

9.0	<b>Use of the baseline data was discussed.</b>
	█ agreed the proposed method for seals and use of SCANS III for point estimates was appropriate. For bottlenose dolphin, CPoD data from the MS-Science funded survey of east coast of Scotland is available for analysis, and that the SMRU photo id project should also be used for reference with respect to the proportion of bottlenose dolphin from the Moray Firth SAC which can be expected to be utilising the Firth of Tay at any one time. These data sources should be examined to provide a more realistic baseline assessment. The baseline used in the Original ES is likely to prove conservative with respect to the number of animals likely to be in the coastal regions that are exposed to higher levels of piling related noise. █ suggested that it would be sensible to investigate whether it would be possible to improve the distribution estimate of bottlenose dolphins that was used in the original ES.
10.0	<b>█ noted that the impacts from noise will not be assessed for the operational phase of the project within the Revised Development EIA. These are scoped out of the revised assessment.</b>
	It was noted that noise monitoring of operational turbines could inform the PEMP (Project Environmental Monitoring Plan). Discussions also highlighted that this information was required on a national level to confirm assumptions made through impact assessments, and thus monitoring would probably be more appropriate through the SpORRAn initiative.
11.0	<b>The assessment criteria for minke whale will form part of the discussion during the first workshop</b>
	█ agreed that using the M weighted criteria within PTS onset modelling would be appropriate.
12.0	<b>█ asked when workshop 1 (WS 1) is planned to take place?</b>
	█ noted that this is still to be decided but likely to be in 6 - 8 weeks (no later than 10 <sup>th</sup> July) in order to enable project timelines to be met.
13.0	<b>The cumulative impact assessment was discussed. Of particular relevance will be the baseline population to be used for each species (with reference to the management units). This will need to be agreed by this point.</b>
	Stakeholder and ICOL will agree the approach through scoping responses and minuted discussions in WS 1.
14.0	<b>█ noted that Aberdeen Harbour will need to be considered in the CIA in relation to bottlenose dolphin.</b>
	Aberdeen harbour construction will produce impulsive sound that will need to be assessed cumulatively over time. It was noted that the interim PCOD can include this as a parameter now.
15.0	<b>SNH noted that there would be too many uncertainties to include MORL WDA in the CIA</b>
	The project is yet to be defined. █ agreed and noted that for this reason ICOL were not planning to include this Project in the CIA.

16.0	<b>SNH noted that Beatrice platform may be due for decommissioning at this time and may be required to be considered in the CIA.</b>
	This was acknowledged, timelines and further information on the work will be required.
17.0	<b>Discussions regarding what project designs would be assessed for the CIA for NNG and Seagreen were had.</b>
	<p>The general consensus was that due to uncertainties and timeframes with the Design Envelopes for the revision of the other Firth of Forth projects, the CIA would have to focus on the consented projects design parameters for these projects. It was agreed that this would most likely be the worst-case scenario in terms of impacts (revised project Design Envelopes are likely to propose fewer, larger turbines, and this would constitute a reduced impact for marine mammal receptors).</p> <p>It was agreed that CIA impacts should be limited to projects that have produced (or that have involved in the recent past) impulsive noise from piling and/or explosives.</p> <p>█ advised that the scoping opinion will have a shelf life.</p>
18.0	<b>It was questioned whether ship to ship transfer would need to form part of the assessment.</b>
	<p>It was understood that the route to impact from this activity would be accidental spillage and thus pollution of the marine environment. It was noted that safety and mitigation measure requirements that follow best practice for such activities would be embedded in part of a consent condition - such as committed to through the environmental management plan and construction method statement. As such, the assessment for the Original Development covered this potential impact, concluded a minor significance of impact, and therefore is proposed to be scoped out of the assessment for the Revised Development.</p>
19.0	<b>█ noted, as proposed within the Scoping Document, that consideration of harbour porpoise within the HRA would not be required</b>



# Minutes – Inch Cape Natural Fish and Benthic Ecology Scoping report

**Date:** 26 May 2017

**Location:** Marine Scotland Laboratory, Aberdeen

**Subject:** Natural Fish and Benthic - Scoping report and introduction to the Revised Development

**Attendees:** [Redacted]

ITEM	MINUTE
1.0	<p>█ provided an overview of the scoping process for fish and shellfish ecology. █ noted that the species composition that was considered for the original development was unlikely to have materially changed. Therefore those species assessed would form part of the assessment for the Revised Development.</p> <p>█ asked if all were happy with the approach to groupings and baseline</p>
	<p>There was a consensus in the room that the approach seemed appropriate.</p>
2.0	<p>█ noted that due to the location of the site (both the wind farm and the export cable corridor being in marine waters) and that there are no definitive populations numbers of SAC fish species within these areas, it was SNH's position that there will be no requirement to carry out an HRA assessment for those species connected to an SAC (Atlantic salmon, lamprey and fresh water pearl mussel) that these should only be assessed at EIA.</p>
	<p>ICOL noted SNH's position that there would be no requirement for a HRA for SAC species for River and estuarine SACs. The HRA screening report would note that SNH's position on the requirement not to undertake HRA for migratory SAC species for developments at sea.</p>
3.0	<p>█ noted that approach proposed for assessing impacts on diadromous fish seems appropriate.</p>

4.0	<p>█ said that this approach might often be appropriate, but that the location of ICOL directly opposite the mouth of the estuary of the Tay which is a SAC for salmon might need considered. █ also noted that there may not be sufficient evidence within the Scoping Report to 'scope out' those items proposed. █ advised that, although the report included an update on relevant research with material on diadromous fish, that there was now other new information, for example on the likely spatial and temporal distribution of salmon smolts and returning adults, which are highly likely to occur at the site, which needed to be considered somewhere, whether by revising and extending the scoping report or by scoping in to the ES. He noted that the absence of salmon and sea trout in the conventional trawl surveys which had been carried out in earlier survey work commissioned by ICOL should not be taken as evidence for absence of these species as they were now known to spend most of their time very close to the surface where they would not be caught in conventional trawls.</p>
	<p>ICOL explained that it was our intention to draw on the impacts reached from the original development, and if they still remained appropriate (eg no likely change in baseline, assessment methodology/ guidance/ understanding, or change from the impacts proposed) that non-significant effects would not be considered further and significant effects would. ICOL also noted that the intention was not to assess all effects but only significant. The general consensus with consultees was that this was how it should be carried out.</p> <p>█ noted that should there be any aspect that any consultee felt needed to be included in the EIA, or required further attention that this should be clearly indicated in their scoping opinion with sufficient information for the reasons.</p>
5.0	<p>█ noted that impacts on particle motion may be required and this was also supported by █ in the context of diadromous fish</p>
	<p>█ felt that due to the uncertainties in our current understanding and lack of data on the level of particle motion generated by piling that an assessment would purely be a literature review (one of which has been carried out at Blyth) and would not conclude anything that would make a difference to the impacts from the project. Therefore █ suggested that there is not enough information to warrant another literature review and that our proposal would be not to include this.</p> <p>█ agreed that the evidence available at this stage is unlikely to lead to a meaningful assessment and that it is unlikely that there would be any further understanding on the matter in the timeframes of this application.</p>
6.0	<p>█ noted that it was the intention to scope out impacts on EMF from all fish species as current understanding is that the impacts are unlikely to lead to significant effects. The original EIA assessed the effects as non-significant and the EIA for the revised development would conclude this again.</p>
	<p>█ noted that it had now been demonstrated that some salmonids can detect and use weak fields as geomagnetic navigation cues which again needed consideration somewhere.</p> <p>█ reiterated her original position and further noted that the cable will be buried/ covered to a</p>



	<p>depth of c.1m which would again minimise any slight impacts that may or may not occur.</p> <p>█ noted that responses to the Scoping Report should include any additional requirements not detailed within the document that consultees feel that could lead to a significant effect from the proposal and therefore need to be assessed within the EIA. Likewise if consultees disagree with the scope of assessment proposed this should form part of their scoping opinion providing sufficient information on why it should be assessed.</p>
7.0	<p>█ noted that he expected there to be continued requirements for engagement in the groups that were established previously for looking at monitoring and a regional scale and to participate in the monitoring requirements laid out in the National Research Strategy for Diadromous Fish (now being subsumed into the SpORRAN framework) which would involve putting in place a suitable project or projects.</p>
	<p>█ explained the set-up of the group.</p>
8.0	<p><b>There was a general discussion about the CIA. The general consensus was that the CIA should assess the consented schemes for the other Firth of Forth projects.</b></p>
	<p>The EIA for the Firth of Forth schemes were carried out on a larger envelope than what was consented, therefore represents a worse case than the actual schemes consented. The consented schemes therefore represents the worst case as this is what could be built.</p> <p>ICOL are updating their noise modelling so an accurate assessment of potential noise impacts from the project will be known and this will be used to assess the CIA of the other developments.</p>
9.0	<p>█ detailed the questions at the back of the scoping report, and ensured they were discussed.</p>
	<p>It was agreed that the baseline assessment on receptors and noise proposed was appropriate for the EIA.</p> <p>It was agreed that there would be no HRA requirements for fish ecology.</p> <p>█ noted that impacts on scallops (larval stage) in relation to sedimentation may be required.█ noted that again this would be a literature review that wouldn't result in a quantitative assessment.█ explained that the literature review from MORL could be reviewed█ explained the biology and habitat preference of scallop larvae and noted that any sedimentation impacts were unlikely to lead a significant impact and therefore suggest that this doesn't need to be included again.</p> <p>It was agreed that the scope of the other projects to be assessed in the CIA were appropriate.</p> <p>█ noted that the spatial and temporal distribution of salmon should be considered.</p> <p>█ noted that spawning maps are available for cod and haddock are available now and should be considered.</p> <p>SNH noted that the commercial fish section of the EIA needs to be considered separately and not be detailed in the ecology section and vice versa. ICOL noted that this would be the case.</p>
10.0	<p>█ provided the presentation on Benthic ecology</p>
	<p>SNH noted that a lot of work has gone into BOWL's Environmental Management Plan which also contains a Non-Invasive Species Plan, this could be useful reference document when considering</p>

	either for the ICOL project.
11.0	SNH noted that as the site will have no direct impact on the MPA there is no need for an individual MPA assessment. ■ advised that an MPA assessment was not required for the original ICOL consent. An MPA assessment was completed for Seagreen previously (Seagreen overlaps with the MPA)
	ICOL noted this.
12.0	■ provided a summary noting that all impacts on Benthic ecology would be scoped out of the Revised Development EIA- as it's unlikely to lead to significant effects.
	SNH noted that it is likely that they are content with what is being proposed (scoping out all impacts on benthic ecology from the EIA). ■ also stated that SNH's position was that an MPA assessment would not be required, as the project does not overlap with the MPA.
13.0	<b>The timeframe for the application was discussed</b>
	It was noted that time will be required for consultation during the pre-application stage and this should be factored in to final submission times. ICOL explained the timeframes with an application to be made early in 2018, which gives sufficient time to carry out the assessment work required.



# Minutes – Inch Cape Ornithology Scoping report

**Date:** 26 May 2017

**Location:** Marine Scotland Laboratory, Aberdeen

**Subject:** Ornithology - Scoping report and introduction to the Revised Development

**Attendees:** [Redacted]

ITEM	MINUTE
1.0	<p>■ provided overview of the purpose of the meeting – to facilitate structured discussion between MS LOT, ICOL and consultees of the ornithological issues of relevance to the ICOL request for a scoping opinion from Ministers; to inform consultee responses and to inform the consideration of the scoping opinion to be prepared by MS LOT on behalf of Ministers.</p> <p>General discussion around approach to EIA. Agreed by all present that the proposed application would be subject to full EIA requirements, accompanied by a self-contained ES and would report all likely significant environmental effects of the proposed Revised Development. Agreed that more detailed approach to scoping would allow those issues which were assessed in relation to the Original Development as having no likely significant effects; where those assessment remain relevant to the Revised Development and where there are no material changes in the policy context or baseline position, then the assessment used for the Original Development should be used to inform discussion around what should be scoped in/ out of the current assessment.</p> <p>■ outlined the application process going forward and highlighted that MS LOT is not seeking to achieve consensus on all ornithological issues accepting that there may be disagreement about methodology and/ or outcomes, inviting all consultees to provide clear and detailed responses to allow MS LOT to evaluate those responses and confirm Ministers’ requirements in the scoping</p>

	<p>opinion to be issued.</p> <p>█ distinguished current scoping exercise from previous applications in the Forth and Tay. There is no conjoined approach being proposed by the three applicants and so any advice contained in the scoping opinion must relate to the ICOL proposal alone.</p>
2.0	<p>█ provided an overview of the presentation and noted that there would be no update to the baseline survey work.</p>
	<p>█ asked the question to all consultees whether the boat based data remained sufficient to assess the EIA. █ noted that SNH had previously indicated that no further site specific survey work was required for the EIA. █ requested that if any consultee were to highlight a requirement for additional survey work, that detailed reasons be provided for that suggestion, to allow Ministers to evaluate the advice when formulating a scoping opinion.</p>
3.0	<p><b>Discussion was had on the proposed change to the operational period of the development (original 25 years and proposed up to 50 years). Question was asked whether the original assessment can therefore be used as appropriate means for justifying the scope of the revised development.</b></p>
	<p>ICOL noted that the proposed change in operational period was based on the design life of new generation turbines.</p> <p>SNH noted that this should be considered in the assessment across topics.</p> <p>There were discussions in regards to the inherent uncertainty of modelling population-level effects over any timescales and whether it was credible to consider predicting impacts over a 50-year period.</p> <p>General consensus was that longer operational periods are preferable to new sites however it would only be appropriate if the long term environmental impacts were deemed acceptable.</p> <p>RSPB asked the question as to whether a phased consent would be possible- eg 25 year consent and then a review to determine suitability for extension.</p> <p>█ noted that ICOL would be open to discussion around this point.</p> <p>█ requested specific advice from consultees on whether conclusions presented in ES for the Original Development which assume 25 year operational period can be relied upon to scope effects out of EIA for Revised Development, if 50 year operational period sought.</p>
4.0	<p>█ raised the issue of whether little gull should be scoped into the EIA, given that it is a qualifying feature of the Outer Firth of Forth and St Andrews Bay Complex pSPA, and given that Manx shearwater is being scoped in on this basis?</p>
	<p>█ agreed that, as little gull is a qualifying feature of the pSPA, there is a need to give consideration to whether there is a case for scoping it in. However, this had been considered and in line with the approach that had been adopted to scoping it had been scoped out. This was because there were no</p>



	<p>significant impacts predicted on the species in the Original Development EIA.</p> <p>The difference in approach compared to Manx shearwater is related to the fact that Manx shearwater had been scoped out of the EIA for the Original Development, in part because of a lack of connectivity to SPA populations. With the inclusion of Manx shearwater as a named component of the seabird assemblage of the pSPA, there is now potential connectivity with pSPA populations, and the species had been scoped in because of this change in status. By contrast, little gull had been scoped into the EIA for the Original Development and, hence, impacts on this species had been assessed in that EIA.</p> <p>As indicated in a later part of the presentation, it is also the case that the Outer Firth of Forth and St Andrews Bay Complex pSPA is amongst the sites screened into the HRA, and as such LSE has been identified for the qualifying features of this pSPA (which include little gull).</p>
5.0	<p>█ asked whether the Thaxter et al foraging range data will be used as the primary source of seabird ranging information in the assessment.</p>
	<p>█ explained it would be based mainly on the Thaxter et al. (2012)<sup>1</sup> data but would also use more recent studies, such as Wakefield et al. (2013)<sup>2</sup>.</p>
6.0	<p>RSPB noted that the FAME (<a href="http://www.fameproject.eu">www.fameproject.eu</a>) project information on foraging ranges could be made available to ICOL. This would provide more up-to-date information on foraging ranges, although the data are not yet in the public domain.</p>
	<p>Discussions were had as to what would be required to make these data available to ICOL for the purposes of the EIA. It was unclear whether these data could be made available within the timeframes for this application. It appeared unlikely that the data in a finalised format would be ready.</p> <p>If RSPB would like to see these data used as part of the assessment it should form part of their scoping response.</p> <p>█ to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Determine from the RSPB staff responsible for the FAME data and their use, whether they can be made available and within what timescale</li> <li>(ii) Provide MS-LOT with a list of the (potentially relevant) seabird breeding colonies for which FAME data exist</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Thaxter *et al.* (2012) Seabird foraging ranges as a preliminary tool for identifying candidate Marine Protected Areas. *Biological Conservation*, **156**, 1-148.

<sup>2</sup> Wakefield *et al.* (2013) Space partitioning without territoriality in gannets. *Science*, **341**, 68-70

7.0	<p><b>Discussions were held over the CIA and in particular the Firth of Forth projects, and how these would be dealt with in terms of basing the CIA upon the 2014 consented or (the assumed to arise) re-application designs for NnG and Seagreen Alpha and Bravo.</b></p>
	<p>Discussion around which projects should be included in the cumulative impact assessment. General consensus that if each of the 2014 consents and current proposals were mutually exclusive (eg the Original Development described in the 2014 consents and the proposed Revised Development are physically incompatible and not both capable of being constructed; the NNG 2014 and NNG 2017 projects are mutually exclusive and not both capable of being constructed; the Seagreen Alpha and Bravo 204 and proposed Seagreen Alpha and Bravo 2017 projects are mutually exclusive and not capable of both being constructed) then there would be no merit in undertaking a cumulative assessment of all six projects. The question for consideration by MS LOT is whether the projects are physically incompatible and not the commercial intention presently stated by the parties. ICOL to confirm whether the Original Development and Revised Development are mutually exclusive or both capable of construction.</p> <p>Where mutually exclusive, the proposed ICOL Revised Development should be assessed against the worst case scenario of either NNG 2014/17 and Seagreen A+B 2014/17 as the case may be. The general consensus was that the worst case scenario option for the CIA would be for the Revised Development to be assessed alongside the consented NNG and Seagreen Applications. Assuming that all of the Forth and Tay projects submit new applications, it was agreed that this issue would need to be dealt with in a way that was consistent across the applications from the different developers.</p> <p>There were discussions about the approach in methodology in doing this and, in particular, the extent to which collision risk estimates would need to be re-worked to account for changes in the recommended methods since the 2014 consents. It was highlighted that MS LOT would not facilitate a discussion around development of a common currency, and that it would be for individual applicants to undertake and report a cumulative assessment for consideration by Ministers.</p>
8.0	<p><b>SNH noted that the CIA will have to ensure that the impacts on natura sites are considered</b></p>
	<p>This was noted and agreed.</p>
9.0	<p><b>█ noted that there has been an update since 2014 on assessment/ modelling methods and asked whether the 2014 data would be updated to reflect this change.</b></p>
	<p>This point appeared to relate specifically to collision risk modelling and the use of basic or extended versions of the model, as well as to the use of revised avoidance rates.</p> <p>█ confirmed that collision risk modelling for ICOL would follow the recommendations that have emerged since the 2014 consents with regard to the model version and avoidance rate to be used. He also indicated that the preferred approach (as detailed in the Scoping Report) was to use the site-specific flight height data for ICOL.</p>
10.0	<p><b>█ emphasised the need for the assessments for the different Forth and Tay projects to use a 'common currency' because of the need to compare and contrast between projects.</b></p>



	<p>This discussion was linked to the discussion over CIA and how the different Forth and Tay projects would be dealt with for that purpose. Whilst the merits of trying to ensure a common currency were generally agreed, [REDACTED] indicated that there may be practical problems in achieving this and that consideration had to be given to the timescales for the application.</p>
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Key questions sought from the Scoping Report</b>
	<p>[REDACTED] highlighted the importance to the process of the EIA production of having stakeholders address the key questions, as set out in the Scoping Report. [REDACTED] confirmed that SNH had considered this list of questions and that it covered the key questions they thought needed to be answered.</p>
	<p>[REDACTED] invited consultees to consider whether there are any additional issues of relevance for consideration in the scoping opinion, which have not already been discussed in the meeting or specifically highlighted in the request for a scoping opinion submitted by ICOL.</p>

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted] @redrockpower.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 20 June 2017 10:11  
**To:** [Redacted]

**Cc:** [Redacted]

**Subject:** ICOL- Scoping Meeting- Ornithology, Marine Mammals and Natural Fish: Final Minutes

**Attachments:** INC1-EC-NEW-070-RNE-MOM-003 Marine Mammals Scoping Meeting 26 May 2017 - Final.pdf; INC1-EC-NEW-070-RNE-MOM-004 Natural Fish Scoping Meeting 26 May 2017 Minutes final.pdf; INC1-EC-NEW-070-RNE-MOM-005 Ornithology Scoping Meeting 26 May 2017 final.pdf

**Categories:** Inch Cape

Hi all,

Please find attached the final minutes from the scoping meetings on 26<sup>th</sup> May.

Many thanks for your input into these.

As you will know we are progressing with the EIA and some of the actions from the minutes will have already been actioned.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

The information in this e-mail (or any attachments to it) is confidential and may be legally privileged. It may not represent the views of Red Rock Power Limited, any of its subsidiaries, its holding company or any holding company thereof (of any tier). If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution, use of its contents or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this e-mail (or any attachments to it), is strictly prohibited. Any unintended recipient should advise the sender immediately of the error in transmission. Unless specifically stated otherwise, this email (or any attachments to it) is not an offer capable of acceptance or acceptance of an offer and it does not form part of a binding contractual agreement Red Rock Power Limited is a company registered in Scotland with registration number SC284836 whose registered office is at 5th Floor, 40 Princes Street, Edinburgh EH2 2BY with VAT registration number GB115073645.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

\*\*\*\*\*

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*



Inch Cape Offshore Windfarm Limited

Marine (Scotland) Act 2010

The Marine Licence (Pre-application Consultation) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

Notice is hereby given that Inch Cape Offshore Windfarm Limited (company number, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, 40 Princes Street, Edinburgh, EH2 2BY) plans to hold a pre-application consultation event regarding a proposed licensable marine activity 15km of the Angus coast, central grid reference: XXXXXXXX. The activity consists of up to 72 wind turbine generators, 2 offshore substation platforms, associated export cables and infrastructure.

Further information, can be obtained from: <http://www.inchcapewind.com/home>

The pre-application consultation event will be held at XXX- XXX on XXX August 2017 at:

XXXXXX

Persons wishing to provide comments on the proposed wind farm development can do so by writing to the applicant at:

inchcapewind@redrockpower.co.uk, or by post to:

[Redacted] , Inch Cape Offshore Limited, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, 40 Princes Street, Edinburgh, EH2 2BY, in either case not later than XXXXX 2017.

Comments should be dated and should clearly state the name and full return email or postal address of those making comment.

Comments made to the applicant are not representative to the Marine Scotland Licencing Operations Team (MS-LOT). If Inch Cape Offshore Wind Limited submits an application for a marine licence to MS-LOT, an opportunity will be given for representations to be made to the Scottish Ministers on the application.

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted] @redrockpower.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 21 June 2017 17:16  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Pre-application consultation  
**Attachments:** PAC advertisement template.docx; INC1-EC-NEW-090-RNE-REP-001 ICOL PAC Justification.docx

Hi [Redacted]

Following our call with [Redacted] yesterday, please find attached justification for ICOL's attendance at public events for our pre-application consultation. I'd appreciate it if you could confirm the following;

- Would the attached proposal of attending these 2 events meet the PAC requirements?
- If not, can MS-LOT provide further information on the additional requirements?
- Can MS- LOT confirm suitability of the proposed newspaper advertisement for the events?

Thanks  
[Redacted]

ion in this e-mail (or any attachments to it) is confidential and may be legally privileged. It may not represent the views of Red Rock Power Limited, any of its subsidiaries, its holding company or any holding company thereof (of any tier). If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution, use of its contents or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this e-mail (or any attachments to it), is strictly prohibited. Any unintended recipient should advise the sender immediately of the error in transmission. Unless specifically stated otherwise, this email (or any attachments to it) is not an offer capable of acceptance or acceptance of an offer and it does not form part of a binding contractual agreement Red Rock Power Limited is a company registered in Scotland with registration number SC284836 whose registered office is at 5th Floor, 40 Princes Street, Edinburgh EH2 2BY with VAT registration number GB115073645.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
This email has been received from an external party and  
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.  
\*\*\*\*\*



[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 27 June 2017 16:48  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Inch Cape - Pre-application Consultation Proposal

Dear [Redacted]

Many thanks for sending us the PAC proposal and supporting information.

MS-LOT can confirm that the two events outlined in your proposal are not sufficient to fulfil the requirements of the Regulations. Therefore, a separate PAC event should be organised for this application.

Marine Scotland guidance on pre-application consultation and pre-application consultation events can be found online here: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Licensing/marine/guidance/preappconsult>

However, this does not preclude you from attending the events included in your proposal and using them as an additional opportunity to engage with and inform the public.

The proposed newspaper advert is suitable, however, please amend the last paragraph to read, "*Comments made to the prospective applicant are not representations to the Scottish Ministers. If [Developer] submits an application for a marine licence to the Scottish Ministers, an opportunity will be given for representations to be made to the Scottish Ministers on the application.*"

Kind regards

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted] [@redrockpower.co.uk](mailto:@redrockpower.co.uk)  
**Sent:** 21 June 2017 17:16  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Pre-application consultation

Hi [Redacted]

Following our call with [Redacted] yesterday, please find attached justification for ICOL's attendance at public events for our pre-application consultation. I'd appreciate it if you could confirm the following;

- Would the attached proposal of attending these 2 events meet the PAC requirements?
- If not, can MS-LOT provide further information on the additional requirements?
- Can MS- LOT confirm suitability of the proposed newspaper advertisement for the events?

Thanks

[Redacted]

The information in this e-mail (or any attachments to it) is confidential and may be legally privileged. It may not represent the views of Red Rock Power Limited, any of its subsidiaries, its holding company or any holding company thereof (of any tier). If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution, use of its contents or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this e-mail (or any attachments to it), is strictly prohibited. Any unintended recipient should advise the sender immediately of the error in transmission. Unless specifically stated otherwise, this email (or any attachments

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 28 June 2017 13:27  
**To:** [Redacted]@redrockpower.co.uk; [Redacted]  
redrockpower.co.uk> [Redacted] @redrockpower.co.uk)  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** ornithology Inch Cape

Hi [Redacted]

We discussed on the phone last week whether a further ornithology meeting with Inch Cape would be appropriate to focus on the ornithology questions which were circulated. I think the best approach would be for Inch Cape to provide written responses to the questions so that your views can be considered during our discussions with SNH and RSPB if you wish to do this.

Thanks  
[Redacted]

-----  
[Redacted]

Marine Scotland – Marine Planning & Policy Division  
Scottish Government | Marine Laboratory, PO Box 101 | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen AB11 9DB  
[Redacted]

[ms.marinelicensing@gov.scot](mailto:ms.marinelicensing@gov.scot)  
Web: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/topics/marine/licensing/marine>

[Redacted]



[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 28 June 2017 10:39  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Inch Cape - Pre-application Consultation Proposal

[Redacted]  
Hi

Whilst the events are good places to engage and inform the public, the nature of the proposed events means they are not suitable PAC events. For example, The Arbroath Sea Fest has an entry fee, which provides a block to accessibility. In addition, the events may not be fully accessible for those with impaired mobility, i.e. uneven ground surface(s).

The geographical coverage is reasonable for the proposed development.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted] @redrockpower.co.uk  
**Sent:** 27 June 2017 17:21  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: Inch Cape - Pre-application Consultation Proposal

Hi [Redacted]

Thanks for getting back to me on this.

It would be useful to have further clarification on why an additional event is required. Is it for geographical coverage, potential attendees, or the nature of the events we have proposed?

This would be useful to allow us to focus our attention to ensure we organise to attend a suitable additional event.

Thanks  
[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 27 June 2017 16:48  
**To:** [Redacted] [@redrockpower.co.uk](mailto:@redrockpower.co.uk)>  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Inch Cape - Pre-application Consultation Proposal

Dear [Redacted]

Many thanks for sending us the PAC proposal and supporting information.

MS-LOT can confirm that the two events outlined in your proposal are not sufficient to fulfil the requirements of the Regulations. Therefore, a separate PAC event should be organised for this application.

Marine Scotland guidance on pre-application consultation and pre-application consultation events can be found online here: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Licensing/marine/guidance/preappconsult>

However, this does not preclude you from attending the events included in your proposal and using them as an additional opportunity to engage with and inform the public.

The proposed newspaper advert is suitable, however, please amend the last paragraph to read, "Comments made to the prospective applicant **are not representations** to the Scottish Ministers. If [Developer] submits an application for a marine licence to the Scottish Ministers, an opportunity will be given for representations to be made to the Scottish Ministers on the application."

Kind regards

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted] @redrockpower.co.uk  
**Sent:** 21 June 2017 17:16  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Pre-application consultation

Hi [Redacted]

Following our call with [Redacted] yesterday, please find attached justification for ICOL's attendance at public events for our pre-application consultation. I'd appreciate it if you could confirm the following;

- Would the attached proposal of attending these 2 events meet the PAC requirements?
- If not, can MS-LOT provide further information on the additional requirements?
- Can MS- LOT confirm suitability of the proposed newspaper advertisement for the events?

Thanks  
[Redacted]

The information in this e-mail (or any attachments to it) is confidential and may be legally privileged. It may not represent the views of Red Rock Power Limited, any of its subsidiaries, its holding company or any holding company thereof (of any tier). If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution, use of its contents or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on this e-mail (or any attachments to it), is strictly prohibited. Any unintended recipient should advise the sender immediately of the error in transmission. Unless specifically stated otherwise, this email (or any attachments to it) is not an offer capable of acceptance or acceptance of an offer and it does not form part of a binding contractual agreement Red Rock Power Limited is a company registered in Scotland with registration number SC284836 whose registered office is at 5th Floor, 40 Princes Street, Edinburgh EH2 2BY with VAT registration number GB115073645.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

\*\*\*\*\*

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*



# Minutes – Inch Cape SLVIA Scoping report

**Date:** 05 June 2017

**Location:** Dundee City Council Office, Dundee

**Subject:** Scoping report meeting and introduction to the Revised Development

**Attendees:** [Redacted]

ITEM	MINUTE
1.0	<p>█ provided an overview of the judicial review and current status of the project, with the Original Consent now back with ICOL and noting that the Revised Development is a standalone application.</p>
	<p>This was noted as being helpful.</p>
2.0	<p>█ presented PowerPoint slides and discussed the EIA approach that allows ICOL to 'scope out' those elements of the Revised Development EIA that are unlikely to lead to a significant effect.</p>
	<p>It was generally discussed as being a sensible approach.</p>
3.0	<p>█ noted that the main area of consideration during the EIA for Dundee council will be the visual impacts.</p>
	<p>The wirelines and comparative ZTV were reviewed and it was discussed that the view point from Dundee Law would still be assessed in the revised development EIA, but there would be no additional viewpoints considered. GR confirmed that they are content with the 50km study area proposed.</p>