| Issue for amendment or further environmental justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turbine on deep peat when there is an area to the north that is not deep peat. <br> Note recent submission indicates that there are other environmental and technical constraints in this area - it may be helpful to understand these further (and if they relate to our interests they may effect our opinion) <br> Turning T directly adjacent to | Figure inserted above shows location of GWDTE in relation to Turbine T1 sited for Proposed Development, acting as a constraint on micro-siting. | Turbine T1 relocated east to 287093 835457 to avoid as much peat as possible. This reduces the amount of peat that will be excavated in this location by $1,220 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, from the previous volume of $\sim 7,370 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ to $\sim 6,150 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. The relocation also moves the infrastructure away from the GWDTE and the topography associated with the feature. The turning head has also been moved closer to the turbine hardstanding and away from watercourse and rotated to the south to avoid peat. | Offered \& achievable |


| Issue for amendment or <br> further environmental <br> justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA <br> This area (inserted left) was the location <br> for the construction compound for the <br> Operational Scheme. The Applicant does <br> not have legal control to site permanent <br> wind farm infrastructure (i.e. turbines or <br> internal access tracks) in an area which <br> is demarcated in a legal agreement for <br> the siting of a decommissioning <br> compound by the owner of the <br> Operational Scheme. The owner of the <br> Operational Scheme has also identified <br> this area as a 'laydown area' for turbine <br> components (storing blades, nacelles, <br> gearboxes etc.) in case urgent upgrades <br> are required during the operational <br> lifetime of the Operational Scheme. A <br> temporary construction compound in this <br> area for the Proposed Development is <br> acceptable to the owner of the <br> Operational Scheme. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Access track to turbine on deep <br> peat although there is no peat <br> north disturbed ground to the <br> of the way to the west. |  |  |


| Issue for amendment or further environmental justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consideration only given to site being to the west of current substation - other areas might have shallower peat. <br> Possibility to extend existing substation or locate directly adjacent to it so no new disturbed peat. |  | The Applicant has no legal control for areas east of existing sub-station for Tom nan Clach Wind Farm. The location for the Proposed Development, adjacent to existing sub-station, mitigates the Landscape Visual impact by not creating any 'gaps' between these two buildings. The design principle underpinning the Proposed Development is for it to be seen an Extension to the Operational Scheme in Landscape Visual Impact terms. <br> The existing 'as built' substation is shown in the image, and where the Proposed Development substation is located. | Not offered for reasons set out. |
| Can you provide any further evidence (site photographs?) to support the proposal that these water features are man-made drains rather than natural water features that the layout needs to avoid? <br> Note recent submission indicates peat gullies or manmade drainage will be diverted or restored (which is acceptable). | Below: Linear man made ditches that will be diverted around hardstanding <br> Below: more natural watercourse to the south that will remain intact due to relocation of T4 to the north | Turbine T4 has been relocated 32 m north. This avoids the natural water feature to the south and allows the manmade drain to be diverted preconstruction. <br> The turning head has also been moved to the east of the track to avoid the small pool. | Offered \& achievable |


| Issue for amendment or <br> further environmental <br> justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Issue for amendment or further environmental justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | change in crane pad orientation would not achieve the desired outcome, it would increase the environmental impacts (increase in peat depth) and be unacceptable in civil engineering \& HSE terms. |  |
| Existing track directly to Turbine but new track proposed. |  | The Applicant did look at three possible options in achieving this in earlier site iteration of the internal access tracks. All options would dissect a GWDTE. What became the preferred option (in environmental/civil terms, inserted and see document 'TNC - T4 \& T6 Plan' attached) the turning head is located on a 10\% vertical gradient (not permitted in HSE). The cut required for the track and hardstanding (@4m deep at the worst point) will have a knock-on effect on the existing tracks. The cut for this would create a ponding area which would need to be drained. Where the cut is located is where the existing 33 kV underground cable connecting the Operational TNC Wind Farm is located (see Figure 2.0 Design Freeze 9 of the EIA Report). Designing \& constructing an internal access track over a live underground | Not offered for reasons set out. |


| Issue for amendment or <br> further environmental <br> justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 33kV cable is challenging but acceptable <br> with appropriate mitigation (which the <br> track North of Turbine T5 has <br> incorporated). 4m of cut in this location, <br> where the underground 33kV cable can <br> be buried @1m deep (min. permitted is <br> 600mm), presents an unacceptable <br> commercial risk (the Operational TNC <br> Wind Farm would need to be switched <br> off, whilst any install/construction takes <br> place for an undefined amount of time). <br> The proposed new track does not <br> achieve the outcome desired, and was <br> discounted during the Design Iteration <br> process for the Proposed Development. |  |  |


| Issue for amendment or further environmental justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access track from T5 to T7 is over deep peat. An alternative access from T4 to T7 would be shorter - more probing information required to consider this alternative further. |  | Proposed track directly connecting Turbines T4 to T7 is not possible in civil engineering/turbine delivery (as the gradient exceed 20\%). The alternative option (see red line, image inserted) is 750 m in length compared to 800 m in length for the current proposed track between T5 and T7. <br> The alternative would be also be over deep peat (1.5-2m) and therefore similar to the existing T5 to T7 route would need floating road sections. In addition, the steepest gradient on this option is @12\% which for some turbine suppliers is too steep for turbine component delivery and an unacceptable commercial and health \& safety risk. <br> This alternative track would also result in three watercourse crossings rather than a single crossing in the current T5 to T7 route. <br> This alternative route would also be located on areas of Medium (orange) risk of peat landslide which is not recommended. <br> The alternative internal access track does not achieve the outcome desired. On balance it would increase the number of watercourse crossing required and peat landslide risk. | Not offered for reasons set out. |


| Issue for amendment or <br> further environmental <br> justification |  | Applicant's response to SEPA | Applicant reasoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |




