

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Report

LT383 Alyth to Tealing Overhead Line (OHL)

400kV Upgrade

November 2024



VOLUME 4: APPENDIX 6.2 - SCOPING OPINION



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

**The Scottish Government
Energy Consents Unit**

**Scoping Opinion on behalf of Scottish Ministers under the
Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland)
Regulations 2017**

**Alyth to Tealing Overhead Line 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring)
Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc**

3 September 2024

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Consultation	3
3.	The Scoping Opinion	5
4.	Mitigation Measures	7
5.	Conclusion	8
	ANNEX A	9
	ANNEX B.....	40

1. Introduction

1.1 This scoping opinion is issued by the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit on behalf of the Scottish Ministers to Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc a company incorporated under the Companies Acts with company number SC213461 and having its registered office at 200 Dunkeld Road, Perth PH1 3AQ (“the Company”) in response to a request dated 28 June 2024 for a scoping opinion under the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 in relation to the proposed Alyth to Tealing Overhead Line (“OHL”) 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring) (“the proposed development”). The request was accompanied by a scoping report.

1.2 The proposed development would be located between Alyth substation, south east of Alyth, Perth and Kinross and tower 685, north west of Tealing substation, Angus. The proposed Development would pass through the local planning authority areas of Perth and Kinross and Angus.

1.3 The proposed Development would consist of the upgrade of approximately 14km of the existing 16km 275kV OHL between Alyth substation and tower 685, north west of Tealing substation, to enable operation at 400kV. This would involve the replacement of the existing conductors, insulators, and fittings on the existing steel lattice towers. Where required, tower condition works including steel work and tower leg foundation work to strengthen existing steel lattice towers would be undertaken. Some modifications may be required to the existing towers such as the inverting of cross arms to improve clearances and changes to the insulator set configurations. This would be determined following further engineering and design checks.

1.4 In addition to the OHL there will be ancillary infrastructure including:

- Site compounds; and
- Tower access track upgrades (where required)

1.5 The proposed development is within the planning authority areas of Perth and Kinross Council and Angus Council.

2. Consultation

2.1 Following the scoping opinion request a list of consultees was agreed between Scottish Hydro Electric Transmission Plc (acting as the Company’s agent) and the Energy Consents Unit. A consultation on the scoping report was undertaken by the Scottish Ministers and this commenced on 8 July 2024. The consultation closed on 12 August 2024. An Extension to this deadline was granted to Historic Environment Scotland. The Scottish Ministers also requested responses from their internal advisors Transport Scotland and Scottish Forestry. Standing advice from Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) has been provided with requirements to complete a checklist prior to the submission of the application for consent under section 37 of the Electricity Act 1989. All consultation responses received, and the standing advice from MD-SEDD, are attached in **ANNEX A Consultation responses** and **ANNEX B MD-SEDD Standing Advice**.

2.2 The purpose of the consultation was to obtain scoping advice from each consultee on environmental matters within their remit. Responses from consultees and advisors, including the standing advice from MD-SEDD, should be read in full for detailed requirements and for comprehensive guidance, advice and, where appropriate, templates for preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report.

2.3 Unless stated to the contrary in this scoping opinion, Scottish Ministers expect the EIA report to include all matters raised in responses from the consultees and advisors.

2.4 To date no response has been received from Angus Council, and it has been decided that the Scottish Ministers will provide a scoping opinion at this time based on the consultation responses received. In the event that a response is subsequently received from Angus Council, it will be published on the Energy Consents Unit website as an addendum to this scoping opinion.

2.5 In addition to Angus Council the following organisations were consulted but did not provide a response:

- Scottish Forestry
- BT
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Crown Estate Scotland
- Fisheries Management Scotland
- Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board
- John Muir Trust
- Mountaineering Scotland
- NATS Safeguarding
- RSPB Scotland
- ScotWays
- Scottish Wildlife Trust
- Scottish Wild Land Group
- Visit Scotland
- Woodland Trust
- Maritime and Coastguard Agency
- National Grid
- Scottish Canoe Association
- Scottish Gas Networks
- Sustrans
- National Farmers Union
- Alyth Community Council
- Kirriemuir Landward West Community Council
- Meigle and Ardler Community Council
- Newtyle and Eassie Community Council
- Auchterhouse Community Council
- Tealing Community Council

2.6 With regard to those consultees who did not respond, it is assumed that they have no comment to make on the scoping report, however each would be consulted again in the event that an application for section 37 consent is submitted subsequent to this EIA scoping opinion.

2.7 The Scottish Ministers are satisfied that the requirements for consultation set out in Regulation 12(4) of the Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 have been met.

3. The Scoping Opinion

3.1 This scoping opinion has been adopted following consultation with Perth and Kinross Council, within whose area the proposed development would be situated, NatureScot (previously “SNH”), Scottish Environment Protection Agency and Historic Environment Scotland, all as statutory consultation bodies, and with other bodies which Scottish Ministers consider likely to have an interest in the proposed development by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities or local and regional competencies.

3.2 Scottish Ministers adopt this scoping opinion having taken into account the information provided by the applicant in its request dated 28 June 2024 in respect of the specific characteristics of the proposed development and responses received to the consultation undertaken. In providing this scoping opinion, the Scottish Ministers have had regard to current knowledge and methods of assessment; have taken into account the specific characteristics of the proposed development, the specific characteristics of that type of development and the environmental features likely to be affected.

3.3 A copy of this scoping opinion has been sent to Perth and Kinross Council and Angus Council for publication on their website. It has also been published on the Scottish Government energy consents website at www.energyconsents.scot.

3.4 Scottish Ministers expect the EIA report which will accompany the application for the proposed development to consider in full all consultation responses attached in **Annex A and Annex B**.

3.5 Scottish Ministers are satisfied with the scope of the EIA set out in the scoping report.

3.6 In addition to the consultation responses, Ministers wish to provide comments with regards to the scope of the EIA report. The Company should note and address each matter.

3.7 Scottish Water provided information on whether there are any drinking water protected areas or Scottish Water assets on which the development could have any significant effect. Scottish Ministers request that the company contacts Scottish Water (via EIA@scottishwater.co.uk) and makes further enquires to confirm whether there any Scottish Water assets which may be affected by the development, and includes details in the EIA report of any relevant mitigation measures to be provided.

3.8 Scottish Ministers request that the Company investigates the presence of any private water supplies which may be impacted by the development. The EIA report should include details of any supplies identified by this investigation, and if any supplies are identified, the Company should provide an assessment of the potential impacts, risks, and any mitigation which would be provided.

3.9 Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) provide generic scoping guidelines for onshore wind farm and overhead line development (<https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Salmon-Trout-Coarse/Freshwater/Research/onshoreren>) which outline how fish populations can be impacted during the construction, operation and decommissioning of a wind farm or overhead line development and informs developers as to what should be considered, in relation to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries, during the EIA process.

3.10 In addition to identifying the main watercourses and waterbodies within and downstream of the proposed development area, developers should identify and consider, at this early stage, any areas of Special Areas of Conservation where fish are a qualifying feature and proposed felling operations particularly in acid sensitive areas.

3.11 MD-SEDD also provide standing advice for onshore wind farm or overhead line development (which has been appended at Annex B) which outlines what information, relating to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries, is expected in the EIA report. Use of the checklist, provided in Annex 1 of the standing advice, should ensure that the EIA report contains the required information; the absence of such information may necessitate requesting additional information which may delay the process. Developers are required to submit the completed checklist in advance of their application submission.

3.12 Scottish Ministers consider that where there is a demonstrable requirement for peat landslide hazard and risk assessment (PLHRA), the assessment should be undertaken as part of the EIA process to provide Ministers with a clear understanding of whether the risks are acceptable and capable of being controlled by mitigation measures. The Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessments: Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments (Second Edition), published at <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2017/04/8868>, should be followed in the preparation of the EIA report, which should contain such an assessment and details of mitigation measures. Where a PLHRA is not required clear justification for not carrying out such a risk assessment is required.

3.13 The scoping report states visualisations shall be included within Volume 4 of the EIA Report. The production of these visualisations to form part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should follow discussions on agreed viewpoint locations with Perth and Kinross Council, Angus Council and NatureScot.

3.14 The noise assessment should be carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards as detailed in section 11 of the scoping report. As requested by Perth and Kinross Council Environmental Health, an indoor noise assessment should also be incorporated assuming a partially opened window using Noise Rating curve criteria. It is further expected that all noise from construction works would comply with Perth and Kinross Council and Angus Council area's guidelines for construction noise.

3.15 It is recommended by the Scottish Ministers that in order to assess the full environmental impact of the development, the Company include within the cumulative impact assessment not only approved EIA development, but also EIA and non EIA OHL or Substation infrastructure that is associated with SSEN Transmission ASTI projects.

3.16 It is recommended by the Scottish Ministers that decisions on bird surveys – species, methodology, vantage points, viewsheds & duration - site specific & cumulative – should be made following discussion between the Company and NatureScot.

3.17 The assessment on archaeology and cultural heritage impacts should be carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards as detailed in section 8 of the scoping report and should also include the recommendations by both HES and Perth and Kinross Council within their consultation responses (Annex A).

3.18 The Scottish Ministers request that the company assess the impact of the proposed development on existing and/or planned infrastructure. In particular, the company should carry out the necessary assessments to confirm if any part of the proposed development is within the consultation zone of any of the following:-

- a licenced explosives site;
- gas (or any other) pipeline;
- existing overhead electric lines;
- underground cables;
- water pipes;
- telecommunications links.

3.19 Scottish Ministers request the company to assess if any flammable, toxic or explosive chemicals detailed in The Town and Country Planning (Hazardous Substances) (Scotland) Regulations 2015 would be stored on site in quantities such that a Hazardous Substances Consent would be required under section 2 of the Planning (Hazardous Substances) (Scotland) Act 1997.

3.20 Ministers are aware that further engagement is required between parties regarding the refinement of the design of the proposed development regarding, among other things, surveys, management plans, peat, radio links, finalisation of viewpoints, cultural heritage, cumulative assessments and request that they are kept informed of relevant discussions.

4. Mitigation Measures

4.1 The Scottish Ministers are required to make a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment as identified in the environmental impact assessment. The mitigation measures suggested for any significant environmental impacts identified should be presented as a conclusion to each chapter. Applicants are also asked to provide a consolidated schedule of all mitigation measures proposed in the environmental assessment, provided in tabular form, where that mitigation is relied upon in relation to reported conclusions of likelihood or significance of impacts.

5. Conclusion

5.1 This scoping opinion is based on information contained in the applicant's written request for a scoping opinion and information available at the date of this scoping opinion. The adoption of this scoping opinion by the Scottish Ministers does not preclude the Scottish Ministers from requiring of the applicant information in connection with an EIA report submitted in connection with any application for section 37 consent for the proposed development.

5.2 This scoping opinion will not prevent the Scottish Ministers from seeking additional information at application stage, for example to include cumulative impacts of additional developments which enter the planning process after the date of this opinion.

5.3 Without prejudice to that generality, it is recommended that advice regarding the requirement for an additional scoping opinion be sought from Scottish Ministers in the event that no application has been submitted within 12 months of the date of this opinion.

5.4 It is acknowledged that the environmental impact assessment process is iterative and should inform the final layout and design of proposed developments. Scottish Ministers note that further engagement between relevant parties in relation to the refinement of the design of this proposed development will be required, and would request that they are kept informed of on-going discussions in relation to this.

5.5 Applicants are encouraged to engage with officials at the Scottish Government's Energy Consents Unit at the pre-application stage and before proposals reach design freeze.

5.6 When finalising the EIA report, applicants are asked to provide a summary in tabular form of where within the EIA report each of the specific matters raised in this scoping opinion has been addressed.

5.7 It should be noted that to facilitate uploading to the Energy Consents portal, the EIA report and its associated documentation should be divided into appropriately named separate files of sizes no more than 10 megabytes (MB).

Lee Stirrat

**Energy Consents Unit
3 September 2024**

ANNEX A

Consultation

List of consultees who provided a response.

- Perth and Kinross Council A1 – A4
- Historic Environment Scotland A5 – A10
- Scottish Environmental Protection Agency A11 - A13
- NatureScot (previously “SNH”) A14 – A15
- British Horse Society A16 – A18
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation A19 – A20
- Joint Radio Company Limited A21 – A22
- Network Rail A23 – A23
- Office for Nuclear Regulation A24 – A24
- Scottish Water A25 – A27

Internal advice from areas of the Scottish Government was provided by officials from Transport Scotland and Marine Directorate (in the form of standing advice from Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD).

See Section 2.5 above for a list of organisations that were consulted but did not provide a response.

**ELECTRICITY ACT 1989
THE ELECTRICITY WORKS (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT)
(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2017**

**REQUEST FOR SCOPING OPINION FOR PROPOSED SECTION 37
APPLICATION FOR ALYTH TO TEALING OHL 400KV UPGRADE
(RECONDUCTORING)**

**RESPONSE OF PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL AS PLANNING AUTHORITY
REGARDING SCOPE OF THE FORTHCOMING EIA FOR THIS PROPOSAL**

PKC Ref No	24/00017/CONSUL	
ECU Ref No	ECU00005167	
Ward No	P2- Strathmore	
Due Determination Date	31st July 2024	
Draft Report Date	12th August 2024	
Report Issued by	John Cooney	Date 12th August 2024

PROPOSAL Upgrade works to overhead lines (EIA Scoping)

LOCATION: Land 370 Metres South of Cottage 1 Grange of Aberbothrie
Alyth Blairgowrie PH11 8NX Coupar Angus

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR COMMENTS REGARDING EIA SCOPING
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

1. Transportation And Development

No comments received.

2. Biodiversity/Tree Officer

No comment at this stage.

3. Conservation Team

The proposed scoping for heritage assets is acceptable. However, the project site boundary intersects Category C listed Drumkilbo Mains Farm which has not been identified on the heritage assets map or within the scoping report. The EIA should include this Category C listed building.

The EIA for heritage impact assets should be undertaken on the 'Worst Case Access Strategy' map.

4. Environmental Health (Noise Odour)

Wood noise consultants have been in contact with this Service to agree the methodology for the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) which will be submitted as part of the EIA. Guidance has been taken from British Standard 4142:2014+A1:2019: Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound (BS 4142), Planning Advice Note (PAN) 1/2011: 'Planning and Noise', National Grid Technical Report TR(E)564 (2021) - Development of a Method for Assessing the Impact of Noise from Overhead Lines (New Build, Reconductoring, Diversion and Uprating) and TGN(E)322 - Operational Audible Noise Assessment Process For Overhead Lines. They have advised that the criteria will be such that operational noise of the overhead line does not result in over +4 dB excess in a TGN(E)322 assessment. Additionally at the request of this Service, they have confirmed that they will incorporate a indoor noise assessment, assuming a partially opened window (NANR116), using NR curve criteria in this application. However, should the noise meet the external TGN322 criteria, this may be something that is scoped out in the future.

5. Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)

No adverse comments to make

6. Structures And Flooding (Structures)

No further comment.

7. Structures And Flooding (Flooding)

No comments received.

8. Development Plan

LDP Policy 50 Prime agricultural land
NPF4 Policy 5 Soils

The Development Plan Team recommend including consideration of prime agricultural land.

The EIA scoping report omits prime agricultural land but some of the land on/under the proposed development is Class 2 or Class 3.1 - Prime under the land capability for agriculture classification. The remainder of the land is Class 3.2 or lower - non-prime, or not classified.

LDP Policy 50 Prime agricultural land presumes against development on prime agricultural land unless it is necessary to meet a specific established need

LDP Policy 33A Renewable and Low-Carbon Energy part (f) requires consideration of the effects of proposed development on soils including prime agricultural land

NPF Policy 5 Soils, also limits support for development proposals on prime agricultural land to criteria set out in part (b) of the policy, but these criteria include essential infrastructure

It is appreciated that the proposed development may be expected to have little direct effect on soils (including prime agricultural land) however it is important that this is given consideration as the agricultural soil under the line may or may not be indirectly affected as it may become unavailable for use while the line is being upgraded or in use.

9. Perth And Kinross Heritage Trust (PKHT)

Firstly, as part of the EIA process as per 8.5.3 PKHT recommend that a data extract for the scheme is requested from the Perth and Kinross Historic Environment Record (PKHER) as the most detailed and dynamic record available for undesignated historic assets.

In general, the archaeological resource for this area is incredibly rich with various known sites both of nationally and regional significance, alongside potential for unknown assets yet to be discovered. PKHT are aware that the scheme is in the early stages of design and in part looks to reduce impacts wherever possible. However, given the nature of the development, we do have some recommendations for the historic environment. This is not definitive, and more will likely become apparent with a focussed design and further information.

We are broadly in agreement with 8.4 regarding potential impacts however we would also suggest consideration of potential for impacts on unknown buried archaeology on certain areas that are sensitive through geography or indeed blank spots in the record. As such PKHT would expect the EIA to fully consider these with regards to where works look to have physical impacts such as new access tracks. PKHT are also aware that compounds and lay down areas are often large areas that don't always get specified. PKHT would ask this is included to allow the impacts to be fully considered and we recommend compound and laydown areas to be sited in areas without archaeological potential.

The development proposes upgrade to the current line infrastructure, alongside existing towers with the replacement of some which will require extension to foundations. The renewal of existing infrastructure and reuse of access tracks reduces most negative impacts on known archaeology and is therefore the first line in any mitigation. Regarding tracks PKHT understand these will be dependent on tower upgrades but for non-invasive tracks we would expect pre and post condition

surveys in areas of known archaeological sensitivity i.e. adjacent to SMs).

For new access tracks requiring excavation PKHT would be expecting any archaeological requirements to be targeted via proximity to other monuments or as outlined above potential for unknown buried remains to survive (geography etc).

Directly linked to this site are the recent discoveries at Haughend, which identified the continuation of a timber frame building north of the SM red line boundary likely contemporary with that site. As such the boundaries of SMs and the limitations of these should be fully assessed. Protective fencing and buffers should also be considered as measures to avoid accidental damage during works.

In summary, PKHT are happy with the content of the heritage assessment however as the final details have not been agreed, we are unable to fully respond to the potential impacts on the historic environment. Therefore, PKHT would still require consultation in advance of any works and may recommend further programmes of works to those addressed in the EIA report.

It's likely PKHT would propose that a condition for a programme of archaeological works would need attached to any future application and potentially a requirement for an Archaeological Clerk of Works to manage the impacts on unknown archaeological remains and protect known archaeology along the route.

By email: jennifer.gessler@gov.scot

Jennifer Gessler
Case Officer | Onshore Electricity,
Strategy and Consents
Energy Consents Unit

Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

Enquiry Line: 0131-668-8716
HMConsultations@hes.scot

Our case ID: 300071619
Your ref: ECU00005167
26 August 2024

Dear Jennifer Gessler

**The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland)
Regulations 2017
Alyth to Tealing OHL 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring)
Comments on scope of proposed Environmental Impact Assessment**

Thank you for consulting us on this Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping report, which we received on 8 July 2024. We have reviewed the details in terms of our historic environment interests. This covers World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments and their settings, category A listed buildings and their settings, inventory gardens and designed landscapes, inventory battlefields and Historic Marine Protected Areas.

The relevant local authority archaeological and cultural heritage advisors will also be able to offer advice on the scope of the cultural heritage assessment. This may include topics covered by our advice giving role, and also other topics such as unscheduled archaeology, category B and C listed buildings, and conservation areas.

Proposed development

The proposal would comprise alterations to existing overhead line infrastructure including repair and reinforcement of existing tower elements, replacement of fittings etc. plus supporting infrastructure and activities such as the construction of access tracks and welfare facilities.

Scope of assessment

We have identified likely significant effects on our historic environment interests. Our advice on the nature of these impacts is included in an annex to this covering letter. This also includes our requirements for information to be included in the EIA Report.

Further information

Decisions that affect the historic environment should take the [Historic Environment Policy for Scotland](#) (HEPS) into account as a material consideration. HEPS is supported by our Managing Change guidance series. In this case, the advice in the [Setting, Gardens and Designed Landscapes](#) and [Works on Scheduled Monuments](#) guidance notes is particularly relevant.

We also recommend that the applicant refers to the [EIA Handbook](#) for best practice advice on assessing cultural heritage impacts.

We hope this is helpful. If you would like to submit more information about this or any other proposed development to us for comment, please send it to our consultations mailbox, hmconsultations@hes.scot. If you have questions about this response, please contact Deirdre Cameron at deirdre.cameron@hes.scot

Yours sincerely

Historic Environment Scotland

ANNEX: Our Detailed Comments

Background

HES was consulted during pre-application processes undertaken by Scottish and Southern Energy Networks earlier this year. Our responses highlighted potential impacts on designated cultural heritage assets but we also noted the consideration of these potential impacts in the preliminary assessments and the clear commitment to mitigation.

Legislative, Policy and Guidance context

In addition to the background context outlined in section 8.1 of the report, the following documents will also be useful in considering the proposed development –

- [The Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook](#)
- [Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Gardens and Designed Landscapes](#)
- [Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Works on Scheduled Monuments](#)

In section 8.1.5, the reference to “Our Place in Time” should be changed as this document has been superseded by the publication of a new strategy for Scotland’s historic environment [Our Past Our Future](#).

Scoping Report

We note and welcome the consideration of cultural heritage interests in the scoping report and we are generally content with the assessment methodology proposed. The report does not provide much detail on the works themselves, but we note the clear understanding of appropriate mitigation principles displayed in the cultural heritage chapter. We recommend that archaeological mitigation measures should be incorporated within the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan to ensure they are not accidentally overlooked; this is a particular risk if excavation or monitoring by an archaeological contractor is required as responsibilities on site can become confused.

We note that the creation and use of the main site compound is not included in the EIA process as it is the responsibility of the main contractor. That contractor should be made aware of the mitigation requirements for cultural heritage assets and ensure they are followed.

Our interest

The proposed works have the potential to result in direct physical impacts on two designated cultural heritage assets

- **Cardean Roman Camp and prehistoric barrow ([SM4337](#))**
- **Drumkilbo Designed Landscape ([GDL00142](#))**

Section 8.2.11 of the Scoping Report notes that there are a number of other designated assets located within the 500m study area. Based on the information supplied, there should be no direct physical impacts on these sites from the proposed works and the commitment to mitigation through design shown in the scoping report should ensure that these assets are avoided by elements of the works such as access routes, storage areas, vehicular movement etc. However, on large-scale projects such as this there is always a small risk of accidental damage. The Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) should detail the embedded mitigation measures that will be used to minimise or remove that risk. This could range from “toolbox talks” to ensure employee awareness, to Site Protection Plans to avoid accidental damage to assets identified as being at particular risk. These mitigation measures should form part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Given the nature of the works, we do not have significant concerns about potential setting impacts or indirect impacts on cultural heritage assets in our remit.

We also note the commitment to biodiversity enhancement as part of the project. While this is welcome, any such schemes should be designed to ensure they do not create inadvertent adverse impacts on cultural heritage assets.

Cardean Roman Camp and prehistoric barrow (SM4337)

The monument comprises a Roman temporary camp, dating possibly to the Severan campaign of AD 208-211, and a ring-ditch which is probably the remains of a prehistoric barrow. There is an existing OHL tower on the western edge of the protected area of the monument.

Scheduled monuments are legally protected sites under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Most works within the scheduled area of a monument requires scheduled monument consent (SMC), obtained in advance through Historic Environment Scotland. This would include any preliminary investigations involving ground disturbance that might be necessary to establish whether the tower foundations required repair or reinforcement.

The applicants should be aware that scheduled monument consent would be required for any works involving a physical intervention to the monument, including any preliminary ground investigations

Section 8.2.10 of the Scoping Report states that the monument is located within the site development boundary and that there is a potential direct physical impact from works to Towers 643 and 644 including access, working areas and associated infrastructure. A detailed assessment of these impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to avoid or minimise them should be included in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.

Any remaining physical impacts are likely to require scheduled monument consent and we recommend that pre-application discussion with ourselves is progressed as soon as possible.

Should the development be permitted, all contractors working at the site should be made aware of the extent of the legally protected scheduled area of the monument. The scheduled area is shown on the scheduling document for the monument which is available to view and download via this link:

<https://portal.historicenvironment.scot/designation/SM4337>

A Site Protection Plan should be prepared for the monument that includes information on the following:

- **Access** – this should ideally be located to the west of the monument in order to avoid impacts on the scheduled area.
- **Ground Protection** – potential damage to the ground surface from any aspect of the proposed works should be assessed and mitigated.
- **Temporary Barriers** – the scheduled area should be clearly marked with a temporary barrier, such as freestanding Heras fencing, to prevent accidental damage to the monument.

Drumkilbo Designed Landscape ([GDL00142](#))

Drumkilbo House has its origins in the 14th century but the designed landscape dates from the 19th century with subsequent alterations and additions in the 20th century.

The existing route passes southwest of the designed landscape, crossing flat agricultural land close to the mature trees which line the entrance drive of the estate.

We advised in our pre-application response (April 2024) that we were satisfied with the principle of proposed development as it involves upgrading an existing OHL with no change to its route. The Scoping Report explains that visual effects will be scoped out of the EIA due to the temporary nature of the potential changes *unless* any important trees or features are proposed for removal at Drumkilbo (4.4.1). The mature woodlands are an important element of the designed landscape. Any proposed tree felling should consider the significance of the trees to the inventory site, and we advise considering mitigation where appropriate to avoid or reduce adverse impacts.

To allow a fully informed decision to be made on the scheme proposals the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) should address the following matters:

1. Access – the access plan in the scoping report is small-scale (Figure 2.2) and contains no detailed information on what impact might result from the works. The EIAR should clarify this, particularly what visual impacts this might have on the designed landscape. Mitigation measures should be employed to avoid any long-term or permanent effects on Drumkilbo.
2. Tower/foundation strengthening - it is unclear which towers this applies to, and what might be involved. The EIAR should make this clear. Again, we advise mitigating any adverse impacts where appropriate.
3. Reprofilng – it would be helpful to clarify if/where earthmoving is proposed and how any potential impacts will be mitigated.

Our position

Although the proposed works outlined in the scoping report have the potential to result in significant impacts on a scheduled monument and a designed landscape, we are content that those impacts could be mitigated to an acceptable level, allowing the development to proceed. The environmental impact assessment process should identify and document suitable mitigation measures. We would be happy to offer further information and advice on this matter.

Historic Environment Scotland
26 August 2024

Jennifer Gessier
Onshore electricity, Strategy and Consents
Scottish Government

Our Ref: PCS-20001879

Your Ref: ECU00005167

By email only to: Econsents_Admin@gov.scot

SEPA Email Contact:
planning.north@sepa.org.uk

07 August 2024

Dear Jennifer Gessier

**Electricity Act 1989 - Section 37
ECU00005167 - REQUEST FOR SCOPING OPINION FOR PROPOSED SECTION 37
APPLICATION FOR ALYTH TO TEALING OHL 400KV UPGRADE
(RECONDUCTORING)**

Thank you for consulting SEPA for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping opinion in relation to the above development. We welcome engagement with the applicant at an early stage to discuss any of the issues raised in this letter and would especially welcome further pre-application engagement once initial peat probing, peat condition assessment and habitat survey work has been completed and the layout developed further as a result.

Our position and advice, given below, is based on the determining authority ultimately determining that the proposal is classed as development that could be supported for the purposes of assessment under Policies 5 and 22, as defined in National Planning Framework 4. If this is not the case, please advise so we can re-consider our position and advice.

Advice for the planning authority / determining authority

After reviewing the submitted documents, we consider all elements can be covered by our standing advice: [sepa-triage-framework-and-standing-advice.pdf](#).

We provide answers the specific questions asked in section 18.2.1 of the Scoping Report below:

1. Consultee questions

- 1.1 Environmental information - most of our data is available directly from the SEPA website. Where any data cannot be found please submit a data request via our online form - [Environmental data | Scottish Environment Protection Agency \(SEPA\)](#)
- 1.2 Baseline collection and surveys – the baseline data and surveys required to submitted is set out in the attached Appendix.
- 1.3 Additional baseline data – please see 1.1 above.
- 1.4 Key issues or possible effects omitted - No
- 1.5 List of issues to be scoped out – Yes. And provided watercourse crossings are designed to accommodate the 1 in 200-year event plus climate change and other infrastructure is located well away from watercourses we do not foresee from current information a need for detailed information on flood risk. However, should any of the track upgrades and new temporary tracks require landraising within a flood extent then a detailed flood risk assessment and appropriate mitigation maybe required.

2. Regulatory advice for the applicant

- 2.1 Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice, for example in relation to engineering works in the water environment and waste management, can be found on the [regulations section](#) of our website. If you are unable to find the advice you need for a specific regulatory matter, please contact a member of the local compliance team at: fad@sepa.org.uk .

If you have queries relating to this letter, please contact us at planning.north@sepa.org.uk including our reference number in the email subject.

Yours sincerely,

Zoe Griffin
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Service

Ecopy to: Case officer, jennifer.gessler@gov.scot, Applicant, albert.muckley@sse.com

Disclaimer: This advice is given without prejudice to any decision made on elements of the proposal regulated by us, as such a decision may take into account factors not considered at this time. We prefer all the technical information required for any SEPA consents to be submitted at the same time as the planning or similar application. However, we consider it to be at the applicant's commercial risk if any significant changes required during the regulatory stage necessitate a further planning application or similar application and/or neighbour notification or advertising. We have relied on the accuracy and completeness of the information supplied to us in providing the above advice and can take no responsibility for incorrect data or interpretation, or omissions, in such information. If we have not referred to a particular issue in our response, it should not be assumed that there is no impact associated with that issue. For planning applications, if you did not specifically request advice on flood risk, then advice will not have been provided on this issue. Further information on our consultation arrangements generally can be found on our [website planning pages - www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/](http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/)

Jennifer Gessler

Onshore Electricity, Strategy and Consents

Directorate for Energy and Climate Change

Scottish Government

5 Atlantic Quay

150 Broomielaw

Glasgow G2 8LU

Sent by email to Econsents_Admin@gov.scot

23 July 2024

Our ref: CDM176236

Dear Ms Gessler,

Electricity Act 1989

The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

Request for Scoping Opinion for Proposed Section 37 Application for Alyth to Tealing Overhead line Upgrade (Reconductoring) – ECU00005167

Thank you for your consultation request. The Applicant has engaged with us throughout the earlier planning stages of this proposal. We have provided feedback to them, primarily focused on statutory protected areas where the work associated with the uprating of the OHL has potential to affect the protected natural features of protected areas.

NatureScot comments on Scoping Report

SSEN's ongoing approach to consultation does afford us the confidence that the right level of information is being gathered to inform their Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

We agree with the topics and issues proposed to be scoped in and out and we are not aware of any further information we hold that could assist with the production of their EIA.

NatureScot advice on key issues identified at Scoping stage

Protected areas

The OHL project has potential to impact on protected areas. However, it is envisaged that significant adverse effects on protected areas can be avoided through the implementation of standard mitigation measures during the construction work, including compliance with both project wide and site-specific environmental management procedures, with reference to SSEN Transmission General Environmental

Management Plans (GEMPs) and Species Protection Plans (SPPs). A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) will be developed for the project and adopted by the Principal Contractor during the construction phase. The implementation of the CEMP would be managed on site by a suitably qualified and experienced Environmental Clerk of Works (ECOW), with support from other environmental professionals as required.

River Tay Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

The existing OHL crosses the SAC at two locations on the River Isla and the Dean Water. The protected features of the SAC that could be present in these locations are Atlantic salmon, lamprey species (sea, river and brook) and otter. These watercourses are currently spanned by the OHL and all existing towers are outwith the SAC, set back from the rivers. The standard measures referred to above should ensure that the aquatic environment is protected against pollution, excessive sediment run off and accidents.

Whilst freshwater pearl mussels are not a qualifying interest of the SAC, it is possible that they may be present, and they are a protected species.

Special Protection Areas for ornithological interests

No other protected areas are directly affected but potential connectivity to Special Protection Areas (SPAs) designated for bird interests needs to be considered. This will be included within the EIA as detailed in the Scoping Report.

We are also engaged with SSEN regarding the production of their shadow Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA).

Concluding remarks

The advice in this letter is provided by NatureScot, the operating name of Scottish Natural Heritage and is given without prejudice to a full and detailed consideration of the impacts of the proposal if submitted for formal consultation as part of the EIA or planning process.

Please contact us if you require any further information or advice.

Yours sincerely

Jennifer Heatley
Operations Officer - North
jennifer.heatley@nature.scot

cc. Albert Muckley, SSEN Transmission

Patron His Majesty The King

The British Horse Society

Email catriona.davies@bhs.org.uk

Scotland

Website www.bhs.org.uk

Suite A3

Tel 02476 840749

Stirling Agricultural Centre

REDACT

Bringing horses and people together

Stirling FK9 4RN

By email to: Econsents_Admin@gov.scot8th August 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Alyth to Tealing OHL 400KV upgrade ECU00005167

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this application. The British Horse Society (The BHS) represents the interests of the 3.4 million people in the UK who ride or who drive horse-drawn vehicles and is the largest and most influential equestrian charity in the UK. The BHS is committed to protecting and promoting the interests of all horses and the people who care for them through our work in education, welfare, safety and access.

Outdoor Access

Access to safe off-road riding routes is vital to the health and wellbeing of horses and their riders. Under the terms of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, equestrians have the same rights of access to the outdoors as other non-motorised users, such as pedestrians and cyclists. Equestrian use should therefore be included when planning and designing wind farm proposals. Considering all access takers, including equestrians, in the early stages helps to avoid problems down the line and ensures that projects like this are an opportunity to preserve and improve access for all, rather than curtail it or restrict it to certain groups.

I note there are several core paths close to and intersecting with the OHL and access tracks. These are likely to be used by equestrians as well as walkers and cyclists. In addition, other paths, tracks and informal routes are likely to be used by all access takers. Quiet, informal routes, such as field margins, are especially valuable to equestrians which can result in them passing unexpectedly close to work sites.

The BHS is here to help and can provide guidance on suitable surfaces and infrastructure to accommodate equestrians and other access takers. We would be very willing to work with the applicant on these aspects.

The Importance of Off-Road Riding

Access to safe off-road riding routes is vital to the health and wellbeing of horses and their riders. Equestrian road users are classed as vulnerable as they are more likely to be involved in a road accident and more likely to suffer the worst consequences.

Most riding accidents happen on minor roads and with increasing numbers of horses and riders seeking to access the countryside, adequate access to off-road riding should be a priority, especially in rural and semi-rural areas, and areas of high horse ownership, like Perthshire and Angus. Few riders access busy roads by choice (although the horse has as much right to be on public roads as cars, bikes and pedestrians) - but they often have few other places to ride or no other way to access their safe off-road riding.

Vehicles travelling two and from the construction of the OHL are likely to meet equestrians on the road and drivers should be advised of this risk. I have enclosed a copy of our *"Guidance to drivers of large vehicles"* document.

The British Horse Society is an Appointed Representative of South Essex Insurance Brokers Limited who are authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.

Registered Charity Nos. 210504 and SC038516. A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England & Wales No. 444742

The Horse and the Rural Economy

Scotland's equestrian industry is worth over £300 million to the Scottish economy annually. This figure excludes the value of the horse racing industry, which is worth a further £300 million. Perthshire and Angus are areas of high horse ownership, so equestrianism is an important part of the rural economy here. Recent joint research between SRUC and The BHS showed current trends in the sector point to a continued increase in horse numbers and riding activity in all geographical areas of Scotland and across a wide cross section of society, leading to growth in the sector.

A national survey of riders who had recently given up their horse found that 27% of them had done so because they had lost access and had nowhere to ride. Failing to accommodate horses on our local path networks may lead to riders being forced to give up their horses, which in turn may damage the local economy.

I trust that the above information is of assistance. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the needs of equestrians further, please do contact me.

Kind regards,

REDACT

Catriona Davies
Scotland Access Officer
The British Horse Society

Horses are normally nervous of large vehicles, particularly when they do not often meet them. They can run away in panic if they are really frightened. Whilst their riders will do all they can to prevent this, should it happen, it could cause a serious accident for other road users, as well as for the horse and rider.

In such a situation, the main factors causing the fear are:

- Being approached by something which is unfamiliar to them and intimidating
- A large moving object, especially if it is noisy
- Lack of space between the horse and the vehicle
- The sound of the vehicles air brakes
- Anxiety on the part of the rider

How can you help?

- On seeing a rider, or riders, approaching – please slow down and be prepared to stop if necessary.
- Be aware that the sound of your airbrakes may spook the horse.
- If the horse, or horses, show signs of nervousness as you get closer, please turn the engine off and allow them to pass.
- Please don't move off again until the riders are well clear of the rear end of the vehicle.
- If you are approaching riders and wishing to overtake them, please approach slowly, or even stop to give the rider's time to find a gateway, or other place off the road, where they can take refuge and create sufficient space between the horse and vehicle. Horses are very aware of things coming from behind, due to the position of their eyes.
- Please be patient. Most riders will do their best to reassure their horses even though they may be feeling a high degree of anxiety themselves.
- Note: the safest place for the rider's hands is on the reins, so if they are anxious, they may only be able to nod their thanks to you – but please do be assured that they will be very, very grateful for your consideration of their situation.

THE BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY IS VERY GRATEFUL TO ALL DRIVERS WHO ARE WILLING TO FOLLOW THESE GUIDELINES.





Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Wendy Talbot
Ministry of Defence
Safeguarding Department
St George's House
DIO Headquarters
DMS Whittington
Lichfield
Staffordshire
WS14 9PY

Your Reference: ECU00005167

MoD Telephone: 07977410762

Our Reference: DIO10062097

E-mail: DIO-safeguarding-statutory@mod.gov.uk

Jennifer Gessler
Scottish Government
Directorate for Energy and Climate Change
5 Atlantic Quay
150 Broomielaw
GLASGOW
G2 8LU

29 July 2024

Dear Jennifer

MOD Safeguarding – SITE OUTSIDE SAFEGUARDING AREA (SOSA)

Proposal: Request for a scoping opinion from the Scottish Ministers for the proposed section 37 application for the Alyth to Tealing OHL 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring). The proposed development is for to upgrade approximately 14 kilometres (km) of an existing 16km 275 kilovolts (kV) overhead line (OHL) between Alyth substation and tower 685 north west of Tealing substation to enable operation at 400kV.

Location: Between Alyth substation and tower 685 north west of Tealing substation

Grid Ref:

Number	Easting	Northing
Alyth	328990	746998
2	330185	744654
3	332337	742783
4	333429	740593
5	335361	738979
6	339409	738979
Tealing	339937	737055

Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above proposed development which was received by this office.

The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the Ministry of Defence (MOD) as a consultee in UK planning and energy consenting systems to ensure that development does not compromise or degrade the operation of defence sites such as aerodromes, explosives storage

sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites or training resources such as the Military Low Flying System.

The application is a request for a Scoping Opinion on the reconductoring of approximately 14km of existing 275kV lattice electricity towers to enable their use in the transmission of 400kV.

This application relates to a site outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas. Having reviewed the proposals, I can confirm the MOD has no concerns in principle with regard to the scale and massing of the proposed development indicated on the submitted plans.

At this consultation stage, where the proposal is based on existing electricity towers being refurbished and the introduction of no new electricity towers, MOD representations are limited to the principle of the development only. In summary the MOD has no concerns, but should be consulted at all future stages for this proposed development to complete a full detailed safeguarding assessment.

The MOD must emphasise that the advice provided within this letter is in response to the data and information detailed in the developer's documents titled "Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report – Alyth to Tealing 400kV Upgrade" and "Location of Proposed Development" dated June 2024. Any variation of the parameters (which include the location, dimensions, form, and finishing materials) detailed may significantly alter how the development relates to MOD safeguarding requirements and cause adverse impacts to safeguarded defence assets or capabilities. In the event that any amendment, whether considered material or not by the determining authority, is submitted for approval, the MOD should be consulted and provided with adequate time to carry out assessments and provide a formal response.

I trust this is clear however should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

REDACT

Wendy Talbot
Assistant Safeguarding Manager
DIO Safeguarding

From: [JRC Windfarm Coordinations Old](#)
To: [Jennifer Gessler](#)
Cc: [Econsents Admin](#); [Wind SSE](#)
Subject: Alyth to Tealing OHL 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring) - Request for Scoping Opinion [WF490973]
Date: 10 July 2024 13:27:12

Dear Jennifer,

A Windfarms Team member has replied to your co-ordination request, reference **WF490973** with the following response:

Dear Jennifer

REF: ECU00005167

Thank you for your advisory regarding the ALYTH TO TEALING OHL 400KV UPGRADE (RECONDUCTORING).

Having determined from the documentation provided that the pylons carrying this section of the OHL are not moving (and that existing pylons are being re-used), JRC has no comment to make on this application at this time.

In the case of this proposed development, JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and the data you have provided.

Please note that due to the large number of adjacent radio links in this vicinity, which have been taken into account, clearance is given specifically for the proposed re-use of in-situ pylons.

However, if any details of the development change, particularly the grid location or scale of any towers, it will be necessary to re-evaluate the proposal.

In making this judgement, JRC has used its best endeavours with the available data, although we recognise that there may be effects which are as yet unknown or inadequately predicted. JRC cannot therefore be held liable if subsequently problems arise that we have not predicted.

It should be noted that this clearance pertains only to the date of its issue. As the use of the spectrum is dynamic, the use of the band is changing on an ongoing basis and consequently, you are advised to seek re-coordination prior to submitting a planning application, as this will negate the possibility of an objection being raised at that time as a consequence of any links assigned between your enquiry and the finalisation of your project.

JRC offers a range of radio planning and analysis services. If you require any assistance, please contact us by phone or email.

With best wishes

The Windfarm Team.

*Friars House
Manor House Drive
Coventry CV1 2TE
United Kingdom*

Office: 02476 932 185

JRC Ltd. is a Joint Venture between the Energy Networks Association (on behalf of the UK Energy Industries) and National Grid.

Registered in England & Wales: 2990041

[About The JRC | Joint Radio Company | JRC](#)

We hope this response has sufficiently answered your query.

If not, please **do not send another email** as you will go back to the end of the mail queue, which is not what you or we need. Instead, **reply to this email by clicking on the link below or login to your account** for access to your co-ordination requests and responses.

<https://breeze.jrc.co.uk/tickets/view.php?id=33683>

From: [Martin Henderson](#) on behalf of [Town Planning Scotland](#)
To: [Econsents Admin](#)
Subject: REF: ECU00005167 - Request for Scoping Opinion Alyth to Tealing OHL 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring)
Date: 29 July 2024 11:54:55
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

OFFICIAL

For the attention of Jennifer Gessler

Jennifer,

Thank you for consulting Network Rail regarding the above application. After examining the proposal Network Rail considers that it will have no impact on railway infrastructure and therefore have no comments/objections to this application.

Regards

Martin Henderson



Martin Henderson
Town Planning Technician (West Scotland)
Network Rail Property (Scotland)
151 St Vincent Street, Glasgow, G2 5NW
07702400389
martin.henderson@networkrail.co.uk
www.networkrail.co.uk/property

Please send all Notifications and Consultations to TownPlanningScotland@networkrail.co.uk or by post to Network Rail, Town Planning, 151 St Vincent Street, Glasgow, G2 5NW

The content of this email (and any attachment) is confidential. It may also be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure.
This email should not be used by anyone who is not an original intended recipient, nor may it be copied or disclosed to anyone who is not an original intended recipient.
If you have received this email by mistake, please notify us by emailing the sender, and then delete the email and any copies from your system.
Liability cannot be accepted for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of Network Rail.
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited registered in England and Wales No. 2904587, registered office Network Rail, Waterloo General Office, London, SE1 8SW.

Dear Sir/Madam,

With regard to planning application ECU00005167 - Alyth to Tealing OHL, ONR makes no comment on this proposed development as it does not lie within a consultation zone around a GB nuclear site.

You can find information concerning our Land Use Planning consultation process here: (<http://www.onr.org.uk/land-use-planning.htm>).

Kind regards,

Land Use Planning
Office for Nuclear Regulation
ONR-Land.Use-planning@onr.gov.uk

Thursday, 01 August 2024



Local Planner
Energy Consents Unit
5 Atlantic Quay
Glasgow
G2 8LU

Development Operations
The Bridge
Buchanan Gate Business Park
Cumbernauld Road
Stepps
Glasgow
G33 6FB

Development Operations
Freephone Number - 0800 3890379
E-Mail - DevelopmentOperations@scottishwater.co.uk
www.scottishwater.co.uk



Dear Customer,

Alyth to Tealing OHL 400kV Upgrade (Reconductoring)
Planning Ref: ECU00005167
Our Ref: DSCAS-0113597-M7C
Proposal: The Proposed Development consists of the upgrade of approximately 14km of an existing 16km 275 kilovolts (kV) overhead line (OHL) between Alyth substation and tower 685 north west of Tealing substation to enable operation at 400kV

Please quote our reference in all future correspondence

Scottish Water has no objection to this proposal. Please read the following carefully as there may be further action required. Scottish Water would advise the following:

Drinking Water Protected Areas

A review of our records indicates that there are no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive, in the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

Asset Impact Assessment

Scottish Water records indicate that there is live infrastructure in the proximity of your development area that may impact on existing Scottish Water assets.

The applicant must identify any potential conflicts with Scottish Water assets and contact our Asset Impact Team via our Customer Portal for an appraisal of the proposals.

The applicant should be aware that any conflict with assets identified will be subject to restrictions on proximity of construction. Please note the disclaimer at the end of this response.

Written permission must be obtained before any works are started within the area of our apparatus.

Surface Water

For reasons of sustainability and to protect our customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system.

There may be limited exceptional circumstances where we would allow such a connection for brownfield sites only, however this will require significant justification from the customer taking account of various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges.

In order to avoid costs and delays where a surface water discharge to our combined sewer system is anticipated, the developer should refer to our guides which can be found at <https://www.scottishwater.co.uk/Help-and-Resources/Document-Hub/Business-and-Developers/Connecting-to-Our-Network> which detail our policy and processes to support the application process, evidence to support the intended drainage plan should be submitted at the technical application stage where we will assess this evidence in a robust manner and provide a decision that reflects the best option from environmental and customer perspectives.

Next Steps:

All developments that propose a connection to the public water or waste water infrastructure are required to submit a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form via our Customer Portal prior to any formal technical application being submitted, allowing us to fully appraise the proposals

I trust the above is acceptable however if you require any further information regarding this matter, please contact me on **0800 389 0379** or via the e-mail address below or at planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Angela Allison

Development Services Analyst
PlanningConsultations@scottishwater.co.uk

Scottish Water Disclaimer:

"It is important to note that the information on any such plan provided on Scottish Water's infrastructure, is for indicative purposes only and its accuracy cannot be relied upon. When the exact location and the nature of the infrastructure on the plan is a material requirement then you should undertake an appropriate site investigation to confirm its actual position in the ground and to determine if it is suitable for its intended purpose. By using the plan you agree that Scottish Water will not be liable for any loss, damage or costs caused by relying upon it or from carrying out any such site investigation."

Supplementary Guidance

- Scottish Water asset plans can be obtained from our appointed asset plan providers:
 - Site Investigation Services (UK) Ltd
 - Tel: 0333 123 1223
 - Email: sw@sisplan.co.uk
 - www.sisplan.co.uk
- Scottish Water's current minimum level of service for water pressure is 1.0 bar or 10m head at the customer's boundary internal outlet. Any property which cannot be adequately serviced from the available pressure may require private pumping arrangements to be installed, subject to compliance with Water Byelaws. If the developer wishes to enquire about Scottish Water's procedure for checking the water pressure in the area, then they should write to the Development Operations department at the above address.
- If a connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s) by way of a deed of servitude.
- Scottish Water may only vest new water or waste water infrastructure which is to be laid through land out with public ownership where a Deed of Servitude has been obtained in our favour by the developer.
- The developer should also be aware that Scottish Water requires land title to the area of land where a pumping station and/or a Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) proposed to vest in Scottish Water is constructed.
- Please find information on how to submit application to Scottish Water at our Customer Portal.

Jennifer Gessler
Energy Consents Unit
The Scottish Government
5 Atlantic Quay
150 Broomielaw
Glasgow
G2 8LU

Your ref:
ECU00005167 &
ECU00005168

Our ref:
GB01T19K05

Date:
12/08/2024

econsents_admin@gov.scot

Dear Sirs,

ELECTRICITY ACT 1989

THE ELECTRICITY (APPLICATIONS FOR CONSENT) REGULATIONS 2017

**REQUEST FOR SCOPING OPINION FOR PROPOSED SECTION 37 APPLICATION FOR
ALYTH TO TEALING OHL 400KV UPGRADE (RECONDUCTORING) and**

**REQUEST FOR SCOPING OPINION FOR PROPOSED SECTION 37 APPLICATION FOR
TEALING TO WESTFIELD OHL 400KV UPGRADE (RECONDUCTORING) PROJECT**

With reference to your recent correspondence on the above developments, we acknowledge receipt of the respective Scoping Reports (SRs) prepared by Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks Transmission in support of the above development.

This information has been passed to SYSTRA Limited (SYSTRA) for review in their capacity as Term Consultants to Transport Scotland – Roads Directorate. Based on the review undertaken, Transport Scotland would provide the following comments.

Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises two separate elements, as follows:

- Application Reference ECU00005167 is a proposal to upgrade approximately 14km of an existing 16km 275kV overhead line (OHL) between Alyth Substation and Tower 685 north west of Tealing Substation (Alyth to Tealing OHL)
- Application reference ECU00005168 is a proposal to upgrade approximately 38km of OHL between Tower 182 (west of Tealing Substation) and the licence boundary with Scottish Power Energy Networks (SPEN) (Westfield/Glenrothes), to enable operation at 400kV (Tealing to Westfield OHL).

Alyth to Tealing OHL is remote from the trunk road, with the nearest trunk road being the A90(T) which lies approximately 2km east of the Tealing substation.

The Tealing to Westfield OHL runs from Tealing in the north of Dundee, travelling southwest roughly parallel to the A90(T) before crossing the River Tay south of St Madoes, and the River Earn north of Abernethy. We note that the proposed route involves crossing the A90(T) at Longforan.

Assessment of Environmental Impacts

Chapter 9 of each SR presents the proposed methodology for the assessment of potential impacts associated with Traffic and Transport during the construction phase.

The methodology states that the thresholds as indicated within the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines entitled Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (July 2023) are to be used as a screening process for the assessment. These specify that road links should be taken forward for further detailed assessment of environmental effects where the following two rules are breached:

- Rule 1: Include road links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%)
- Rule 2: Include road links of high sensitivity where traffic flows have increased by 10% or more.

The SRs indicate that the Tealing Substation site and its surroundings are served by the A90(T) Emmock Road, therefore, it is proposed that this road be included within the study area, in addition to local roads. In addition, the M90 and A92(T) will be included within the Tealing to Westfield assessment.

We note it is proposed to utilise two sources to obtain baseline traffic information, as follows:

- Department for Transport (DfT) counters present on the study area roads, sourced from the DfT website, will be analysed and used on links where possible.
- Where required, traffic surveys in the form of Automatic Traffic Counters (ATC) will be undertaken to provide traffic data for routes not covered by DfT counters.

Transport Scotland considers this appropriate, but we would ask that “estimated” data from the DfT site is not used. We would add that an alternative source of traffic data is Traffic Scotland’s National Traffic Data System. We would also note that base traffic data will require to be factored to the construction year flows, using National Road Traffic Forecasts (NRTF) Low Growth.

Transport Scotland would note that any requirement for the OHL to cross the trunk road along with any associated temporary construction access(es) will require to be discussed and agreed (through a technical process) with the appropriate Area Manager. The Area Manager for the A90(T) is Ken Power who can be contacted at kenneth.power@transport.gov.scot.

Abnormal Loads Assessment

We note that no mention is made of the need for deliveries by Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL). If such loads are required then a full Abnormal Loads Assessment report should be provided which identifies key pinch points on the trunk road network. Swept path analysis should be undertaken

and details provided with regard to any required changes to street furniture or structures along the route.

I trust that the above is satisfactory but should you wish to discuss any issues raised in greater detail, please do not hesitate to contact me or alternatively, Alan DeVenny at SYSTRA's Glasgow Office on 0141 343 9636.

Yours faithfully,

REDACT

Iain Clement

**Transport Scotland
Roads Directorate**

cc Alan DeVenny – SYSTRA Ltd.

Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) advice on freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries in relation to the installation of overhead line developments.

Updated September 2023

Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) provides internal, non-statutory, advice in relation to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries to the Scottish Government’s Energy Consents Unit (ECU) for the installation and maintenance of overhead line (OHL) developments in Scotland.

Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*), sea trout and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) are of high economic value and conservation interest in Scotland and for which MD-SEDD has in-house expertise. The route of OHLs often cross watercourses which support important salmon and trout populations. MD-SEDD aims, through our provision of advice to ECU, to ensure that the installation and maintenance of these OHLs do not have a detrimental impact on the fish habitat and populations.

The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) (Scotland) Regulations (2017) state that the EIA must assess the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on water and biodiversity, and in particular species (such as Atlantic salmon) and habitats protected under the EU Habitats Directive. Salmon and trout are listed as priority species of high conservation interest in the Scottish Biodiversity List and support valuable recreational fisheries.

A good working relationship has been developed over the years between ECU and MD-SEDD, which ensures that these fish species are considered by ECU during all stages of the application process of OHL developments and are similarly considered during the installation and maintenance of future transmission lines. It is important that matters relating to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries, particularly salmon and trout, continue to be considered during the installation and maintenance of future OHLs.

In the current document, MD-SEDD sets out a revised, more efficient approach to the provision of our advice, which utilises our generic scoping and monitoring programme guidelines (<https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Salmon-Trout-Coarse/Freshwater/Research/onshoreren>). This standing advice provides regulators (e.g. ECU, local planning authorities), developers and consultants with the information required at all stages of the application process for OHL projects, such that matters relating to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries are addressed in the same rigorous manner as is currently being carried out and continue to be fully in line with EIA regulations. At the request of ECU, MD-SEDD will still be able to provide further and/or bespoke advice relevant to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries e.g. site specific advice, at any stage of the application process for a proposed development, particularly where a development may be considered sensitive or contentious in nature.

MD-SEDD will continue undertaking research, identifying additional research requirements, and keep up to date with the latest published knowledge relating to the

impacts of onshore wind farms on freshwater and diadromous fish populations. This will be used to ensure that our guidelines and standing advice are based on the best available evidence and also to continue the publication of the relevant findings and knowledge to all stakeholders including regulators, developers and consultants.

MD-SEDD provision of advice to ECU

- MS-SEDD should not be asked for advice on pre application and application consultations (including screening, scoping, gate checks and EIA applications). Instead, the MD-SEDD scoping guidelines and standing advice (outlined below) should be provided to the developer as they set out what information should be included in the EIA report;
- if new issues arise which are not dealt with in our guidance or in our previous responses relating to respective developments, MD-SEDD can be asked to provide advice in relation to proposed mitigation measures and monitoring programmes which should be outlined in the EIA Report (further details below);
- if new issues arise which are not dealt with in our guidance or in our previous responses, MD-SEDD can be asked to provide advice on suitable wording, within a planning condition, to secure proposed monitoring programmes, should the development be granted consent;
- MD-SEDD cannot provide advice to developers or consultants, our advice is to ECU and/or other regulatory bodies.
- if ECU has identified specific issues during any part of the application process that the standing advice does not address, MD-SEDD should be contacted.

MD-SEDD Standing Advice for each stage of the EIA process

Scoping

MD-SEDD issued generic scoping guidelines

(<https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Salmon-Trout-Coarse/Freshwater/Research/onshoreren>) which outline how fish populations can be impacted during the construction, operation and decommissioning of a wind farm and transmission line developments and informs developers as to what should be considered, in relation to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries, during the EIA process.

In addition to identifying the main watercourses and waterbodies within and downstream of the proposed development area, developers should identify and consider, at this early stage, any areas of Special Areas of Conservation where fish are a qualifying feature and proposed felling operations particularly in acid sensitive areas.

If a developer identifies new issues or has a technical query in respect of MD-SEDD generic scoping guidelines then ECU should be informed who will then co-ordinate a response from MD-SEDD.

Gate check

The detail within the generic scoping guidelines already provides sufficient information relating to water quality and salmon and trout populations for developers at this stage of the application.

Developers will be required to provide a completed gate check checklist (annex 1) in advance of their application submission which should signpost ECU to where all matters relevant to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries have been presented in the EIA report. Where matters have not been addressed or a different approach, to that specified in the advice, has been adopted the developer will be required to set out why.

EIA Report

MD-SEDD will focus on those developments which may be more sensitive and/or where there are known existing pressures on fish populations (<https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Salmon-Trout-Coarse/fishreform/licence/status/Pressures>). The generic scoping guidelines should ensure that the developer has addressed all matters relevant to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries and presented them in the appropriate chapters of the EIA report. Use of the gate check checklist should ensure that the EIA report contains the required information; the absence of such information may necessitate requesting additional information which may delay the process:

Developers should specifically discuss and assess potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures associated with the following:

- any designated area, for which fish is a qualifying feature, within and/or downstream of the proposed development area;
- the presence of a large density of watercourses;
- the presence of large areas of deep peat deposits;
- known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area; and
- proposed felling operations.

Post-Consent Monitoring

MD-SEDD recommends that a water quality and fish population monitoring programme is carried out to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures are effective. A robust, strategically designed and site specific monitoring programme conducted before, during and after construction can help to identify any changes, should they occur, and assist in implementing rapid remediation before long term ecological impacts occur.

MD-SEDD has published guidance on survey/monitoring programmes associated with onshore wind farm developments (<https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Salmon-Trout-Coarse/Freshwater/Research/onshoreren>) which developers should follow when drawing up survey and/or monitoring programmes

If a developer considers that such a monitoring programme is not required then a clear justification should be provided.

Planning Conditions

MD-SEDD advises that planning conditions are drawn up to ensure appropriate provision for mitigation measures and monitoring programmes, should the development be given consent. We recommend, where required, that a Water Quality Monitoring Programme, Fisheries Monitoring Programme and the appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works, specifically in overseeing the above monitoring programmes, is outlined within these conditions and that MD-SEDD is consulted on these programmes.

Wording suggested by MD-SEDD in relation to water quality, fish populations and fisheries for incorporation into planning consents:

1. No development shall commence unless a Water Quality and Fish Monitoring Plan (WQFMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority in consultation with Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) and any such other advisors or organisations.
2. The WQFMP must take account of the Scottish Government’s MD-SEDD guidelines and standing advice and shall include:
 - a) water quality sampling should be carried out at least 12 months prior to construction commencing, during construction and for at least 12 months after construction is complete. The water quality monitoring plan should include key hydrochemical parameters, turbidity, and flow data, the identification of sampling locations (including control sites), frequency of sampling, sampling methodology, data analysis and reporting etc.;
 - b) the fish monitoring plan should include fully quantitative electrofishing surveys at sites potentially impacted and at control sites for at least 12 months before construction commences, during construction and for at least 12 months after construction is completed to detect any changes in fish populations; and
 - c) appropriate site specific mitigation measures detailed in the Environmental Impact Assessment and in agreement with the Planning Authority and MD-SEDD
3. Thereafter, the WQFMP shall be implemented within the timescales set out to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in consultation with MD-SEDD and the results of such monitoring shall be submitted to the Planning Authority on a 6 monthly basis or on request.

Reason: *To ensure no deterioration of water quality and to protect fish populations within and downstream of the development area.*

Sources of further information

NatureScot (previously “SNH”) guidance on wind farm developments - <https://www.nature.scot/professional-advice/planning-and-development/advice-planners-and-developers/renewable-energy-development/onshore-wind-energy/advice-wind-farm>

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) guidance on wind farm developments – <https://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/energy/renewable/#wind>

A joint publication by Scottish Renewables, SNH, SEPA, Forestry Commission Scotland, Historic Environment Scotland, MD-SECC (previously Marine Scotland Science) and Association of Environmental and Ecological Clerks of Works (2019) Good Practice during Wind Farm Construction - <https://www.nature.scot/guidance-good-practice-during-wind-farm-construction>.

Annex 1 (revised June 2023)

MD-SEDD – EIA Checklist

The generic scoping guidelines should ensure that all matters relevant to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries have been addressed and presented in the appropriate chapters of the EIA report. Use of the checklist below should ensure that the EIA report contains the following information; the absence of such information **may necessitate requesting additional information** which could delay the process:

MD-SEDD Standard EIA Report Requirements	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to MD-SEDD advice, please set out reasons.
<p>1. A map outlining the proposed development area and the proposed location of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the towers/poles, ○ permanent and temporary access tracks, including watercourse crossings; ○ buildings including substations; ○ permanent and temporary construction compounds; ○ all watercourses; and contour lines; 			
<p>2. A description and results of the site characterisation surveys for fish (including fully quantitative electrofishing surveys) and water quality including the location of the electrofishing and fish habitat survey sites and water quality sampling sites on the map outlining the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>This should be carried out where a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is present and where salmon are a qualifying feature, and in exceptional</p>			

MD-SEDD Standard EIA Report Requirements	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to MD-SEDD advice, please set out reasons.
<p>cases when required in the scoping advice for other reasons. In other cases, developers can assume that fish populations are present;</p>			
<p>3. An outline of the potential impacts on fish populations and water quality within and downstream of the proposed development area;</p>			
<p>4. Any potential cumulative impacts on the water quality and fish populations associated with adjacent (operational and consented) developments including wind farms, hydro schemes, aquaculture and mining;</p>			
<p>5. Any proposed site specific mitigation measures as outlined in MD-SEDD generic scoping guidelines and the joint publication “Good Practice during Wind Farm Construction” (https://www.nature.scot/guidance-good-practice-during-wind-farm-construction);</p>			
<p>6. Full details of proposed monitoring programmes using guidelines issued by MD-SEDD and accompanied by a map outlining the proposed sampling and control sites in addition to the location of all turbines and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>At least 12 months of baseline pre-construction data should be included. The monitoring programme can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.</p>			

MD-SEDD Standard EIA Report Requirements	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to MD-SECC advice, please set out reasons.
<p>7. A decommissioning and restoration plan outlining proposed mitigation/monitoring for water quality and fish populations.</p> <p>This can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.</p>			

Developers should specifically discuss and assess potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures associated with the following:	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to MD-SEDD advice, please set out reasons.
1. Any designated area (e.g. SAC), for which fish is a qualifying feature, within and/or downstream of the proposed development area;			
2. The presence of a large density of watercourses;			
3. The presence of large areas of deep peat deposits;			
4. Known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area; and			
5. Proposed felling operations.			