

3.	ALTERNATIVES AND SCHEME EVOLUTION	
3.1.	Introduction.....	3-2
3.2.	Post-Submission Turbine Layout Iterations.....	3-2
3.3.	Post-Submission Evolution of the Associated Infrastructure.....	3-3

3. Alternatives and Scheme Evolution

3.1. Introduction

- 3.1.1. The process of site selection and design evolution was outlined in Chapter 3 of the EIA Report (November 2018), and the content of that chapter remains valid.
- 3.1.2. The approach to the design evolution has been a continuous process of site evaluation, environmental appraisal and, ongoing consultation. This Chapter provides additional information in regards to the Revised Development, specifically:
- Turbine Layout Iterations following submission of the application; and
 - Evolution of the Associated Infrastructure following submission of the application.
- 3.1.3. The section 36 application turbine layout, dated November 2018 and assessed within the EIA Report, is shown as Iteration 7 within **AEI Figure 3.1**.

3.2. Post-Submission Turbine Layout Iterations

- 3.2.1. In March 2019, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) issued a holding objection to the Proposed Development until further justification was provided for the location of turbines T4, T6, T8, T9, T10, T13, and T16 within areas of deep peat.
- 3.2.2. As part of the subsequent design process, the opportunity was taken to adjust the locations of turbines T4, T6, T8, T9, T10, T13, and T16 outwith areas of deep peat, where possible, rather than solely provide further justification.
- 3.2.3. In March 2019, Historic Environment Scotland (HES) raised an objection to the Proposed Development because of its potential to have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Craigengillan Cairn (SM 2238) and Stroanfreggan Craig Fort (SM 1095) Scheduled Monuments.
- 3.2.4. The HES response letter advised that a layout redesign exercise should be undertaken and highlighted that T7 should be re-sited or deleted and that there was scope through repositioning turbines (for example T11) to achieve improvements for both Scheduled Monuments.
- 3.2.5. A meeting was held with HES in early June, where a potential amended layout and associated visuals was discussed, including the deletion of T7 and T11 and re-siting of T9 further to the west, as well as the limited re-siting of other turbines to avoid deep peat and the consequent need to preserve adequate turbine spacing.
- 3.2.6. This layout (Iteration 8) is shown in **AEI Figure 3.1**.
- 3.2.7. HES responded to this layout iteration in early July, confirming that they would lift their objection based on this layout, primarily due to the improvements made to the effects upon the Scheduled Monuments as a result of deleting T7 and T11 and the re-siting of T9 further west.

- 3.2.8. A further iteration of the layout was then generated which maintained the deletion of T7 and T11, the re-siting of T9, and re-sited the western turbines (T4, T6, T8, T10, T13, and T16) out of the deep peat areas, where possible, but did not require the re-siting of all the other remaining turbines due to turbine separation considerations. This iteration was then subject to more detailed environmental analysis and wind turbine yield and output calculations.
- 3.2.9. This layout (Iteration 9) is shown in **AEI Figure 3.2**.
- 3.2.10. Confirmatory peat probing was then undertaken at the amended turbine positions. A review was also undertaken of associated adjustments to the hard-standing positions at this time to ensure that moving the turbines did not result in more hand-standings being in deep peat areas. As a result of this exercise, the position of T16 was slightly adjusted.
- 3.2.11. Subsequently, the amended turbine layout (Iteration 10) was fixed and is shown in **AEI Figure 3.2**.

3.3. Post-Submission Evolution of the Associated Infrastructure

- 3.3.1. As the re-siting the western turbines (T4, T6, T8, T10, T13, and T16) was minimal (maximum 80 m), the track layout did not require much alteration as the turbines and associated hard-standings were adjusted along the existing track alignment.
- 3.3.2. As a result of the deletion of T7, the section of track associated with it, passing near Craigengillan Cairn, forming a loop to T3 and T5 was no longer necessary and was therefore deleted.
- 3.3.3. A new section of track joining the southern and northern part of the layout was included, leading north from the vicinity of T8 to a point near T5. The alignment of this section of track was selected to avoid areas with deep peat.
- 3.3.4. With the deletion of T11, the section of track leading to it from the vicinity of T12 was no longer required, and it was removed from the track alignment.
- 3.3.5. The re-positioning of T9 further west, resulted in the track stub leading to it being shifted further west.
- 3.3.6. The movement of T10, approximately 60m to the south west, enabled it and the associated hardstanding to be moved out of an area of deep peat. However, this would have resulted in the substation compound being shifted further south-west into an area of deep peat. The substation was therefore re-located outside of a deep peat area, further to the north-east, between T10 and T8.
- 3.3.7. **AEI Figure 3.3** presents a comparison of the Proposed Development as detailed in the EIA Report and the Revised Development presented in this AEI.