



# Tangy IV Wind Farm S36C

## Non-Technical Summary

June 2026

Document Classification | **Public**



# Contents

|                                                                 |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>                               | <b>3</b>  |
| 1.1. PREFACE .....                                              | 3         |
| 1.2. NEED FOR THE PROPOSED VARIATION.....                       | 4         |
| 1.3. THE PROPOSED VARIATIONS .....                              | 5         |
| 1.4. THE SITE .....                                             | 5         |
| 1.5. THE APPLICANT .....                                        | 6         |
| <b>2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED VARIED DEVELOPMENT.....</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>3. SITE SELECTION AND DESIGN EVOLUTION .....</b>             | <b>10</b> |
| 3.1. SITE SELECTION .....                                       | 10        |
| 3.2. DESIGN EVOLUTION .....                                     | 10        |
| 3.3. APPROACH TO EIA AND EIA METHODOLOGY .....                  | 11        |
| <b>4. SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL AND COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENTS.....</b> | <b>12</b> |
| 4.1. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT .....                          | 12        |
| 4.2. ORNITHOLOGY .....                                          | 13        |
| 4.3. ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION .....                      | 14        |
| 4.4. GEOLOGY, SOILS AND PEAT .....                              | 15        |
| 4.5. SURFACE WATER .....                                        | 16        |
| 4.6. CULTURAL HERITAGE .....                                    | 17        |
| 4.7. NOISE .....                                                | 18        |
| 4.8. ACCESS TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT .....                         | 18        |
| 4.9. LAND-USE, SOCIO ECONOMICS AND RECREATION .....             | 19        |
| 4.10. SHADOW FLICKER .....                                      | 20        |
| 4.11. AVIATION.....                                             | 20        |
| <b>5. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS .....</b>                          | <b>22</b> |

## Tables

|                                                                            |   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| TABLE 1: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONSENTED AND PROPOSED VARIED DEVELOPMENT | 8 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|

## Figures

Figure 1.1: Site Location Plan

Figure 1.2: Environmental Constraints

Figure 1.3: The Proposed Varied Development layout

Figure 1.4: The Proposed Varied Development and the Consented Development layouts

# 1. Executive Summary

## 1.1. Preface

- 1.1.1. In 2019, SSE Generation Limited (hereafter referred to as ‘the Applicant’) secured consent under Section 36 (‘S.36’) of the Electricity Act 1989 (‘the 1989 Act’) and deemed planning permission under Section 57(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 for the construction and operation of Tangy IV Wind Farm (‘the Consented Development’). The Consented Development comprises 16 Wind Turbine Generators (‘WTGs’) of tip heights up to a maximum of 149.9m alongside associated ancillary infrastructure.
- 1.1.2. The Applicant proposes a variation to the Consented Development under Section 36c (‘S.36C’) of the 1989 Act. The Applicant is also seeking a direction under Section 57(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) (‘the 1997 Act’) to vary the deemed planning permission granted in respect of the Consented Development. The proposed changes to the Consented Development are referred to in the application as ‘the Proposed Varied Development’.
- 1.1.3. This document is the Non-Technical Summary (‘NTS’) of the Environmental Impact Assessment (‘EIA’) Report which accompanies the S.36C application for the Proposed Varied Development. The NTS summarises the key findings of the EIA Report, which has been undertaken to assess the change in potential impacts from the Proposed Varied Development compared to the Consented Development.
- 1.1.4. The EIA Report comprises 5 volumes:
- Volume 1: Non-Technical Summary
  - Volume 2: Main Report
  - Volume 3a: Figures
  - Volume 3b: Visualisations
  - Volume 4: Technical Appendices
- 1.1.5. The application is supported by a Planning Statement, a Pre-Application Consultation (‘PAC’) Report, and a Maximising Socio-Economic Benefits Framework Report.
- 1.1.6. A hard copy of both the EIA Report and the 2018 EIA Report will be made available for public viewing during the application’s consultation period at the following locations:
- Argyll and Bute Council, Customer Service Point, 1A Manse Brae, Lochgilphead, PA31 8RD, Mon – Fri from 9am – 12.30 and 1.30 – 4pm;

- Chair of West Kintyre Community Council, Birchfield, Whitehouse, By Tarbert, PA29 6XS. Viewing by appointment, please call Chair of West Kintyre Community Council on 07506 833280.
- Campbeltown Library, Aqualibrium, Kinloch Road, Campbeltown, PA28 6EH, Tues from 9.30am – 4.30pm, Wed & Thu from 9.30am – 6.30pm and on Fri and Sat from 9.30am to 1.30pm
- Carradale Village Hall, Carradale, PA28 6QG, Monday - Friday 9am-5pm. Viewings at weekends by arrangement on 07884470460

1.1.7. Hard copies of the NTS are available free of charge. Hard copies of the EIA Report and further information may be obtained by arrangement for £1,500 per copy, or £15 per disk/USB memory stick copy. For copies please contact SSE Generation Ltd, FAO Onshore Development Team, 1 Waterloo Street, Glasgow, G2 6AY or OWSBSupport@sse.com.

1.1.8. The documents will also be available for viewing online at:

- the Scottish Government ECU planning portal: <https://www.energyconsents.scot/ApplicationSearch.aspx>;
- The Argyll and Bute Council ('A&BC') planning portal: <https://www.argyll-bute.gov.uk/planning-and-building/find-and-comment-planning-applications>; and
- The Applicant's website: <https://www.sserenewables.com/tangy-repower>

1.1.9. Any public representations to the application may be submitted via the ECU website at [www.energyconsents.scot/Register.aspx](http://www.energyconsents.scot/Register.aspx); by email to the Scottish Government, Energy Consents Unit mailbox at [representations@gov.scot](mailto:representations@gov.scot); or by post to the Scottish Government, Energy Consents Unit, 4th Floor, 5 Atlantic Quay, 150 Broomielaw, Glasgow, G2 8LU, identifying the proposal and specifying the grounds for representation.

1.1.10. The Applicant will advertise the submission of the application in the local and national press (The Herald, The Edinburgh Gazette and the Campbeltown Courier) and on the dedicated project website. The advert will state the deadline for submitting representations to Scottish Ministers.

## 1.2. Need for the Proposed Variation

1.2.1. The Consented Development is no longer deliverable in its current form, for two related reasons. First, turbines of the consented blade tip height of 149.9m are effectively no longer available on the market. The onshore wind turbine market has moved towards larger, more efficient machines, and manufacturers are increasingly phasing out turbines of the smaller dimensions consented in 2019. A variation to increase the consented tip height is therefore necessary simply to enable a turbine that is available to be procured and

installed. Second, the Consented Development is no longer commercially viable in its current form, principally due to rising supply chain costs and high transmission charges affecting the onshore wind sector in Scotland. The taller, more efficient turbines proposed both restore the commercial viability of the project and allow a currently available turbine model to be procured.

### 1.3. The Proposed Variations

1.3.1. In summary, the Applicant is proposing to:

- Increase the maximum turbine tip height from 149.9m to up to 200m, with a commensurate increase in the hub height, rotor diameter, and the size of hardstands required;
- Optimise and slightly increase the length of access tracks;
- Relocate the consented substation to the north-west of the site to enable a more efficient grid connection route and also increase the size of proposed substation platform;
- Remove a consented site substation and removal of consented operations control building that are no longer needed.

### 1.4. The Site

1.4.1. The Site boundary for the Proposed Varied Development remains the same as the Consented Development (see **Figure 1.1: Site Location Plan**).

1.4.2. The Site is located approximately 9 km north-west of Campbeltown on the west side of the Kintyre peninsula in Argyll and Bute, Scotland on an area of land which occupies an area of approximately 710 hectares.

1.4.3. The A83, the main transport corridor along the Kintyre Peninsula is approximately 1.5km to the west of the Site. The closest villages are Bellochantuy, approximately 2 km north-west of the site, and Kilchenzie, approximately 3 km south of the site.

1.4.4. The site sits in an upland rural landscape of moorland, forestry and agricultural land currently used for commercial forestry, grazing and renewable electricity generation (Tangy Wind Farm). The highest point within the application boundary is Cnocan Gean, which lies to the north-east of the existing wind farm at a height of 200m Above Ordnance Datum ('AOD'). In general, the elevation of the site ranges from about 90 m to 200 m AOD (**Figure 1.2 Environmental Constraints**).

## 1.5. The Applicant

- 1.5.1. The Applicant is part of SSE Renewables, a leading developer, owner and operator of onshore and offshore wind farms in the UK and Ireland, with a vision to make renewable energy the foundation of a zero-carbon world. Part of the FTSE-listed SSE plc, the Applicant's strategy is to drive the transition to a low-carbon future through the world class development, construction and operation of their fleet of onshore and offshore wind energy generation sites, and flexible hydro.
- 1.5.2. SSE Renewables operates one of the largest onshore wind energy fleets in the UK and Ireland, with almost 5GW of installed green energy capacity and another 2GW in construction. Their vision is to be a leading renewables company in a net-zero world with the aim of increasing their renewable energy output by ~40% over the next 2 years. SSE Renewables continues to progress development options for new onshore wind farms and extensions to existing wind farms and is well placed to develop any future opportunities as they emerge.

## 2. Description of the Proposed Varied Development

- 2.1.1. The Proposed Varied Development layout is shown on **Figure 1.3**. The Proposed Varied Development and the Consented Development layouts have then been overlain and shown together on **Figure 1.4**.
- 2.1.2. The Proposed Varied Development would comprise the following key components:
- 16 Wind Turbine Generators ('WTGs') of up to 200m tip height;
  - Hardstanding area at each turbine base with an approximate area of 2126m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Three permanent meteorological masts and associated hardstand areas;
  - One site substation and operations control building with parking and welfare facilities;
  - A total of 12.1km of onsite access tracks with associated watercourse crossings;
  - Onsite underground cabling;
  - Temporary construction compound and laydown areas;
  - Temporary meteorological masts;
  - Temporary telecoms infrastructure;
  - Forest removal and subsequent replanting;
  - Decommissioning and removal of existing operational turbines and associated reinstatement;
  - Up to four borrow pits; and
  - Any other associated ancillary works required.
- 2.1.3. **Table 1** below summarises the differences between the Consented Development and the Proposed Varied Development.

**Table 1: Differences between the Consented and Proposed Varied Development**

| <b>S.36 Consent<br/>(Annex 1 Description of Development)</b>                            | <b>S.36C Proposed Variations</b>                                                                       | <b>Details of Change</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16 turbines each with a maximum blade tip height of up to 149.9m                        | 16 turbines each with a maximum blade tip height of up to 200m                                         | Increase in turbine tip height by up to 50.1m but no change to number of turbines.                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Hardstanding area at each turbine base with an approximate area of 1800m <sup>2</sup> . | Hardstanding area at each turbine base with an approximate area of 2126m <sup>2</sup>                  | Each hardstanding would increase by approximately 326 m <sup>2</sup> to accommodate the proposed candidate turbine model.                                                                                                                                                |
| Three permanent meteorological masts and associated hardstand areas                     | Three permanent meteorological masts and associated hardstand areas (new locations)                    | No change to the number of masts; new locations are proposed. See Figure 1.4: Consented and Proposed Varied Layouts.                                                                                                                                                     |
| Up to four borrow pits                                                                  | Up to four borrow pits                                                                                 | No change                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Up to two site substations                                                              | One site substation (new location)                                                                     | Removal of one substation and relocation of the remaining substation to the north west of the Site, reducing environmental effects and enabling a more efficient grid connection route.                                                                                  |
| One operations control building with parking and welfare facilities                     | Operations and control functions integrated within the substation building                             | The standalone operations control building has been removed from the design; its functions will be integrated within the relocated substation building.                                                                                                                  |
| A total of 11km of onsite access tracks with associated watercourse crossings           | A total of 12.1km of onsite access tracks with associated watercourse crossings and five turning heads | Increase of up to 1.1 km of onsite access tracks, reflecting the rerouting of the consented central spine track around the central area of deep peat. The turning heads allow vehicles to turn without the need for extended looped tracks or additional passing places. |
| Onsite underground cabling                                                              | Onsite underground cabling                                                                             | No change                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |



| S.36 Consent<br>(Annex 1 Description of Development)          | S.36C Proposed Variations                                     | Details of Change                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Temporary construction compound and laydown areas             | Temporary construction compound and laydown areas             | No change                                                                                                                                                     |
| Temporary meteorological masts                                | Temporary meteorological masts                                | No change                                                                                                                                                     |
| Temporary telecoms infrastructure                             | Temporary telecoms infrastructure                             | No change                                                                                                                                                     |
| Forest removal and subsequent replanting                      | Forest removal and subsequent replanting                      | No change to the extent of forest removal; the replanting proposals have been updated to account for changes to the required bat buffer protection distances. |
| Dismantling of existing turbines and associated reinstatement | Dismantling of existing turbines and associated reinstatement | No change                                                                                                                                                     |

## 3. Site Selection and Design Evolution

### 3.1. Site Selection

- 3.1.1. The site boundary remains as per the one described for the Consented Development (**Figure 1.1**). The criteria used in the initial assessment to determine the suitability of the Site for the Consented Development and the subsequent design process, including alternatives considered and site layout evolution, are described in the 2018 EIA Report for the Consented Development.
- 3.1.2. The decision by the Scottish Ministers in 2019 to grant Section 36 consent and deemed planning permission for the Consented Development has established the suitability of the Site for a large-scale wind farm.

### 3.2. Design Evolution

- 3.2.1. In early 2025 the Applicant reviewed the project in light of changes in the energy market and improvements in turbine technology. The review concluded that using taller turbines would allow the project to proceed while generating significantly more renewable electricity, increasing its contribution to Scotland's net zero goals. A refined design was developed to reflect this, while continuing to work within the site's engineering and environmental limits.
- 3.2.2. The proposal keeps the same number of turbines (16) but seeks to increase their maximum height from 149.9 metres to 200 metres. Some turbines have been moved, mainly to provide the greater spacing that taller turbines require, and in two cases to avoid a badger sett and to sit further from the nearest home.
- 3.2.3. The access tracks were redesigned to avoid the deepest areas of peat. Most notably, a track that the consented scheme would have run through the centre of the site has been rerouted around the central peatland, keeping that area intact. Where deep peat cannot be avoided, tracks will be built to float on the surface rather than being dug in, and existing tracks from the earlier Tangy wind farms will be re-used to reduce new construction. The turbine bases have likewise been positioned to limit peat disturbance.
- 3.2.4. Taken together, these changes involve only a small increase in the amount of peat affected, much of it the result of the deliberate decision to protect the central peatland, and the wind farm remains strongly positive in carbon terms.

- 3.2.5. Detailed information on the design evolution can be found in **Volume 2 – Chapter 2: Design Iteration and Description of Proposed Varied Development** of the EIA Report.

### 3.3. Approach to EIA and EIA methodology

- 3.3.1. As the Applicant is seeking to vary a consented scheme, a comparative EIA Report is required to compare the likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Varied Development against those identified in the 2018 EIA Report for the Consented Development. This information is presented in the within each technical chapter of the EIA Report.
- 3.3.2. The scope of the EIA was informed by an EIA Scoping Report submitted in July 2025 and the EIA Scoping Opinion provided by the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit ('ECU') in September 2025. The Scoping Opinion was developed in consultation with consultees including Argyll & Bute Council ('A&BC') NatureScot, Scottish Environment Protection Agency ('SEPA'), Historic Environment Scotland ('HES') and other consultees.
- 3.3.3. In preparing the EIA Report, the Applicant considered how the project should be defined, in particular whether the wind farm and the connection that will carry its electricity to the national grid should be assessed together.
- 3.3.4. This follows a recent court judgment which stated that, before granting consent, the decision-maker must consider on the facts whether a wind farm and its grid connection amount to a single project that should be assessed as a whole.
- 3.3.5. The electricity generated by the wind farm needs to reach the national grid through a connection operated by Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks ('SSEN') Transmission. SSEN Transmission is separately seeking consent for a shared overhead power line that would link this wind farm and the neighbouring Cnoc Buidhe project to a substation at Carradale in Argyll and Bute, with that application expected at the end of June 2026.
- 3.3.6. The Applicant recognises that whether to treat these as a single project is ultimately for the decision-maker, not the Applicant, to decide. As a cautious approach, each technical chapter of the assessment therefore considers the likely effects of the grid connection alongside those of the wind farm, so far as information about the connection is available.

## 4. Summary of Technical and Comparative Assessments

### 4.1. Landscape and Visual Impact

- 4.1.1. The Landscape and Visual Impact assessment considers how increasing the turbine height from 149.9 metres to 200 metres would change the landscape and visual effects identified for the Consented Development, focusing on where that change is material, particularly for the locations and views where significant effects had already been identified.
- 4.1.2. Considering landscape character, the Proposed Varied Development would give rise to significant effects within a relatively localised area, generally within about 11 km of the site, affecting four landscape character types: Plateau Moor and Forest, Bay Farmland, Rocky Coastland and Sand Dunes and Machair. This is because the larger turbines would appear more prominent on the southern edge of the forested upland core of Kintyre, which forms the backdrop to the agricultural fringes, foothills and the low-lying landscape of Aros Moss to the south, and to the rocky coastline to the west. Among designated landscapes, a significant (moderate) effect is predicted on the West Kintyre Coast Local Landscape Area within around 8 km, increasing from the not significant effect identified for the consented scheme.
- 4.1.3. In visual terms, increased effects were identified at ten viewpoints, focused within 15 km of the site where the taller turbines become more noticeable. These are mainly viewpoints to the south across Aros Moss, such as Machrihanish, Southend Road, Campbeltown, Beinn Ghuilean and Drumble, where the turbines appear on the northern skyline, together with some to the east such as Bord a Dubh on the Kintyre Way. The settlements of Drumble and Machrihanish, both within 10 km to the south of Aros Moss, would see a noticeable increase in the apparent size of the turbines, and the coastal Core Path along the Links of Machrihanish would experience an increased effect in views north along the coast. In total, significant visual effects were identified at 11 of the 28 viewpoints, 4 of the 8 settlements and 4 of the 10 routes assessed. Because the taller turbines now require aviation lighting, a separate assessment identified further significant effects from this lighting on a number of landscape character types, viewpoints, a residential grouping and routes.
- 4.1.4. Considered alongside other operational, consented and proposed wind farms (as of 5 January 2026), few additional significant cumulative effects were identified beyond those of the development on its own, although there is some increase compared with the consented scheme owing to the greater influence of the taller turbines. Cumulative effects remain relatively localised, with most

significant effects occurring within 11 km, consistent with the Consented Development.

- 4.1.5. Overall, the assessment concludes that the Proposed Varied Development would result in some increased but localised significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity, up to about 11 km from the site. It would have a greater influence on the central Kintyre uplands and would become a noticeable feature in views from the settled lowlands and coast to the south and west, particularly around Aros Moss, Glenbarr and Machrihanish Bay.

## 4.2. Ornithology

- 4.2.1. The ornithology assessment considers likely changes to the conclusions reached in the 2018 assessment which found no significant effects on ornithology either alone or cumulatively.
- 4.2.2. Updated surveys were completed between April 2025 and May 2026 and roosting goose surveys were completed from October 2025 to May 2026. Additionally, updated desk study data relating to breeding Schedule 1 listed raptor species was obtained in March 2026. The updated survey and desk study data supplemented the existing baseline ornithology data collected between April 2012 and November 2017 and presented in the 2018 EIA Report, **Volume 2, Chapter 9: Ornithology** for the Consented Development.
- 4.2.3. Based on the updated and existing baseline information, it is considered that the assessment of effects of the Proposed Varied Development will remain largely unchanged when compared with the previously identified IOFs in the 2018 EIA for the Consented Development.
- 4.2.4. Two matters were assessed afresh. First, the increase to 200 metres requires aviation lighting, and NatureScot advised that the effect of this lighting on Greenland white-fronted goose be assessed. Second, because the taller turbines change the area swept by the blades and the turbine geometry, the collision risk modelling was revised, drawing on flight activity data from both 2016 to 2017 and 2025 to 2026.
- 4.2.5. The minimum gap between the ground and the lowest blade increases from around 20 to 33 metres for the consented scheme to 50 metres for the proposal, so the species included in the revised modelling differ slightly. For the five species common to both assessments (greylag goose, Greenland white-fronted goose, herring gull, hen harrier and peregrine), predicted collision risk is higher than for the consented scheme. However, the revised modelling adopted a more precautionary approach, and the risk is assessed as being of low to negligible magnitude for all of them.
- 4.2.6. Given its high nature conservation importance, collision risk to Greenland white-fronted goose was taken forward to detailed assessment, as was white-Tangy IV Wind Farm S36C

tailed eagle, owing to the small regional breeding population and the potential for risk to increase in future. Collision risk to all other species was screened out as having no potential for significant effects. Revised assessments of disturbance and displacement during construction and decommissioning were also completed for Greenland white-fronted geese roosting on Tangy Loch and for breeding and foraging hen harrier.

- 4.2.7. An updated cumulative collision risk assessment for Greenland white-fronted goose, together with consideration of potential barrier effects, identified no significant cumulative effects. No significant effects on the species were predicted from the development alone or cumulatively. Nonetheless, given the importance of the local population and the occasional use of Tangy Loch by large numbers of roosting birds, targeted mitigation will be secured through a Goose Protection Plan, broadly following the measures proposed for the consented scheme with some modifications.
- 4.2.8. Because of the proximity of the Kintyre Goose Roosts Special Protection Area and the potential for connectivity, Greenland white-fronted goose was also assessed under the Habitats Regulations, which concluded that the development would not adversely affect the integrity of the protected site. For hen harrier, with embedded mitigation secured through a Breeding Bird Protection Plan, no significant effects were identified.

### 4.3. Ecology and Nature Conservation

- 4.3.1. This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Varied Development on ecological features (not including birds which are assessed in **Chapter 6**). The assessment builds on the survey information gathered for the Consented Development, updated by a fresh desk study and targeted new field surveys, and considers only those effects that might differ between the consented scheme and the proposal. Where effects on a feature would be the same as already assessed, that feature was not reassessed.
- 4.3.2. The site is predominantly conifer plantation, with peatland in firebreaks in the north and grassland and peatland in the open ground to the south. These habitats are degraded, the southern areas through livestock grazing and the northern peatland through the effects of commercial forestry. Earlier surveys recorded limited badger activity however there several setts, generally low bat activity (mostly common and soprano pipistrelle), and brown trout at low densities in an isolated population that migratory fish cannot reach.
- 4.3.3. Since consent was granted in 2019, further work was undertaken, including activity across 2023 and 2024 to develop the Habitat Management Plan, and this has informed the revised assessment. Additional peat depth surveys, a pre-

construction survey along the access track in 2024, and updated bat and badger surveys in late 2025 have also been undertaken.

- 4.3.4. The design follows the mitigation hierarchy set out in national planning policy ('NPF4'), avoiding ecologically sensitive areas where possible, then minimising impacts (for example by re-using existing tracks), and providing targeted mitigation, compensation and enhancement where impacts remain. Of the important ecological features assessed in 2018, sensitive habitats, badger, bats and freshwater fish were taken forward for the assessment of the Proposed Varied Development. The effects on other ecological receptors (including Tangy Loch Site of Special Scientific Interest, otter, pine marten and reptiles) were considered to be no different from the Consented Development and so were not reassessed.
- 4.3.5. With targeted mitigation in place, the assessment concludes that the Proposed Varied Development would result in no significant adverse effects on any ecological feature, and no significant cumulative effects were identified when assessed alongside other nearby developments.
- 4.3.6. In terms of habitat management, a detailed Habitat Management Plan was approved by NatureScot and Argyll and Bute Council in October 2024 for the consented scheme. A revised plan accompanies this application, with changes confined to the forest to bog restoration. The committed restoration area reduces slightly from 85.77 to 79.48 hectares, because a small area (3.97 hectares) now falls within the development footprint and an area of shallow peat has been removed from the programme.
- 4.3.7. Together with 14.5 hectares of open moorland peatland restoration, the committed and feasible peatland restoration totals 93.98 hectares, compensating for 8.83 hectares of peatland impact. This exceeds NatureScot's expectations that developers restore at least ten hectares for every hectare lost. The Proposed Varied Development also delivers a biodiversity net gain of +33%, a strong positive outcome that materially improves on the site's current condition.

## **4.4. Geology, Soils and Peat**

- 4.4.1. The assessment of Geology, Soils and Peat effects of the Proposed Varied Development has been undertaken using the approach and methodology adopted in the assessment for the Consented Development, Chapter 11 Geology, Soils and Peat, 2018 Environmental Impact Assessment Report, as far as possible.
- 4.4.2. The findings of this assessment of the Proposed Varied Development have been appraised in comparison to the residual effects of Chapter 11 of the 2018



EIA Report, highlighting any changes from the effect assessed for the Consented Development.

- 4.4.3. The assessment indicates that there are no material changes to the predicted effects on Geology, Soils and Peat as a result of the Proposed Varied Development and the significance of the effects remains consistent with those reported in the 2018 EIA Report.
- 4.4.4. In conclusion, the effects for the Proposed Varied Development remain largely consistent with those identified in the 2018 EIA Report, where the overall residual effects are predicted to be Minor adverse.

## 4.5. Surface Water

- 4.5.1. The surface water chapter of the EIA Report assesses the potential effects of the Proposed Varied Development on the surface water environment. It presents the baseline conditions of the water environment and highlights the potential effects and their significance, considering embedded and standard mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures were deemed unnecessary due to the limited impacts assessed and/or controlled already under the assessment of the Consented Development. This chapter identifies and assesses the potential impacts and effects of the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Varied Development on the surface water environment, including surface water quality, fisheries and recreation, public water supplies and private water supplies ('PWS').
- 4.5.2. Where there are surface water dependent ecosystems, these are considered in this assessment when determining the importance of water features. This chapter also considers any impacts on the flora and fauna associated with the freshwater aquatic environment, as well as ponds (which are considered as a specific habitat type rather than a water feature). In addition, **Chapter 8: Geology, Soils and Peat** considers the potential for impacts on geology, bedrock, peat and carbon.
- 4.5.3. **Chapter 12: Surface Water**<sup>1</sup> of the 2018 EIA Report examined baseline data and identified 14 PWS within the Study Area, and one of these within 250m of proposed works. No surface water features were identified as being at risk of impacts from the Consented Development. This report examined all water features within 1km of the works involved for the Proposed Varied Development and identified 12 surface water features at potential risk of impact. These have been scoped in for assessment. This includes one

---

<sup>1</sup> WSP (2018) Tangy IV Wind Farm: Chapter 12 – Surface Water. Environmental Impact Assessment Report. August 2018.  
Prepared for the Tangy IV Wind Farm project



watercourse partially within a Site of Special Scientific Interest ('SSSI'), which does not have a Water Framework Directive ('WFD') classification.

- 4.5.4. Effects considered were potential impact of pollution, run-off and spillage due to the construction of new access tracks and watercourse crossings during the construction phase, and site traffic vehicles during both the construction and operation phases. With embedded and standard mitigation, none were found to have a significant effect.

## 4.6. Cultural Heritage

- 4.6.1. This chapter considers the potential effects of the Proposed Varied Development on cultural heritage, covering both direct effects on heritage assets within the site arising from the changes to the layout, and effects on the setting of heritage assets in the surrounding landscape. An updated record of known heritage assets was obtained from the West of Scotland Archaeology Service in January 2026, and a further field survey in February 2026 identified eight heritage assets within the site in addition to those recorded for the consented scheme.
- 4.6.2. Construction of the proposal could directly affect two heritage assets within the site, a sheepfold and the remains of a building, both of low sensitivity. Mitigation has been set out to reduce these effects to no more than negligible (not significant), and all other assets have been avoided through the design of the layout. The potential for further, as yet unrecorded archaeological remains within the site is assessed as moderate, but with the proposed mitigation the residual effect would not be significant.
- 4.6.3. The assessment also considered effects on the setting of heritage assets, taking account of the larger area from which the taller turbines could theoretically be seen. Seventeen heritage assets within 10 km would now have theoretical visibility of the development where they would not have seen the consented scheme. As for the consented scheme, a significant effect remains on two designated assets of national importance, the Tangy Loch fortified dwelling and a cairn at Killocrew. An additional significant (moderate) effect has been identified on a second Killocrew cairn, where the introduction of modern turbines and a substation would noticeably alter its otherwise rural, pastoral setting. However, the main contributors to that cairn's significance, including its relationship with other features and its expansive coastal views to the south, would be retained, so its ability to convey its cultural significance would not be significantly harmed, consistent with national planning policy. Effects on the settings of all other heritage assets are no greater than minor and not significant.
- 4.6.4. Three significant cumulative effects are predicted from operating the proposal alongside other developments, affecting the settings of the Tangy Loch fortified dwelling and the two Killocrew cairns, with the proposal contributing

the greatest share of the combined effect in each case. Even so, the combined developments would not harm the overall heritage value of these assets, with the isolated, defensive setting of the fortified dwelling and the south-facing coastal views from the cairns retained.

## **4.7. Noise**

- 4.7.1. The Noise chapter assesses the potential noise impact of the Proposed Varied Development on nearby properties sensitive to noise, principally residential homes. The 2018 assessment identified the nearby noise-sensitive properties and the noise limits applying to them. These limits are expressed in relation to a standardised wind speed measured at 10 metres, which is derived from the wind speed at hub height, so the limits have been updated to reflect the increased hub height of the proposal.
- 4.7.2. For cumulative effects, the 2018 assessment considered the consented Beinn an Tuirc III Wind Farm, while this updated assessment considers both Beinn an Tuirc III and the proposed Cnoc Buidhe Wind Energy Hub. Cumulative noise has been managed using site-specific noise limits, which are reduced from the full cumulative limits to account for the contribution of other wind farms, so that they apply to the effects of this development alone.
- 4.7.3. The assessment found the predicted noise from the Proposed Varied Development would exceed the site-specific limits by up to 1.4 decibels at wind speeds between 6 and 10 metres per second, which is a potentially significant effect. A mitigation strategy has therefore been provided, and with the turbines operating in reduced-noise modes the operational noise effects would be not significant.

## **4.8. Access Traffic and Transport**

- 4.8.1. A screening assessment has been undertaken to review the potential traffic impact of the Proposed Varied Development when compared to that of the Consented Development, in line with the requirements of the EIA scoping responses.
- 4.8.2. The Proposed Varied Development was found to generate marginally more traffic than the Consented Development and this was then compared against a modern future year baseline traffic estimate.
- 4.8.3. The analysis concluded the Proposed Varied Development will have similar traffic impacts to that of the Consented Development. No further mitigation

measures are therefore required, and all impacts are considered **not significant**, following the application of mitigation.

- 4.8.4. A review of the Abnormal Indivisible Load ('AIL') routes from the pier at Campbeltown to the site access junction has been undertaken and the physical measures required are identified in a revised AIL Route Survey Report.
- 4.8.5. The Proposed Varied Development will not result in any significant effects. All traffic effects are temporary and negligible in nature.

## **4.9. Land-use, Socio Economics and Recreation**

- 4.9.1. This chapter addresses land use, socio-economics and recreation in the context of the Tangy IV Wind Farm Section 36C variation application. All three topics have been scoped out of the EIA Report.
- 4.9.2. Forestry was initially scoped in by Scottish Forestry as part of the Scottish Ministers' Scoping Opinion of September 2025. However, following pre-application engagement with Scottish Forestry and the provision of detailed felling information in May 2026, agreement was reached that no further forestry assessment is required, however a revised replanting plan and information relating to the potential cumulative effects of the grid connection have been discussed in Chapter 13 of the EIA Report.
- 4.9.3. The Proposed Varied Development delivers a net reduction in woodland loss of 4.92 hectares relative to the Consented Development, and no significant adverse cumulative forestry effects are anticipated when considered in combination with the proposed Shared Use Connection.
- 4.9.4. Socio-economic effects, which are expected to be wholly positive and at least equivalent to those assessed for the Consented Development, are addressed in a dedicated Socio-Economic Report submitted alongside this application. This reflects the agreed position of the EIA Task and Finish Group established under the Onshore Wind Sector Deal and demonstrates compliance with NPF4 Policy 11(c).
- 4.9.5. Recreation and tourism are not further assessed. The Proposed Varied Development does not alter the baseline established for the Consented Development, and the conclusions of that assessment, supported by the BiGGAR Economics (2017) evidence base, remain valid.

## 4.10. Shadow Flicker

- 4.10.1. A revised shadow flicker assessment has been undertaken for an assessment area of 1,500m around each turbine (increasing from 1,300m in the 2018 EIAR due to the larger rotor diameter being proposed). Previously, 12 receptors were identified within 1,300m of the Consented Development, however, with the increase in study area the total number of identified receptors has increased to 24.
- 4.10.2. The maximum number of realistic hours, at the worst-case dwelling, is predicted to increase from 15.4 hours (the Consented Development assessment) to 18.4 hours (the Proposed Varied Development assessment). As shadow flicker has been predicted to occur at receptors within 10 rotor diameters of turbines, such effects are potentially significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 4.10.3. The Consented Development's consent applied a planning condition that required a shadow flicker control scheme to be submitted for the approval of the Argyll & Bute Council prior to commencement of development. It is anticipated that a similar pre-commencement condition would be attached if consent is granted for the Proposed Varied Development.
- 4.10.4. Following implementation of a shadow flicker control scheme, shadow flicker is unlikely to occur at receptors within ten rotor diameters of any turbine of the Proposed Varied Development. Mitigated effects are, therefore, considered to be not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

## 4.11. Aviation

- 4.11.1. This chapter assesses the potential effects of the Proposed Varied Development on aviation during construction, operation and decommissioning, using the same methods as the 2018 assessment.
- 4.11.2. The aviation baseline is largely unchanged since 2018, the only difference being that a NATS navigation beacon (the 'DVOR') has since been withdrawn from service. Following consultation, Highlands and Islands Airports Limited ('HIAL') and National Air Traffic Services ('NATS') confirmed that the proposal would not adversely affect Islay Airport's instrument flight procedures (the routes pilots fly using instruments) or a NATS navigation beacon, so these did not require re-assessment.
- 4.11.3. A specialist assessment of Campbeltown Airport's flight procedures identified minor issues to be addressed. HIAL has indicated it is willing to accept the recommended changes which require approval from the Civil Aviation Authority ('CAA'). An effect on one of the airport's protected surfaces was identified, but HIAL confirmed this surface is not currently safeguarded and

that the required aviation lighting would provide sufficient mitigation. The assessment of two further procedures is awaiting input from Campbeltown air traffic control, though any effect is anticipated as highly likely to be resolved.

- 4.11.4. As the Proposed Varied Development requires aviation lighting, a lighting scheme has been prepared and approved by the CAA. This comprises visible lights on five turbines (T01, T05, T06, T08 and T11) and non-visible infra-red lighting on all sixteen turbines.
- 4.11.5. NATS also confirmed that ten of the turbines would adversely affect the Lowther Hill air traffic control radar. The Applicant is in discussions with NATS on a mitigation solution, likely to involve a radar-blanking technique, and intends to have this in place before the wind farm becomes operational. This radar mitigation is a change from the consented scheme.
- 4.11.6. Following mitigation, the assessment concludes that the effects on aviation during all phases are assessed as negligible and not significant.

## 5. Summary and Next Steps

- 5.1.1. Overall, through a combination of design-led mitigation and additional mitigation measures implemented during construction and operation, the effects and conclusions of the Proposed Varied Development EIA Report remain largely consistent with those identified in the 2018 EIA Report.
- 5.1.2. Compared with the Consented Development, the Proposed Varied Development would result in increased landscape and visual effects from a limited number of viewpoints, receptor groups, routes, landscape character types, and landscape designations.
- 5.1.3. The Cultural Heritage assessment predicted three significant cumulative effects from operating the Proposed Varied Development alongside other developments, affecting the settings of the Tangy Loch fortified dwelling and the two Killochrairns. This means the Proposed Varied Development presents an additional significant effect on the setting of one designated heritage compared to the Consented Development, however the key contributors to the cairn's significance would be retained such that the understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset are maintained and the integrity of its setting would not be significantly affected.
- 5.1.4. No residual significant (adverse) effects are identified for Ornithology; Ecology and Nature Conservation; Geology, Soils and Peat; Surface Water; Noise; Access Traffic and Transport; Land Use, Socio Economics and Recreation; Shadow Flicker or Aviation.
- 5.1.5. The Proposed Varied Development would also deliver a biodiversity net gain of +33% meaning a strong positive improvement on the site's current condition. In addition, expectations for restoration measures have been exceeded through 14.5 hectares of open moorland peatland restoration, 93.98 hectares committed restoration and further feasible peatland restoration of 8.83 hectares of peatland impact compensation.
- 5.1.6. The ECU will consider the Section 36C application and the findings of the EIA Report. As part of the decision-making process, the ECU will consult a number of consultees including Argyll and Bute Council, NatureScot and SEPA, and will consider all representations received from other parties including members of the public.
- 5.1.7. Any public representations to the application may be submitted via the ECU website at [www.energyconsents.scot/Register.aspx](http://www.energyconsents.scot/Register.aspx); by email to the Scottish Government, Energy Consents Unit mailbox at [representations@gov.scot](mailto:representations@gov.scot); or by post to the Scottish Government, Energy Consents Unit, 4th Floor, 5 Atlantic Quay, 150 Broomielaw, Glasgow, G2 8LU, identifying the proposal and specifying the grounds for representation.