets and following consultation between AOC and HES in December 2019 HES requested '*that a photomontage is provided taken from SM 90211, Hackness, battery and Martello Tower looking towards the corresponding tower at SM 2726, Crockness, Martello Tower, Long Hope. The visualisation should include the proposed turbines in the view to demonstrate the level of effect on the settings of these assets given their key visual relationship with one another.'*<br><br>HES also requested that effects on the setting of inter-related groups of monuments in the surrounding area such as scheduled military remains and brochs be considered and consideration is given to providing visualisations to demonstrate these impacts<br><br>HES also noted the potential for direct and indirect impacts on category A listed Underground Fuel Reservoir, Wee Fea, Lyness, Hoy (LB 52318) and specified that impacts caused by vibration for example, from construction and operation of the wind farm should also be given proper consideration and assessment in the design process to ensure there are no adverse impacts to the listed structure. | photomontage (Figure 10.14) from Hackness, Battery and Martello Tower (PIC and Scheduled Monument, SM90211) (Site 173) Crockness Martello Tower, Long Hope, (Scheduled Monument, SM2726) (Site 96).<br><br>The potential for effects upon the settings of heritage assets is included in Section 10.9 and Technical Appendix 10.2 and photomontages (Figures 10.12 - 10.14) have been prepared for the Former Naval Headquarters and Communications Centre (Site 127) and Royal Naval Cemetery, Lyness, Hoy (Site 147) and for Hackness, Battery and Martello Tower (Site 173). A range of wireframes have also been prepared.<br><br>The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid direct impacts upon the Underground Fuel Reservoir and a buffer of 30 m put in place by design team engineers to ensure no adverse impacts from vibration during construction and operation. |
| Cultural Heritage | HES<br><br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Heritage | Orkney County Archaeologist<br><br>07/10/19 | A recent survey of Hoy's wartime remains has identified a lot of assets and features at the eastern end of the site, although these are not designated (Legacies of Conflict: Hoy & Walls Wartime Heritage Project 2013-14, Online resource and report). | Assets recorded on The Legacies of Conflict: Hoy & Walls Wartime Heritage Project 2013-14 that are within the site and the 1 km study area have been incorporated into AOC's gazetteer for this project. These assets were available to view and check during the site walkover survey using an iPad incorporating ESRI's ArcGIS Collector software.<br><br>The potential for previously unrecorded remains to be present on the site is acknowledged and a detailed mitigation strategy, is included in section 10.8 of Chapter 10 of the EIA Report. |
| | | The County Archaeologist's main concern was the setting of the Category B Listed Royal Naval Cemetery at Lyness (Site 147, LB48348) and she wondered whether it would be possible to plant a tree belt to limit views of the turbines. | Photomontages (Figures 10.13) have been prepared for the Royal Naval Cemetery, Lyness, Hoy (Site 147). Given the scale of turbines it is considered unlikely that planting of trees would block views of turbines from Lyness. Planting of trees close to the cemetery would change the setting of the cemetery and would limit views out across the landscape. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural Heritage | Orkney County Archaeologist<br>28/04/20 | AOC consulted the Orkney County Archaeologist with regards to proposed visualisations. Additional visualisations were requested from selected assets beyond the 10 km study area as follows:<br>• Orphir round church scheduled area and property in care;<br>• St Magnus Cathedral, tower (including cumulative). Listed A<br>• Hoxa head battery;<br>• Castle of Burwick stack site; and<br>• Unstan cairn. | Selected assets beyond the 10 km study area have been assessed and wireframes for each of these assets have been produced (Figures 10.23-10.27). These assets are shown on Figure 10.6 and detailed assessment is presented in Appendix 10.2. |
| | Orkney Heritage Society<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology | SEPA<br>02/06/20 | In response to pre-application consultation event SEPA commented:<br>• We agree that the information available through this consultation has been helpful and informative.<br>• We welcome the proposed reduction in numbers of turbines, which will reduce the environmental impact, and that the key design considerations include a 50 m watercourse buffer and that detailed peat probing to be undertaken.<br>• While our scoping advice was for the larger site, and the two access areas on the eastern side of the site were not included, the advice is still applicable. Therefore, we have no additional advice or comments at this stage and will be happy to comment on the Environmental Impact Assessment report once produced. | Refer to Chapter 11 of the EIA Report. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Traffic and Transport | Orkney Islands Council – Harbours Team<br>27/09/19 | Access for abnormal loads would be best achieved via the Lyness Quay. | The Route Survey Report (refer to Chapter 12 of the EIA Report) assumes access from Lyness and notes that there are no significant physical infrastructure constraints at the pier. |
| | | A swept path assessment of the route from the pier to the public road will be required. | The Route Survey Report contains the required drawings and assessment. |
| | | A Port Management Plan will be required to manage abnormal load deliveries and other marine traffic at Lyness. | A commitment to a Port Management Plan is contained in the mitigation proposals. |
| Aviation | Aberdeen Airport<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| | Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)<br>28/04/20 | IR Lighting on perimeter turbines is perfectly acceptable. | Refer to Chapter 14 of the EIA Report. |
| | Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)<br>06/05/20 | May have concerns in relation to low flying. | No issue with low flying expected (refer to Chapter 14 of the EIA Report). |
| | HIAL<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Aviation | HIAL<br>26/08/20 | No objection | Refer to Chapter 14 of the EIA Report. |
| | Kirkwall Airport – Senior Pilot<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| | Kirkwall Airport – Senior Pilot | No objection. | Refer to Chapter 14 of the EIA Report. |
| | NATS Safeguarding<br>27/05/20 | NATS stated in response to pre-application consultation: *"The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal".* | Refer to Chapter 14 of the EIA Report. |
| | Orkney Islands Council Airfields | No objection. | Refer to Chapter 14 of the EIA Report. |
| Shadow Flicker | Orkney Islands Council<br>14/05/20 | An email detailing the scope of the shadow flicker assessment was sent to OIC for comment in May 2020. No response was received. | The scope as detailed in this correspondence has been followed (refer to Chapter 15 of the EIA Report). |
| Telecommunications | BT<br>18/11/19 | BT stated they would accept a 75 m clearance from the blade tip, providing there is no micro-siting closer to their link path. | This buffer has been applied to the link path and turbines have been positioned outwith this buffer. Should micro-siting be required, the turbine locations would not be moved to within this buffer unless otherwise agreed with BT. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Marine Radar | Marine Services and Harbour Authority: Orkney Islands Council<br>09/10/19 | Marine Services and Harbour Authority stated concern that turbines at Hoy could impact on the Hill of Midland and Sandy Hill radars. | Marine Radar Impact Assessment undertaken (refer to Chapter 16 of the EIA Report). |
| | Development & Marine Planning<br>14/02/19 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| | Marine Services and Harbour Authority: Orkney Islands Council<br>25/05/20 | The Marine Radar Impact Assessment was issued to Marine Services and Harbour Authority for comment. No response was received. | The Marine Radar Impact Assessment identified no significant effects and Marine Services and Harbour Authority has provided no response to query or challenge the findings. |
| Outdoor Access | OIC Rural Planner<br>12/05/20 & 24/06/20 | Agreed that various options should be included in the EIA and confirmed happy with outlined approach. | Noted. Outlined approach in line with the approach detailed within Chapter 16 of the EIA Report. |
| | | Would hope to achieve as little disruption as possible during, and as a result of, any development. The goal would be to see an improvement to the outdoor access provision in the area of the development and certainly for there to be no detriment. | Noted and discussed further within Chapter 16 of the EIA Report. |
| | | Noted that vehicular access to the viewpoint is possible at the moment and that whilst such access is not covered by the legislation relating to outdoor access, it is worth being aware of. | Noted and discussed further within Chapter 16 of the EIA Report. |

| Technical Discipline | Consultee | Consultation | Response in EIA Report |
|---|---|---|---|
| Infrastructure | Scottish Water<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| | Road Services<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |
| Consultation | Graemsay, Hoy and Walls Community Council and Flotta Community Council<br>14/02/20 | Issued PAN – no response. | N/A |

This page is intentionally blank.