# CONTENTS

| SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO | THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS 11-1 |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| CONCLUSIONS           |                                  |

#### TABLES

| Table 11-1: Summary of Residual Effects | -1 |
|---|----|
|---|----|

Making Sustainability Happen

## Introduction

- 11.1 **Table 11-1** of **EIA Report Chapter 11** presents any changes to the effects predicted for the consented layout of the Ben Sca and Extension Wind Farm when compared to the effects predicted for the application layout of the Ben Sca Redesign Wind Farm.
- 11.2 This chapter of the SEI Report seeks to draw together the summaries of any changes to the residual effects predicted in the assessments of the revised layout of the Proposed Development (presented in **SEI Report Chapters 3 to 9**) when compared to the application layout.

### Summary of Changes to the Significance of Effects

11.3 A summary of the predicted changes to the residual effects as a result of the revised layout of the Proposed Development is presented in **Table 11-1**.

| SEI Topic               | Changes to Residual Effects as a Result of Revised Layout  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Landscape and<br>Visual | The removal of T1 results in a reduction in turbine visibility overall. However, this is limited in extent and more apparent from distant viewpoints   |
|                         | It is predicted that the revised layout would result in a reduced adverse change in landscape effects overall on the landscape character of the LCT 359 Upland Sloping Moorland. However, this change would not be sufficient to reduce the level of landscape effects originally presented in <b>EIA Chapter 3</b> .  |
|                         | The visual change from the application layout to the revised layout would result in a limited reduced adverse change for almost all viewpoints. The exception potentially being Viewpoint 16 (Bruach na Frithe), where any perception of change between the two layouts would be limited by the intervening distance.  |
|                         | The cumulative changes between the application and revised layout are limited to<br>the removal of T1, as the removed crane hardstanding and turbine foundation<br>would not be perceived in a cumulative assessment. The assessment of visual<br>change would comprise a reduced adverse change compared with the application<br>layout. Significant cumulative effects would remain in relation to visual receptors at<br>Edinbane, Flashader and Kildonan, within 6km to the northeast of the site. |
|                         | There would be no other changes to landscape or visual effects and the conclusions of <b>EIA Chapter 3</b> are sustained with the significance of effects as listed in <b>Table 11-1</b> of <b>EIA Chapter 11</b> remaining valid for the Proposed Development.  |
| Ornithology             | The removal of T1 has reduced the predicted collision rates for eagles (white-tailed and golden eagles) and golden plover for the Proposed Development as follows: Predicted collisions (2023 data):   |
|                         | • white-tailed eagle – reduction by 22.6% to 2.687 birds per year (1 every 0.37yr)   |
|                         | • golden eagle – reduction by 17.59% to 0.0834 birds per year (1 every 11.99yr)  |
|                         | • golden plover – reduction by 15.38% to 0.33 birds per year (1 every 3.03yr)  |
|                         | Cumulative collision rates for white-tailed eagle are potentially high (up to 7.8 birds per year) but significantly reduced from the previously calculated 10.1 birds, and population modelling indicates that impacts on the NHZ and Skye populations will not be significant (as was also the case for the application layout).  |
|                         | Habitat loss impacts for dispersing golden eagles are predicted to be not significant, both for the Proposed Development alone and cumulatively.   |

#### Table 11-1: Summary of Residual Effects



| SEI Topic                         | Changes to Residual Effects as a Result of Revised Layout   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
|                                   | When considered along with the mitigation and proposed habitat enhancement measures there are no significant effects predicted for ornithology as reported in <b>EIA Chapter 4</b> .  |
| Ecology                           | The removal of T1 does not alter the assessment of significance of the effects of the Proposed Development on ecological receptors reported in <b>EIA Chapter 5</b> .   |
|                                   | No significant negative cumulative effects are predicted in combination with the wind farms considered as part of the cumulative assessment.  |
|                                   | Peatland restoration (128.6ha) is proposed which will provide 1:10 restoration and 11% enhancement in line with NatureScot guidance, and significantly greater amounts than proposed for the application layout. Additionally restoration of wet heath (22.74ha) would provide further enhancement.   |
|                                   | Additionally, a significant positive cumulative effect on habitats is predicted due to the connectivity of the proposed peatland restoration areas for Ben Sca Redesign and Balmeanach Wind Farms.  |
| Hydrology and Peat                | The revised layout does not alter the findings of <b>EIA Chapter 6</b> with respect to the water environment or peat stability risk.  |
|                                   | The peat excavation volumes have been reduced from 45,482 m <sup>3</sup> for the application layout to 44,800 m <sup>3</sup> for the revised layout, however the recommendations on excavation and re-use of soils and peat as presented in <b>EIA Technical Appendix 6.1</b> are sustained.  |
| Cultural Heritage and Archaeology | The mitigation outlined within <b>EIA Chapter 7</b> for the closest heritage assets to the revised layout of the Proposed Development would be implemented to ensure protection during construction and no significant effects.   |
|                                   | No significant cumulative effects on cultural heritage are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development and the conclusion of <b>EIA Chapter 7</b> remains valid.  |
| Socio-economics<br>and Land Use   | The revised layout of the Proposed Development would produce approximately 128,000MWh per year and power approximately 39,500 UK homes <sup>1</sup> .   |
|                                   | Taking into account market changes, the overall construction costs and jobs created are anticipated to be similar to those quoted in <b>EIA Chapter 8</b> .   |
|                                   | An updated proposed paths plan in line with the revised layout has been produced to maximise recreational access during the operation phase of the development.   |
|                                   | The Applicant's proposed community benefit of £5,000 per MW installed capacity remains the same as for the application layout, being linked to the grid capacity of the wind farm (up to £204,000 per year), as well as continuing to offer support to develop a near neighbour's electricity contribution scheme and shared revenue opportunities. |
|                                   | The conclusions of <b>EIA Chapter 8</b> in relation to construction and operational effects reported in <b>EIA Chapter 8</b> remain unchanged.  |
| Traffic and<br>Transport          | The revised layout would result in fewer vehicle movements throughout the overall balance of plant construction and turbine works programme than were estimated in <b>EIA Technical Appendix 9.1,</b> reduced to:   |
|                                   | maximum 6,234 HGV trips (6% reduction); and   |
|                                   | • 65 two-way movements per day (7% reduction) in peak months.   |
|                                   | The revised layout does not change the significance of effects stated in <b>EIA</b><br><b>Chapter 9</b> that no significant effects on transport or traffic would result.   |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Calculated using the most recent statistics from DESNZ showing that annual GB average domestic household consumption is 3,239kWh (as of January 2024, updated annually).



| SEI Topic   | Changes to Residual Effects as a Result of Revised Layout  |
|---|--|
| Noise   | The revised layout results in reduced noise operational impacts at nearby noise sensitive receptors from those reported in <b>EIA Technical Appendix 9.3</b> . Wind turbine noise levels from the revised layout remain below the site-specific noise limit. The conclusions of <b>EIA Chapter 9</b> that there would be no significant adverse noise effects are sustained. |
| Climate, Energy<br>Production and<br>Carbon Balance | The carbon payback period and potential CO <sub>2</sub> emissions savings for the revised layout are slightly lower than presented in the EIA Report, however this does not materially alter the Proposed Development's expected carbon saving potential and there is no change to the conclusion of <b>EIA Chapter 9</b> .  |
|   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>Offset 2.2 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> over lifetime (40 years) (when compared to fossil fuels).</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>Offset 1.1 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> over lifetime (40 years) (when compared to a grid<br/>mix).</li> </ul>   |
| Shadow Flicker                                      | The removal of T1 results in no change to the assessment of shadow flicker, therefore there is no change to the findings of <b>EIA Chapter 9</b> that no shadow flicker effects are likely to occur at Upperglen (the only property within the study area).  |
| Aviation  | The removal of T1 would not fundamentally affect the design and implementation of<br>an identified and defined mitigation solution which would ensure that there would be<br>no unacceptable impact on the Tiree radar, therefore there is no change to the<br>findings in relation to aviation of <b>EIA Chapter 9</b> .  |

#### Conclusions

11.4 Whilst the revised layout of the Proposed Development (as considered in this SEI Report) results in beneficial changes to some of the assessments, none of the outcomes significantly alter the findings as reported in the EIA Report. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no material change to the predicted residual effects as a result of the revised layout and updated cumulative assessments.

