

---

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>10. ORNITHOLOGY</b>                       |             |
| <b>10.1. Introduction</b> .....              | <b>10-2</b> |
| <b>10.2. Methodology</b> .....               | <b>10-2</b> |
| <b>10.3. Baseline Conditions</b> .....       | <b>10-2</b> |
| <b>10.4. Change in Effects</b> .....         | <b>10-3</b> |
| <b>10.5. Cumulative Effects</b> .....        | <b>10-3</b> |
| <b>10.6. Summary</b> .....                   | <b>10-3</b> |
| <b>10.7. Statement of Significance</b> ..... | <b>10-4</b> |

## 10. Ornithology

### 10.1. Introduction

- 10.1.1. This Chapter does not repeat the information set out in *Chapter 10: Ornithology* of the Shepherds' Rig EIA Report (November 2018) where that information remains valid in the context of the reduced number of turbines now proposed as the Revised Development (**AEI Figure 4.1**). As such, the Additional Environmental Information (AEI) supplements Chapter 10 of the EIA Report (November 2018) and should be read in conjunction with it.
- 10.1.2. Whilst the vantage points and viewsheds have not changed, **AEI Figure 10.2** has been updated to reflect the reduced number of turbines associated with the Revised Development.
- 10.1.3. In response to the EIA Report (November 2018), no objections were raised by consultees in relation to ornithology as detailed in AEI Table 10.1.

**AEI Table 10.1: Post-Submission Consultation Responses**

| Organisation   | Consultee Comments   | Response to Consultee  |
|--|--|--|
| Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)<br>20 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 | SNH indicated that they were content with the conclusions in the EIA Report (November 2018) and that there should not be significant ornithological effects. | An updated assessment is presented in this chapter of the AEI layout indicates that there are no significant ornithological effects. |
| RSPB<br>1 <sup>st</sup> March 2019                             | RSPB raised a concern regarding the assessment of black grouse due to a misunderstanding of how the survey buffers were defined.                             | This concern was addressed in a response to the Scottish Government, dated 22 July 2019.   |

### 10.2. Methodology

- 10.2.1. There have been no changes to the legislation, policy and guidance referred to in the EIA Report (November 2018). The baseline information relied upon in order to make an assessment of the effects of the Revised Development is that information which has been provided in the EIA Report (November 2018). To ensure consistency of approach, the same significance criteria and assessment methodology as referred to in the EIA Report (November 2018) has been followed. Taking into account the relevant policy and guidance, baseline information, and assessment criteria, an assessment is presented below which details any changes to the effects as a result of the revised layout.

### 10.3. Baseline Conditions

- 10.3.1. With no further fieldwork carried out, the baseline remains as described within Section 10.5 of the EIA Report (November 2018).

## 10.4. Change in Effects

### Construction

10.4.1. Construction effects would be similar to those described within Section 10.6 of the EIA Report (November 2018). The extent of the wind farm is reduced, which in turn would reduce the scale and magnitude of spatial effects. As such, the impacts identified within the EIA Report (November 2018) remain unchanged; no significant effects would occur on ornithology sensitivities as a result of the Revised Development.

### Operation

10.4.2. Most of the operational effects identified within Section 10.6 of the EIA Report (November 2018) would remain unchanged; the exception to this is collision risk which would be altered due to the reduction in turbine number. As a result, collision risk modelling (CRM), using the same methodology as laid out in the EIA Report (November 2018), has been re-run. Detailed calculations are presented in Appendix 10.1: Revised Collision Risk Modelling.

10.4.3. AEI Table 10.2 shows the results of the re-run CRM. Estimated collision risk has decreased from the estimates provided in the EIA Report (November 2018) for all bird species due to the fact that there are fewer turbines.

**AEI Table 10.2: Collision Risk Estimate**

| Species     | Revised Development          |                               | Original Development (2018 EIA Report findings) |                               |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
|             | Estimated collision per year | Number of years per collision | Estimated collision per year                    | Number of years per collision |
| Goshawk     | 0.018                        | 56.5                          | 0.021   | 47.6                          |
| Red kite    | 0.020                        | 49.0                          | 0.028   | 36.0                          |
| Hen harrier | 0.001                        | 846.3                         | 0.001   | 707.9                         |
| Osprey      | 0.003                        | 361.1                         | 0.014   | 73.8                          |

10.4.4. The decrease in predicted collisions across all bird species does not change the assessment, including cumulative assessment, as presented in the EIA Report (November 2018). As such, the identified collision risk remains a non-significant effect.

## 10.5. Cumulative Effects

10.5.1. The predicted in-isolation effects are considered to have no potential to contribute to cumulative effects. The cumulative assessment within Section 10.7 of the EIA Report (November 2018) remains unchanged, which identified cumulative effects as non-significant.

## 10.6. Summary

10.6.1. The revised CRM undertaken has not resulted in any changes to the overall assessment findings, which remain not significant. The Revised Development,

---

particularly the reduction in number of turbines from 19 to 17 and the reduction in land-take, will result in a minor reduction in the magnitude of effects on ornithological receptors overall. The assessment of significance of effects remains unchanged from that outlined within the EIA Report (November 2018), which concluded that there will be no significant effects in terms of the EIA Regulations.

## **10.7. Statement of Significance**

- 10.7.1. Effects on ornithology associated with the Revised Development are considered to be not significant. This represents no change to the conclusions outlined in the EIA Report (November 2018).