

VOLUME 5: CHAPTER 11: SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION MEASURES – ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENT

11. SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION MEASURES

11.1	Introduction	11-1
------	--------------	------

This page is intentionally blank.

11. SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION – ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENT

11.1 Introduction

11.1.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to provide a summary of the mitigation measures proposed throughout this EIA Report, to minimise or offset the potential effects of the Alternative Alignment on the receiving environment.

11.1.2 **Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation** provides a summary of those mitigation measures identified throughout the EIA Report to minimise or offset the potential effects on the receiving environment relevant to the Proposed Alignment. The majority of these mitigation measures are common to both the Proposed Alignment and Alternative Alignment and are therefore not repeated in detail in this Chapter.

11.1.3 Further mitigation measures identified in Volume 5 of this EIA Report which are specifically relevant to the Alternative Alignment are summarised in **Table V5-11.1** below.

Table V5-11.1: Schedule of Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Reference	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility
General Mitigation				
General mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation				
Mitigation for Landscape and Visual (see Volume 5: Chapter 4)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation				
Mitigation for Ecology (see Volume 5: Chapter 5)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation				
Mitigation for Ornithology (see Volume 5: Chapter 6)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation with the addition of:				
O1	Line Marking	<p>Line markers would be installed along key sections of the Alternative Alignment OHL (on the Optical Ground Wire) where breeding red-throated diver are considered to be at increased risk of collision. The following key areas for line marker deployment have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between Towers 19 and 20 (as per the Proposed Alignment); Between Towers A11 and A14; Between Towers A17 and A23; and Between Towers A26 and 47. <p>Although collision risk to hen harrier and curlew were assessed as not significant, as a precautionary approach, it is proposed that line markers are also installed between the following towers to minimise collision risk to hen harrier and curlew:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between Towers 21 and 26 (as per the Proposed Alignment); Between Towers A22 and A26; and Between Towers 54 and 61 (as per the Proposed Alignment). 	Volume 5, Chapter 6, Paragraph 6.11.2 – 6.11.4	Principal Contractor / ECoW

		<p>Implementation of line markers along these sections of the OHL is also expected to reduce collision risk to other IOFs, including common scoter.</p> <p>It is proposed that the most suitable line marker model and optimal spacing would be determined post-submission in consultation with NatureScot. However, in line with recommendations in Martin (2022)¹, as far as possible, the following line marker design and deployment characteristics would be sought and implemented to maximise detectability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As large a surface area as possible. • A repeat chromatic pattern to generate a high degree of internal contrast so that markers are detectable regardless of landscape background conditions (rather than relying upon the markers contrasting with the landscape background). • An element of movement or flicker (i.e., an oscillating or rotating device), which will allow markers to be detected more readily than static markers. • Deployment of markers at small intervals along the OHL. • High durability of markers to minimise wear and tear. <p>The line markers would be monitored at regular intervals, with maintenance or replacement completed at regular intervals to ensure markers remain functional and in the correct position throughout the lifetime of the OHL component of the Proposed Development.</p>		
Mitigation for Soils, Geology and Water (see Volume 5: Chapter 7)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation with the addition of:				
SGW1	Protection of Scottish Water and Private Water Supply (PWS) Distribution Pipework	The Proposed Development would cross Scottish Water infrastructure at 11 locations and would also likely to cross the Private Water Supply (PWS) distribution pipework at Kirton Farm (and associated properties). As part of the detailed design stage of the project the location of the pipework at these locations would be confirmed and clearly marked. If	Volume 5, Chapter 7, Paragraph 7.8.4	Principal Contractor / SSEN Transmission

¹ Martin, G.R. (2022) Vision-Based Design and Deployment Criteria for Power Line Bird Diverters. Birds 3, 410–422.

		necessary, protection measures would be agreed with Scottish Water and the properties at Kirkton to ensure the integrity of their infrastructure is maintained.		
SGW2	OHL Wood Pole Construction (for Temporary Diversions)	<p>The following measures are proposed to mitigate the effects of temporary wood pole foundation construction (required for the Alternative Alignment only) on the water environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> poles would be located and excavated wherever possible in the driest locations with well consolidated superficial geology, and wetland areas such as deep peat would be avoided. Wherever possible, poles would not be located within 20 m of waterbodies or watercourses; wherever possible, poles would be located out with floodplains to reduce potential effects on flooding; where excavations for poles encounter localised limited quantities of groundwater or become flooded due to surface water runoff or heavy rainfall, appropriate treatment of dewatering would be instigated under direction of the site Environmental Clerk of Works (EnvCoW); no dewatering discharge would be permitted directly adjacent to watercourses; unless directed otherwise by the site EnvCoW, dewatering discharge would drain across buffer areas of vegetation (e.g. grassland, heather) of at least 20 m width, which would provide for natural attenuation and dispersal of the flow and removal of silt; where no suitable vegetation is available for natural treatment of dewatering, the discharge would be passed through on-site settling tanks/lagoons prior to discharge by soakaway or to watercourse; the requirement for dewatering would be minimised in all locations by timely and efficient excavation of the foundation void and subsequent backfilling; excavated soils would be used to restore each foundation and be placed in the order they were removed from the foundation; 	Volume 5, Chapter 7, Paragraph 7.8.3	Principal Contractor / Ecological Clerk of Works

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • turves would be used to dress the restored foundations; and • all procedures for dewatering would be agreed by the Principal Contractor with SEPA, THC and NatureScot in the CEMP. 		
Mitigation for Cultural Heritage (see Volume 5: Chapter 8)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation				
Mitigation for Traffic and Transport (see Volume 5: Chapter 9)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation				
Mitigation for Forestry (see Volume 5: Chapter 10)				
Mitigation measures as per Table V1-13.1 of Volume 1: Chapter 13: Schedule of Mitigation				