



# Appendix 8E

## Scoping of Assessment



## Appendix 8E

### Scoping of the Assessment - Summary

This appendix provides the rationale for the scope of the assessment and comprises two tables. Table **8E.1** describes and justifies the level of importance assigned to the ecological features identified during the data gathering exercise carried out to inform this assessment. Table **8E.2** determines and justifies whether those ecological features require further assessment as they have either sufficient legal protection for a breach in legislation to occur or are of sufficient importance that a significant effect may occur as a result of the Proposed Development.

Within Table **8E.1**, consideration is given to both the importance of ecological features based on legislation and policy (refer to paragraphs **8.7.1 to 8.7.3**) and importance with regard to the Proposed Development Survey Area (refer to paragraph **8.7.1 to 8.7.3** and **Table 8.8**). The justification provided for the decision to scope in or out each ecological feature is based on information on its status both with regard to the Proposed Development Survey Area (Table 8E.1) and the Development Site and associated ZoI in Table 8E.2, and the local, county, regional, national or international context, where available.

Table 8E.1 Importance of Ecological Features

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: black-throated diver</b>	International	International	The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 12 pairs, c. 7 % of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015). Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys and flight activity surveys ( <b>Technical Appendix 8D and 8F</b> ), it is assumed that up to three pairs of black-throated diver utilise the area within and around the survey area, and that it is possible that some of this activity may be associated with SPA qualifying birds (25% of the SPA population assuming all three pairs are associated with the SPA). Thus the survey area is considered to be of international importance for the SPA population.	<b>N</b>
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: dunlin</b>	International	Negligible	The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation (in December 2000) was for 3,400 pairs, c. 25 % of the estimated Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015). An estimated seven territories fell within the MBS survey area in the 2018 breeding season (March – July 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)), with five of these falling within the Development Site ( <b>Technical Appendix 8C</b> ).	<b>Y</b>

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>Territories were distributed around the edges of the Development Site boundary, with a concentration to the north and west, where some territories partly fell within the Lewis Peatlands SPA. Flight activity recorded from VP surveys was low, with just three flights being observed over the period March – July 2018 within the CRZ (<b>Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (0.2 % of the SPA population assuming all territories are associated with the SPA population), the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the SPA population during the breeding season.</p>	
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: golden eagle</b>	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation (December 2000) is for 5 pairs, c. 1 % of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al, 2015; Challis et al 2016).</p> <p>Based on the data provided (<b>Appendix D</b> and <b>F</b>), it is assumed that up to three pairs of adult golden eagle utilise the area within and around the survey area (<b>Appendix 8D</b>).</p> <p>Territories for two of these pairs fall within the SPA, representing 40 % of the SPA population. Additionally, the area is utilised by non-territorial immature birds. Thus the survey area is considered to be of international importance for the SPA population.</p>	<b>N</b>
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: golden plover</b>	International	Negligible	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation (December 2000) is for 1,800 pairs, approximately 4.8 % of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>An estimated ten pairs were present within the MBS survey area during the 2018 breeding season (March – July 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)) (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>). Territories were distributed around the edges of the Proposed Development Site boundary, with a concentration on the western and southern edges of the Site, overlapping with the Lewis Peatlands SPA site boundary. Flight activity from golden plover during the breeding season (March – July 2018) was intermittent, with just 11 flights recorded within the CRZ with a total of 382 seconds at PCH, and did not follow any real pattern in distribution(<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (assuming all territories are associated with the SPA population, 10 territories equates to 0.5 % of the SPA population), the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the SPA population during the breeding season.</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: greenshank</b>	International	International	The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 140 pairs, c 11 % of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015). Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys and flight activity surveys ( <b>Technical Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ), it is assumed that up to six pairs of greenshank utilise the area within and around the survey area, and that this activity may be associated with SPA qualifying birds. Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 4.2 % of the Lewis Peatlands SPA population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of international importance during the breeding season for the SPA population.	<b>N</b>
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: merlin</b>	International	International	The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 20 pairs, c 4.62 % of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015). Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys and flight activity surveys ( <b>Technical Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ), it is assumed that one pair of merlin associated with the SPA utilise the area within and around the survey area (5 % of the SPA population). Thus the survey area is considered to be of International importance for the SPA population.	<b>N</b>
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: red-throated diver</b>	International	International	The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 80 pairs, c 6.3 % of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015). Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys and flight activity surveys ( <b>Technical Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ), it is assumed that up to five pairs of red-throated diver utilise the area within and around the survey area. At least four of those pairs fell within the Lewis Peatlands SPA, and it is possible that the fifth pair may also be associated with SPA qualifying birds (6.25 % of the SPA population assuming all pairs are associated with the SPA). Thus the survey area is considered to be of International importance for the SPA population.	<b>N</b>
<b>Lewis Peatlands Ramsar: black-throated diver greenshank red-throated diver</b>	International	International	The Lewis Peatlands Ramsar supports nationally important populations of black-throated diver, greenshank and red-throated diver. The Ramsar site shares the same boundary as the Lewis Peatlands SPA and thus the survey area is considered to be of International importance for the SPA populations of these species.	<b>N</b>

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Lewis Peatlands Ramsar: dunlin golden plover</b>	International	Negligible	The Lewis Peatlands Ramsar citation for dunlin is for 4,386 pairs, c. 33 % of the estimated Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015). The Lewis Peatlands Ramsar supports a nationally important population of golden plover. Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved for both species, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the Ramsar populations during the breeding season.	Y
<b>Ness and Barvas SPA: corncrake</b>	International	Negligible	The Ness and Barvas SPA citation is for 18 individuals, c 1.4 % of the estimated Scottish breeding population (Wotton et al 2015). Corncrake were not recorded during any surveys, and therefore the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the SPA population.	Y
<b>Achmore Bog SSSI:</b>	National	National	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8 km from the closest proposed infrastructure. It is one of the underlying feature of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.	<b>N</b>
<b>Tong Saltings SSSI:</b>	National	Negligible	Tong Saltings SSSI is located c 3 km from the closest proposed infrastructure. There is a lack of habitat connectivity/continuity with the peatland habitats of the Proposed Development Site and the saltmarsh/coastal habitat of the SSSI. Therefore the Proposed Development Site is considered to be of negligible importance for the SSSI breeding and wintering bird populations.	Y
<b>Arctic skua: breeding</b>	National	Negligible	Breeding arctic skua is included on the Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL), and is a Red Listed Bird of Conservation Concern (BoCC) (Eaton et al. 2015) due to a severe decline in its breeding population within the UK. Within the UK it is confined to breeding in north and west Scotland, at the southern extremity of its circumpolar, high latitude breeding range. Scotland supports an estimated 1,027 breeding pairs of Arctic skua, with Shetland and Orkney supporting the majority of the population (915 pairs combined) whilst Natural Heritage Zone 3 (NHZ3), comprising the Western Isles, Coll and Tiree supports 73 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015). Arctic skua were not found to breed within the MBS survey area during the 2018 breeding season surveys, and a single flight was observed on 18 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 at potential collision height ( <b>Technical Appendix 8F</b> ).	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			Given the lack of breeding evidence and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.	
<b>Barnacle goose: Non-breeding</b>	International	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding barnacle goose is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, the SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC with at least 50 % of the UK non-breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>An estimated 94,000 are thought to over-winter in the UK (Musgrove et al, 2013), whilst the Scottish population is estimated at approximately 70,000 (Forester et al. 2007). NHZ3 is thought to support 12,604 individuals (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>A single flight of 15 birds was recorded in October 2017 (<b>Technical Appendix 8B</b>) and this flight fell outside of the collision risk zone (CRZ), an area defined as the site boundary plus a 500m buffer.</p> <p>Based on the data provided (with approximately 0.1 % of the NHZ wintering population) the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
<b>Black-throated diver: breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Black-throated diver is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. This species is an Amber listed BoCC due to being a rare breeding bird.</p> <p>The black-throated diver population in Scotland is estimated at 176 (range 123 to 245) breeding pairs (Wilson et al. 2015). The breeding population increased 16% between 1994 and 2006 (Eaton et al. 2007). NHZ3 supports approximately 35 pairs (range 19-55) (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys and flight activity surveys (<b>Appendix 8D</b> and <b>F</b>) it is assumed that up to three pairs of black-throated diver utilise the area within and around the survey area (representing c. 10% of the regional NHZ population), Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	N
<b>Black-tailed godwit: breeding</b>	National	Negligible	<p>Black-tailed godwit is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), SBL and is a Red listed BoCC due to a historical decline in its breeding population and being a rare breeding bird.</p> <p>The Icelandic subspecies of the black-tailed godwit (<i>Limosa limosa islandica</i>) breeds in Iceland, the Faeroes, and in the UK on Orkney and Shetland and is estimated to have a stable size of 5,000–15,000 pairs (Hagemeijer &amp; Blair. 1997). The UK population was estimated at between 7 to 9 pairs over the period 2006-2010 (Musgrove et al, 2013).</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Common sandpiper: breeding</b>	Local	Negligible	<p>Black-tailed godwit were not found to breed within the MBS survey area during the 2018 breeding season surveys, and a single flight of five birds was observed on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018 at potential collision height within the CRZ (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Given the lack of breeding evidence and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
<b>Common tern: breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Common tern is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, the SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC due to at least 50 % of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>An estimated 502 pairs were considered to be breeding on the Western Isles in 2000 (Mitchell et al, 2004), representing approximately 10% of the Scottish population (4,784 pairs).</p> <p>In 2018, a breeding colony of approximately 50 pairs was recorded on an island within Loch a Chlachain, within the Development Site (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>). Common tern flight activity was focussed along a regular flight corridor that followed the River Creed from the breeding colony at Loch a Chlachain down to coastal foraging areas with a total of 60 flights being recorded within the CRZ during VP surveys between April – August (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>), with a total of 66 birds at PCH.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season, holding approximately 10% of the regional population.</p>	N



Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Dunlin: breeding</b>	International	Local	<p>Dunlin is listed on the Annex 1, SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate breeding population decline over the last 25 years, and with at least 50 % of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>A summer migrant, an estimated 13,313 pairs breed in Scotland with 5,996 located in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>An estimated seven territories fell within the MBS survey area in the 2018 breeding season (March – July 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)), with five of these falling within the Development Site (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>). Territories were distributed around the edges of the Development Site boundary, with a concentration to the north and west.</p> <p>Flight activity recorded from VP surveys was very low, with just three flights being observed over the period March – July 2018 within the CRZ (<b>Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (0.1 % of the NHZ regional population) the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
<b>Golden eagle: breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Golden eagle is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1, 1A and A1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and the SBL. This species is a Green listed BoCC.</p> <p>Within Scotland, there are an estimated 508 occupied home ranges, based on a national survey carried out in 2015 (Challis et al, 2016). NHZ3 was considered to contain 81 breeding pairs based on the 2003 national survey data (Wilson et al. 2015), although the 2015 data indicates that numbers on the Western Isles increased to 95 occupied home ranges (Challis et al., 2016).</p> <p>Golden eagle occupy their territories throughout the year but non-breeding sub adult birds can range over large distances.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys (<b>Appendix 8D and F</b>), it is assumed that up to three pairs of adult golden eagle utilise the area within and around the survey area (<b>Appendix 8D</b>). This equates to 3.7 % of the 2003 NHZ population, and 3.2 % of the 2015 Western Isles population. Additionally, the area is utilised by non-territorial immature birds. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Golden eagle: non-breeding</b>	International	Regional	Based on the data provided from non-breeding flight activity surveys and existing knowledge of territorial pairs surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D and F</b> ), it is assumed that up to three pairs of adult golden eagle utilise the area within and around the survey area (3.2 % of the 2015 Western Isles population). Additionally, the area is utilised by non-territorial immature birds. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the non-breeding season.	<b>N</b>
<b>Golden plover: breeding</b>	International	Local	Golden plover is included on the Annex 1, SBL and is a Green listed BoCC. The breeding population of golden plovers within Scotland is estimated at 37,480, with 4,194 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015). An estimated ten pairs were present within the MBS survey area during the 2018 breeding season (March – July 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)), four of which overlapped or fell within the Development Site boundary ( <b>Technical Appendix 8C</b> ). Territories were distributed around the edges of the Development Site boundary, with a concentration on the western and southern edges of the Site. Flight activity from golden plover during the breeding season (March – July 2018) was intermittent, with just 11 flights recorded within the CRZ with a total of 382 seconds at PCH, and did not follow any real pattern in distribution( <b>Technical Appendix 8F</b> ). Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (10 territories equate to 0.2 % of the NHZ regional population), the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species during the breeding season.	Y
<b>Golden plover: Non-breeding</b>	International	Local	There are an estimated 25,000 – 35,000 individuals wintering in Scotland (Forrester et al. 2007) Flight activity from golden plover recorded from VP surveys between October 2017 – February 2018 was intermittent, with five flights (a total of 39 birds) recorded within the CRZ with no flights recorded at PCH, and did not follow any real pattern in distribution ( <b>Technical Appendix 8F</b> ). Based on the data provided (with approximately 0.15 % of the Scottish wintering population) the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species.	Y
<b>Great black-backed gull: breeding</b>	Regional	Regional	Great black-backed gull is an Amber BoCC due to a moderate breeding population decline over 25 years. The Scottish breeding population of great black-backed gull was estimated to be 6,820 breeding pairs, with 1,712 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).	<b>N</b>

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>An estimated 32 pairs were present within the MBS survey area during the breeding season (April – August 2018) (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>), with a scattered colony comprising c 20 AON close to the Beinn Grideag wind farm plus a further 12 nests scattered across the survey area. In addition, counts of up to 60 were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, whilst the species contributed to a maximum mixed herring / great black-backed gull count of c. 500 individuals recorded loafing / roosting there.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys, the survey area supports approximately 3% of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	
<b>Great skua: breeding</b>	Regional	Regional	<p>Great skua is an Amber listed BoCC due to the international importance of the UK breeding population and at least 50 % of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites. The Scottish population of great skua was estimated to be 12,832 breeding pairs, with 283 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>An estimated nine territories were recorded during May 2018, and seven and six in June and July respectively within the MBS survey area (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>) during the 2018 breeding season (April – August). Breeding activity was focussed in one main area in the centre of the Development Site, and two smaller areas to the north and south of the Site.</p> <p>Flight activity was particularly intense in the central area associated with the main breeding, and a total of 272 flights were recorded within the CRZ during the breeding season (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>) with a total of 14,926 seconds at PCH.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supported approximately 3.1 % of the NHZ regional breeding population during the early breeding season in May, which included passage birds and non-breeders. Actual breeding attempts as indicated by territory occupation in June/July amounted to 2.5%-2.1 % of the NHZ breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	<b>N</b>
<b>Greenshank: breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Greenshank is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and is an Amber listed BoCC with at least 50 % of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>The Scottish population of greenshank was estimated to be 1,297 breeding pairs, with 256 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p>	<b>N</b>

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>Based on the method of Hancock (1997) for deriving population estimates from survey data, an estimated maximum six pairs were present within the MBS survey area (<b>Technical Appendix 8D</b>) during the 2018 breeding season (March – July 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)). A maximum of two territories were recorded within the Development Site. Greenshank were recorded intermittently across the survey area during VP surveys in the breeding season, with a total of nine flights recorded within the CRZ totalling 509 seconds at PCH, and did not follow any real pattern in distribution (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 2.3 % of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	
<b>Greylag goose: breeding</b>	Negligible	Negligible	<p>Greylag goose is not listed under any conservation designation as a breeding species within the UK.</p> <p>The Scottish population of breeding greylag goose was estimated to be 47,405 breeding pairs (Mitchell et al. 2011) with 1,912 on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (<a href="https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00063657.2011.585629">https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00063657.2011.585629</a>).</p> <p>An estimated 10 pairs were considered to be breeding within the MBS survey area during the 2018 breeding season in 2018, with five of those within the Development Site (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>). VP surveys indicated that the central part of the survey area was the main focus of flight activity during the breeding season (April – August 2018), and a total of 50 flights were recorded within the CRZ (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>) with a total of 1,830 seconds at PCH.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 0.5 % of the Lewis and Harris breeding population, with flight activity focussed within the Development Site. Thus the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
<b>Greylag goose: non-breeding</b>	Regional	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding greylag goose is an Amber listed BoCC with at least 50 % of the UK non-breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>The Scottish population of non-breeding greylag goose was estimated to be 100,000 individuals (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>Flight activity surveys carried out between October 2017 – March 2018 recorded 38 flights within the CRZ, with a total of 192 birds at PCH, which represents 0.2 % of the Scottish population (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>).</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Hen harrier: breeding</b>	International	National	<p>Surveys indicated that the central part of the survey area was the focus of flight activity during the non-breeding season, indicating local movements of birds rather than a regular migration route.</p> <p>Thus the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the non-breeding season.</p>	N
<b>Hen harrier: non-breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Breeding hen harrier is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedule 1 and 1A of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) the SBL, and is a Red listed BoCC due to a historical decline in the breeding population.</p> <p>The Scottish population of hen harrier was estimated to be 501 breeding pairs, with 48 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015), based on data collected during a national survey in 2010. A more recent national survey was carried out in 2016, and this put the Scottish population at an estimated 460 pairs of hen harrier (Challis et al. 2018). The 2016 data indicated that there were 43 territories in the Western Isles, four of which were on the Isle of Lewis (figures were not provided at the NHZ level). Hen harrier have never nested on the Isle of Lewis before 2015, although there is a thriving population on the Uists, further south on the Outer Hebrides.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys in 2018 (<b>Appendix C, D and F</b>), the survey area supports approximately 1 % of the Scottish breeding population, 10 % of the NHZ regional breeding population (2010 data) and approximately 12 % of the Western Isles population and 100% of the Isle of Lewis population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of national importance for this species during the breeding season.</p> <p>Non-breeding hen harrier is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedule 1A of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL.</p> <p>There is little good information on numbers of hen harriers in the UK outside the breeding season, although Forrester estimated that Scotland held between 1,050-1540 individuals (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from non-breeding surveys in 2017-18 (<b>Appendix B, D and F</b>), the survey area supports approximately 0.6 % of the Scottish non-breeding population. Although there are no estimates for wintering hen harrier at the NHZ level, the survey area is still considered to be of regional importance at the NHZ level.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Herring gull: breeding</b>	National	Regional	<p>Breeding herring gull is listed on the SBL and is a Red listed BoCC due to a severe breeding population decline over 25 years.</p> <p>The Scottish population of herring gull was estimated to be 52,089 breeding pairs, with 1,251 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Six herring gull colonies were recorded, with numbers ranging from 30 to 50 apparently occupied nests each (210 total) within the MBS survey boundary (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>), five of which were within the Development Site. In addition, numbers were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, whilst the species contributed to a maximum mixed herring / great black-backed gull count of c. 500 individuals recorded utilising the area.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2018, the survey area supports approximately 17 % of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	<b>N</b>
<b>Lesser black-backed gull: breeding</b>	Regional	Regional	<p>Breeding lesser black-backed gull is an Amber listed BoCC due to the international importance of the UK breeding population and at least 50 % of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>The Scottish population of lesser black-backed gull was estimated to be 24,457 breeding pairs, with 547 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Three lesser black-backed gull colonies were recorded within the MBS survey boundary, two with c. 30 nests each and one with two pairs, providing a total of 62 pairs. A further single pair was recorded within a mixed herring / great black-backed gull colony (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>), bringing the total to 63 pairs. In addition, birds were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2018, the survey area supports approximately 11.5 % of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	<b>N</b>
<b>Mallard: breeding</b>	Negligible	Negligible	<p>Mallard is not listed under any conservation designation as a breeding species within the UK.</p> <p>The mallard is widespread and ubiquitous throughout the UK, and the Scottish population was estimated at 17,000 – 43,000 pairs (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>A single territory was found during breeding bird surveys in 2018 (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>).</p>	<b>Y</b>

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.	
<b>Merlin: breeding</b>	International	Regional	Merlin is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. This species is a Red listed BoCC due to a historical decline in the breeding population. The Scottish population of merlin was estimated to be between 403-455 breeding pairs, with 53 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015). The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 20 pairs. Three occupied home ranges were found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis (Challis et al. 2018a). Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2018 ( <b>Appendix C, D and F</b> ), the survey area supports approximately 2 % of the NHZ regional breeding. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.	<b>N</b>
<b>Merlin: non-breeding</b>	International	Negligible	Non-breeding merlin is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive and the SBL. An estimated 3,000 + individuals are present as non-breeding birds in Scotland (Forester et al. 20007) VP surveys between October 2017 – March 2018 recorded two flights within the CRZ during the non-breeding season, 30 seconds of which were recorded at PCH ( <b>Technical Appendix 8F</b> ). Based on the data provided the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.	Y
<b>Peregrine: breeding</b>	International	Negligible	Breeding peregrine is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the SBL and is listed as a Green BoCC. The Scottish population of peregrine was estimated to be between 485 breeding pairs, with 16 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015). Five occupied home range were found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (Challis et al. 2018a). No evidence of breeding was recorded within 2km of the Development Site in 2018, and a single flight was recorded during the 2018 breeding season within the CRZ on the 13 <sup>th</sup> March (March – August 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)) ( <b>Technical Appendix 8F</b> ). Given the lack of breeding and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Red-throated diver: breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Red-throated diver is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Scottish Biodiversity List. This species is a Green listed BoCC. Scotland supports approximately 1,268 breeding pairs of red-throated diver, (Wilson et al. 2015) based on the national diver survey of 2006 (Dillon et al. 2009). The NHZ3 population is estimated at 317.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2018 (<b>Appendix C, D and F</b>), the survey area supports approximately 1.5 % of the NHZ regional breeding. Thus the survey area is considered to be of Regional importance for this species.</p>	<b>N</b>
<b>Short-eared owl: breeding</b>	International	Local	<p>Breeding short-eared owl is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive and the SBL. It is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate decline in its breeding range. The Scottish population was estimated to be 1,088 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015), with an estimated 281 in NHZ3. There is often large year-to-year variation in numbers present in any given area that is closely associated with the availability of prey items. A single occupied home range was found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (Challis et al. 2018a).</p> <p>A single bird was observed three times during an MBS survey in May 2018, whilst a number of hunting flights were recorded during surveys in May, June and July 2018 (<b>Technical Appendix 8D</b>). Although no nest was located, based on the categories presented within Hardey et al (2009), this evidence suggests that there was a single possible territory within the survey area. VP surveys recorded five flights between April – August 2018 within the CRZ, with 15 seconds at PCH (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2018 and assuming one occupied territory, the survey area supports approximately 0.3 % of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species.</p>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Short-eared owl: non-breeding</b>	International	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding short-eared owl is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive and the SBL. The Scottish non-breeding population was estimated to be between 300 – 3,000 individuals (Forrester et al. 2007)</p> <p>A single flight was recorded outside PCH within the CRZ during a VP survey in November 2017 (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>).</p> <p>Based on the data provided, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	<b>Y</b>



Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Snipe: breeding</b>	Regional	Negligible	<p>Breeding snipe is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate decline in its breeding range. The Scottish population was estimated to be 34,594 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015), with an estimated 6,780 in NHZ3.</p> <p>An estimated seven territories were considered present within the MBS survey boundary during the 2018 breeding season (March – July 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)) (<b>Technical Appendix 8C</b>). It has been noted that the Brown and Shepherd survey technique is likely to under-estimate the number of breeding snipe. The 'drumming' display indicative of breeding usually occurs at dawn and dusk, i.e. before/after the recommended survey times.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2018 and assuming seven occupied territories, the survey area supports approximately 0.1 % of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
<b>Teal: breeding</b>	Negligible	Negligible	<p>Teal is not listed under any conservation designation as a breeding species within the UK. The Scottish breeding population was estimated to be between 1,950 – 3,400 pairs (Forester et al. 2007).</p> <p>No evidence of breeding was recorded within the MBS survey area during the 2018 breeding season (April - August), and just two flights were recorded from VP surveys (<b>Appendix C</b>).</p> <p>Given the lack of breeding evidence and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
<b>White-tailed eagle: breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>Breeding white-tailed eagle is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedules 1, 1A and A1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. This species is a Red BoCC due to its rarity as a breeding bird and a historical decline in its breeding population.</p> <p>The Scottish population was estimated to be 82 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015), with an estimated 23 in NHZ3. Following the successful re-introduction of white-tailed eagle to Scotland (a recently published modelling study commissioned by SNH suggests that this population will continue to expand in range and numbers for the foreseeable future (Sansom et al. 2016), this species has re-colonised much of the Western Isles and is now regularly seen on the Isle of Lewis.</p> <p>On the Isle of Lewis and Harris 23 occupied territories were recorded in 2017 (considered to represent full survey coverage) (Challis et al 2018b).</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>No territories were recorded within a 2km survey area during the 2018 breeding season (February – August 2018 as specified by SNH (2017)). The nearest known nest site lies c. 5 km from the site boundary. Nineteen flights were recorded within the CRZ during the breeding season from VP surveys, with 1,675 seconds at PCH (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>). Based on the data provided, although the survey area does not support any breeding territories, flight activity recorded indicate that the area is used by non-territorial birds during the breeding season. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	
<b>White-tailed eagle: Non-breeding</b>	International	Regional	<p>As white-tailed eagle occupy their territories throughout the year their breeding status described previously can also be applied to territorial pairs during the non-breeding season. Twelve flights were recorded within CRZ during the non-breeding season (October 2017 – January 2018) (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>), with 1,029 seconds at PCH. Based on the data provided, flight activity recorded indicate that the area is used by non-territorial birds throughout the year. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	<b>N</b>
<b>Whooper swan: breeding</b>	International	National	<p>Whooper swan is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and appears on the SBL. It is an Amber listed BoCC due to its rarity as a breeding species. The Scottish breeding population was estimated to be between 3-7 pairs (Forester et al. 2007). A single confirmed breeding attempt was confirmed within the Development Site in 2018 (<b>Technical Appendix 8D</b>), and a single flight outside of PCH was recorded within the CRZ from VP surveys during the breeding season (April – August 2018) (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>). Based on the data provided, the survey area is considered to be of national importance for this species, representing 14 – 33 % of the national breeding population.</p>	<b>N</b>

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
<b>Whooper swan: non-breeding</b>	International	National	<p>Non-breeding whooper swan is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, the SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC due to at least 50 % of the UK non-breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>Whooper swan is a regular winter visitor to the UK, which supports a population of an estimated 15,000 individuals (Musgrove et al. 2011), the majority of which migrate from breeding grounds in Iceland. It is estimated that Scotland supports 4,142 (Forester, 2007), whilst NHZ3 is estimated to support 813 individuals (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 9 flights (48 birds) within the CRZ, with 3,687 seconds at PCH, from October 2017 – March 2018 (<b>Technical Appendix 8F</b>). Based on the data provided, the survey area supports approximately 6 % of the NHZ non-breeding population and c 1.2 % of the national population, and is thus considered to be of national importance for this species.</p>	<b>N</b>

For those ecological features that remain scoped in following the process as described in **Table 8E.1**, the following are provided in **Table 8E.2**: description of the potential environmental change and associated effect (refer to paragraphs **8.7.6 – 8.7.9**); a description of the Zone of Influence for each ecological feature (refer to paragraph **8.7.6 – 8.7.9** and **Table 8.8**); justification of the decision to scope in or out each ecological feature based on the likely scale of the potential effect, general working measures (i.e. those covered within the Code of Construction Practice) that negate the effect and relevant information on the features status within the local, county, regional, national or international context where that is available.

Table 8E.2 Scoping of Ecological Features of Local or Above Importance and those Receiving Legal Protection

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA / Ramsar: black throated Diver</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	One breeding attempt had the potential to be associated with the SPA, lying adjacent to the SPA/Ramsar boundary but was c1 km form the Development Site outwith the 750M ZoI.
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be minial compared to those during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 750 m of the Proposed Development footprint (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Breeding black-throated diver normally forage within large fresh-water lochs, and do not make regular commuting flights to and from the sea. However, flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> and <b>F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect between breeding locations and feeding lochs, and it is considered that this will may result in a potentially significant effect on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development footprint (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) predicted a potential 0.042 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 23.9 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This equates to the loss of 0.2 % of the SPA breeding population per year, and it is considered that this will not result in a detectable effect on the SPA or Ramsar population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA/Ramsar however there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: golden eagle</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 1000 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	No SPA golden eagle territories were found within 1km of the Proposed Development site, and no known historic nest sites are located within this range. Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA golden eagle population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	PAT modelling indicates that there would be 1.8 % (Pair A) and 5.7 % (Pair B) overlap between available foraging habitat and the ZoI for the two SPA pairs respectively ( <b>Appendix D</b> ). Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA golden eagle population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) and flight activity ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ) indicates that there is potential for significant effects to occur on the SPA population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA / Ramsar: greenshank</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	<b>Y</b>	Locations of breeding birds potentially associated with the SPA qualifying population fall within disturbance distance of proposed works and may result in a potentially significant effect to the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D and F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect and it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) predicted a potential 0.039 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 25.8 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This equates to the loss of 0.01 % of the SPA breeding population per year, and it is considered that this will not result in a detectable effect on the SPA or Ramsar population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA or Ramsar population.
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA: merlin</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	A single breeding location was recorded, falling within the search area and SPA boundary. However, this did not fall within the ZoI, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA population.



Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D and F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect and it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) predicted a potential 0.028 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 36.3 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This equates to the loss of 0.1 % of the SPA breeding population per year, and it is considered that this will not result in a detectable effect on the SPA population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
<b>Lewis Peatlands SPA / Ramsar: red-throated Diver</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.		<b>Y</b>	Locations of breeding birds potentially associated with the SPA qualifying population fall within disturbance distance of proposed works and may result in a potentially significant effect to the SPA population
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>Y</b>	Breeding red-throated diver normally forage at sea, making regular commuting flights to and from breeding lochs inland. Flight activity recorded during surveys indicates that the Proposed Development may potentially cause a barrier effect to breeding red-throated diver, and this may result in a potentially significant effect to the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>Y</b>	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) and flight activity (Appendix 8F) indicates that there is potential for significant effects to occur on the SPA population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
<b>Achmore Bog SSSI</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 1000 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8 km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the ZoI. However it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8 km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the ZoI. However it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8 km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the ZoI. However it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8 km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the ZoI. However it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	Site outwith the ZoI and were no significant effects were identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ).
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	Site outwith the ZoI.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		
<b>Black-throated diver: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding black-throated diver.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	<b>Y</b>	A single breeding location and a number of lochs used by breeding birds from an additional two known breeding attempts for loafing or feeding fall within the ZoI. Therefore up to three breeding pairs could potentially be affected by construction activities, which represents approximately 10 % of the NHZ population. This may lead to potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	<b>N</b>	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be minimal compared to that that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>Y</b>	Breeding black-throated diver normally forage within large fresh-water lochs, and do not make regular commuting flights to and from the sea. However, flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect between breeding locations and feeding lochs, and it is considered that this will may result in a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>N</b>	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) predicted a potential 0.042 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 23.9 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This equates to the loss of 0.06 % of the NHZ breeding population per year. It is considered that this will not lead to a potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	Nest were outwith the ZoI, there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	Nests are outwith the ZoI. Furthermore a Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.
<b>Common tern: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding common tern.	Within 250m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Proposed construction activities fall within approximately 367 m of the known breeding colony at its closest point. This is outside of the ZoI and it is therefore considered that there will be no detectable effect on the regional population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 250m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the regional population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8C and 8F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development may potentially cause a barrier effect to breeding common tern, and this may result in a potentially significant effect to the regional population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) and flight activity (Appendix 8F) indicates that there is potential for significant effects to occur on the regional population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	Nest were outwith the ZoI, there were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	Nests are outwith the ZoI. Furthermore a Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.
<b>Golden eagle: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding or foraging golden eagle.	Within 1000 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	No golden eagle territories were found within the recommended disturbance buffer of 1km from the Proposed Development site, and no known historic nest sites are located within this range ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ). Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ breeding golden eagle population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	PAT modelling ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ) indicates that there would be 1.8 % (Pair A), 5.7 % (Pair B) and 0.05 % (Pair C) overlap between available foraging habitat and the ZoI for the three NHZ pairs respectively. Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ golden eagle population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.114 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 8.8 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.07 % of the NHZ breeding population, and 0.06 % of the Western Isles breeding population. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.



Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>Golden eagle: non-breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding golden eagle.	Within 1000 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	As golden eagle occupy their territories throughout the year the status described above can also be applied to territorial pairs during the non-breeding season.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.114 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 8.8 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.07 % of the NHZ breeding population, and 0.06 % of the Western Isles breeding population. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.046 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 21.6 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.03 % of the NHZ breeding population, and 0.025 % of the Western Isles breeding population. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
<b>Great black-backed gull: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	<p>Based on the distribution of breeding records, 10 individual territories and 40 % of the colony located close to the Beinn Grideag wind farm fall within the ZoI (<b>Appendix 8C</b>). This represents approximately 18 pairs, 1.05 % of the NHZ population.</p> <p>The breeding colonies/sites are directly linked to the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site and its associated gull colonies and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the landfill. Therefore it is predicted that there will not be any potentially significant effects on the NHZ breeding population</p>
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	<p>Given that the entirety of the colony falls within a 500 m buffer of the operational Beinn Grideag wind farm, and disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.</p>

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
<b>Great skua: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Based on the distribution of breeding records from the peak count obtained in May 2018 (an estimated 9 AOT's), eight territories fall within the ZoI ( <b>Appendix 8C</b> ). The ZoI encompassed 2.8 % of the NHZ regional breeding population during the early breeding season in May, which included passage birds and non-breeders. Actual breeding attempts within the ZoI as indicated by territory occupation in June/July amounted to 2.1% of the NHZ breeding population. This breeding activity is probably linked to the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site and its associated gull colonies and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the Development Site. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be minimal compared to that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8C</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development may potentially cause a barrier effect, and this may result in a potentially significant effect to the regional population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.368 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 2.7 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.07 % of the NHZ breeding population, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>Greenshank: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Based on the distribution of breeding records from the peak count obtained in May 2018 (an estimated maximum 6 territories), four fall within the ZoI ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ). This represents approximately 0.8 % of the NHZ population, and therefore it is considered that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary.	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect, and that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.039 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 25.8 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.007 % of the NHZ breeding population per year, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>Hen harrier: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 750 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Three breeding locations fall within the ZoI, representing approximately 6.25 % of the NHZ breeding population, 7 % of the Western Isles breeding population and 60 % of the Isle of Lewis population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ). It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750 m of Proposed Development footprint.	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given that two breeding locations are located less than 300 m from operational turbines it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary.	Y	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect, and that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) (Appendix 8F) calculated an annual CRM of 0.38 (which included all flights from VP surveys within CRZ at PCH), equivalent to 1.4% of Lewis population and 0.16% of the NHZ population. Therefore it is anticipated that there will be no potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.



Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>Hen harrier: non-breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 750 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	<b>Y</b>	Two roosting locations fell within the ZoI, utilised by at least 6 individual birds. This represents approximately 6.25 % of the NHZ breeding population, 7 % of the Western Isles breeding population and 60 % of the Isle of Lewis population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ). It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	<b>Y</b>	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given that one of the two roosting locations are located less than 300 m from operational turbines it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary.	<b>Y</b>	Flight activity recorded during surveys ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> and <b>8F</b> ) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect, and that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>N</b>	Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ) calculated an annual CRM of 0.025 (which included all flights from VP surveys within CRZ at PCH), equivalent to 0.25% of Lewis population. Therefore it is anticipated that there will be no potentially significant effects on the Lewis or NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
<b>Herring gull: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Five colonies, supporting between 30 -50 AON's (total of 170 AON's) fall within the ZoI ( <b>Appendix 8C</b> ). This represents approximately 13.6 % of the NHZ breeding population. The breeding colonies are directly linked to the Bennadrove landfill site and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the landfill. Therefore it is anticipated that there will be no potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
<b>Lesser black-backed gull: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Two colonies, both supporting approximately 30 pairs each, fall within the ZoI. This represents approximately 11 % of the NHZ breeding population ( <b>Appendix 8C</b> ). The breeding colonies are directly linked to the Bennadrove landfill site and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the landfill. Therefore it is anticipated that there will be no potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>Merlin: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No breeding locations fell within the ZoI, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.028 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 36.3 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.03 % of the NHZ breeding population per year and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
<b>Red-throated diver: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Two breeding locations and a number of lochs used by breeding birds for loafing fall within the ZoI ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ). The two breeding pairs represent approximately 0.63 % of the NHZ population, and therefore there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750 m of Proposed Development footprint.	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given that two breeding lochs are located less than 300 m from operational turbines it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity data indicates that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.35 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 2.9 years) ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.06 % of the NHZ breeding population per year and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>White-tailed eagle: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of birds.	Within 2 km of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No breeding pairs were recorded within 2km of the Proposed development footprint ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ), and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the breeding NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 2 km of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity data indicates that there may be potential for a significant effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).



Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
<b>White-tailed eagle: non-breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of birds.	Within 2 km of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No non-breeding birds were recorded utilising the survey area for roosting ( <b>Appendix B</b> ), and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the non-breeding NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 6km of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity data indicates that there may be potential for a significant effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
<b>Whooper swan: breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	<b>Y</b>	A single pair of whooper swan was recorded breeding within the ZoI ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ). This represents 14 – 33 % of the national breeding population and therefore it is considered that there may be potentially significant effects on the national population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	<b>Y</b>	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given the proximity of operational turbines (50 m) it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the national population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>N</b>	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	<b>N</b>	A single flight was recorded below PCH within the CRZ ( <b>Appendix 8F</b> ), and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the national population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the breeding population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied ( see <b>Chapter 11</b> )	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan ( CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.  Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the breeding population.
<b>Whooper swan: non-breeding</b>	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of non-breeding birds.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No birds were recorded utilising habitats within the Proposed Development, with records only being collected from over-flying individuals. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the national wintering population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500 m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	No birds were recorded utilising habitats within the Proposed Development, with records only being collected from over-flying individuals. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the national wintering population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population ( <b>Appendix 8D</b> ).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM predicted a potential 0.146 fatalities per year (equivalent to 1 bird mortality every 6.8 years). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.02 % of the NHZ wintering population and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site ( <b>Chapter 11 Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology</b> ) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the wintering/passage population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	Chapter 15 ( <b>Section 15.4</b> ) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA.	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
		For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see <b>Chapter 11</b> )		Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the wintering/passage population.

## References

- Challis, A., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Roos, S., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2016). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2015*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Challis, A., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Roos, S., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2018a). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2016*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Challis, A., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Roos, S., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2018b). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2017*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Dillon, A., Smith, T.D., Williams, S.J., Haysom, S. & Eaton, M.A. (2009) Status of red-throated divers *Gavia stellata* in Britain in 2006. *Bird Study* 56: 147-157.
- Eaton, M.A., Austin, G.E., Banks, A.N., Conway, G., Douse, A., Grice, P.V., Hearn, R., Hilton, G., Hoccom, D., Musgrove, A.J., Noble, D.G., Ratcliffe, N., Rehfish, M.M., Worden, J. & Wotton, S. (2007). *The State of the UK's Birds 2006*. RSPB, BTO, WWT, CCW, EHS, NE & SNH. Sandy, Bedfordshire.
- Eaton, M.A., Brown, A.F., Noble, D.G., Musgrove, A.J., Hearn, R., Aebischer, N.J., Gibbons, D.W., Evans, A. & Gregory, R.D. (2009) Birds of Conservation Concern 3: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. *British Birds* 102: 296-341.
- Eaton, M., Aebischer, N., Brown, A., Hearn, R., Lock, L., Musgrove, A., Noble, D., Stroud, D., A. and Gregory R. (2015). 'Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.' *British Birds* 108, pp 708-746.
- Forrester, R.W., Andrews, I. J., McInerney, C. J., Murray, R. D., McGowan, R.Y., Zonfrillo, B., Betts, M.W., Jardine, D. C., & Grundy, D. S. 2007. *The Birds of Scotland*. SOC, Aberlady.
- Hagemeyer W.J.M. & Blair M.J. (eds) 1997. *The EBCC Atlas of European Breeding Birds: Their distribution and abundance*. T & A Poyser, London.
- Hancock, M.H., Gibbons, D.W. and Thompson, P.S. (1997). The status of breeding greenshank *Tringa nebularia* in the United Kingdom in 1995. *Bird Study* 44: 290-302.
- Mitchell, P.I., Newton, S.F., Ratcliffe, N. & Dunn, T.E., (2004), *Seabird Populations of Britain and Ireland*. JNCC.
- Mitchell, C., Griffin, L., Trinder, M., Newth, J. & Urquhart, C. (2011) The status and distribution of summering Greylag Geese *Anser anser* in Scotland, 2008–09, *Bird Study*, 58:3, 338-348, DOI: 10.1080/00063657.2011.585629.
- Musgrove, A.J., Austin, G. E., Hearn, R.D., Holt, C.A., Stroud, D.A. and Wotton, S.R. (2011). Overwinter population estimates of British waterbirds. *British Birds* 104: 364-397.
- Musgrove, A., Aebischer, N., Eaton, M., Hearn, R., Newson, S., Noble, D., Parsons, M., Risely, K., & Stroud, D. (2013). Population estimates of birds in Great Britain and the United Kingdom. *British Birds* 106. February 2013: 64–100.
- Sansom, A., Evans, R. & Roos, S. (2016). *Population and future range modelling of reintroduced Scottish white-tailed eagles (Haliaeetus albicilla)*. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No. 898.
- Scottish Natural Heritage (2017). Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore wind farms.

Whitfield, D P, Fielding, A H, McLeod, D R A and Haworth, P F (2008). *A conservation framework for golden eagles: implications for their conservation and management in Scotland*. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No.193 (ROAME No. F05AC306).

Wilson, M. W., Austin, G. E., Gillings S. and Wernham, C. V. (2015). Natural Heritage Zone Bird Population Estimates. SWBSG Commissioned report number SWBSG\_1504. pp72. Available from: [www.swbsg.org](http://www.swbsg.org)

Wotton, S.R., Eaton, M., Ewing, S.R., & Green, R.E. (2015) The increase in the Corncrake *Crex crex* population of the United Kingdom has slowed, *Bird Study*, 62:4, 486-497, DOI: 10.1080/00063657.2015.1089837.