



**PORT OF  
CROMARTY  
FIRTH**

## Appendix E: Scoping Response





## Appendix E.1: Scoping Consultation Response Table



## Appendix E.1: Scoping Consultation Response Table

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
MS-LOT	1	The impact assessment should consider likely changes in vessel movements resulting from the installation, the constraints imposed upon local navigation by the installation and, if considered a risk, the danger of passing vessels colliding with the installation. The assessment of significance should focus on the extent of conflict with navigation, anchorage etc. Any benefits, for example the provision of new mooring facilities, should also be identified and assessed. Mitigation is likely to comprise measures incorporated into the design of a development; however, operational factors such as navigational lighting will also be relevant.	Chapter 20: Sections 20.4 & 20.5 - Page 20.2 & 20.6
MS-LOT	2	MS-LOT is aware of the following works or proposed works that should be included in your assessment of cumulative effects in the ES (please note that this list is not exhaustive): Aberdeen Harbour Expansion Project (Aberdeen); Beatrice STW Offshore Wind Farm (Outer Moray Firth); European Offshore Wind Deployment Centre (Aberdeen); Forthwind (Methil) Offshore Wind; Demonstrator (Firth of Forth); Hywind Scotland Pilot Park Offshore Wind Farm (Offshore Peterhead); Inch Cape STW Wind Farm (Outer Firth of Forth)	Chapter 5: Section 5.6 - Page 5-7
MS-LOT	3	You are also advised to take into account any on-going maintenance dredging operations within the area of the proposal. This should be included in any cumulative impact assessment and updated in-combination effects assessment.	Chapter 5: Section 5.6.2 - Page 5-7
MS-LOT	4	Within the NMP there are a number of marine planning and general policies (GEN) all of which should be considered within the ES. In relation to this proposal the policies which will be of particular significance are the relevant sectorial policy and the following general policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>·GEN 5: Climate Change</li> <li>·GEN 7: Landscape/seascape</li> <li>·GEN 8: Coastal Process and Flooding</li> <li>·GEN 9: Natural Heritage</li> <li>·GEN 11: Marine Litter</li> <li>·GEN 12: Water Quality and Resource</li> <li>·GEN 13: Noise</li> <li>·GEN 16: Planning Alignment B</li> <li>·GEN 17: Fairness</li> <li>·GEN 18: Engagement</li> <li>·GEN 19: Sound Evidence</li> <li>·GEN 21: Cumulative Impacts</li> </ul>	Chapter 4: Section 4.8.1 - Page 4-3 GEN 16: Planning Alignment B is about the alignment of Marine Plans with other plans, this isn't relevant to the development proposal hence was not considered.
THC	5	It would appear from drawing 5121683-GA- 908 Rev 2 attached to the Scoping Report that the site encroaches above the low water mean springs and therefore the development as proposed will require planning permission.	Chapter 3: Section 3.2 - Page 3-1

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
THC	6	Further more the Scoping Report goes on to say at 4.3.3 that 'in conjunction with the Phase 4 development there may be works carried out above MLWS which could require planning consent.' This therefore suggests these additional activities should be subject to EIA, as they will all be part of the same development. If Phase 4 cannot be built without the associated elements above low water mark, then planning permission will be required for the entirety of the development and all matters below and above the low water mark need to be included within the EIA. Correspondence is ongoing with PoCF to clarify this.	Chapter 3: Section 3.2 - Page 3-1 No activities above MLWS
THC	7	Section 5.3.1 notes the underwater noise dissipation model for Phase 3 was subsequently found to be only "slightly conservative", rather than "very conservative" as stated in the Environmental Statement (ES). The ES should therefore detail how amended modelling will be used to show likely impacts/mitigation. As per the request on Phase 3, Phase 4 should show modelling impacts (i.e. sound levels) from 1 km, 5 km as well as 500m from the proposed development, rather than drop-off rates. Data provided in Phase 3 (Diagram 8.2) focussed on noise levels that are 20km – 80km away and showed drop off levels rather than actual levels of noise.	Chapter 7 A new detailed model of underwater piling noise is provided.
THC	8	Section 5.3.2.2. Volume of marine traffic will increase, therefore an increase in disturbance/cumulative impacts/collision risk.	Chapter 12: Section 12.5.1.1 & 12.5.2.1 - Page 12-10 & 12-20
THC	9	Section 8 needs to include assessment of coastal squeeze impacts.	Chapter 9: Section 9.5.2.1 Page 9-8
THC	10	Section 9 and Appendix A needs to consider Ramsar sites and Seal Haul-out sites.	Chapters 11 & 12 Sections 11.4.1 & 12.4.2.3 - Page 11-6 & 12-8
THC	11	Sections 9.3.3 and 9.7.3: suggest SNH advise best location to conduct transect/surveys, if not already the case.	Chapter 11: Section 11.3.1 Page 11-2
THC	12	Section 9.4 needs to include Seal Haul-out Areas	Chapters 12 Sections 12.4.2.3 - Page 12-8
THC	13	Section 9.7.2.1. needs to consider cumulative impacts of spoil dumped with Phase 3 and other development in the SAC and its qualifying features.	Chapters 9 & 15 Section 9.5.1.1 & 15.5.1.2 - Page 9-8 & 15-13
THC	14	Could explore if any seascape/National Coastal Character Assessment data become available that can be included in the Environmental Statement that will support the application.	Chapter 16 Section 16.4.2.1 - Page 16-15

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
THC	15	Section 10.4 How would "improvements to the linear part and the gateway to Invergordon" be assessed in the Environmental Report?	The Port Authority is working on the improvements to the linear park and gateway with the local community as part of a separate project. It has not therefore been taken account of within the LVIA.
THC	16	Section 12.1 should make use of the Scottish Government Marine Litter Strategy.	Chapter 18: Section 18.5.3.4 - Page 18-9
THC	17	Sufficiently detailed maps, showing boundary measurements, depths, etc and showing development in relation to previous phases should be provided to allow full assessment of likely environmental impacts.	Volume 4
THC	18	Section 13 should also consider the likely significant effects of the predicted increase of marine transport e.g. increased volume of traffic may increase risk of collision and therefore pollution incidents.	Chapter 20: Sections 20.4 & 20.5 - Page 20-2 & 20-6
THC	19	Section 15 should include the Nigg and Ardersier developments as well as the cumulative effects of Phases 1/2/3.	Chapter 5: Section 5.6 - Page 5-7 NB Existing developments are classed as baseline.
THC	20	The Scoping Report outlines two development scenarios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cruise Ship and General Laydown of components</li> <li>• Wind Turbine Storage and assembly</li> </ul> The scenarios have potentially very different impacts on the visual amenity of receptors in the Cromarty Firth and Black Isle areas and the viewpoints identified for Cruise ship and general laydown will not be adequate for assessment of likely impacts from Wind Turbine assembly. Nor is it safe to rule out significant effects occurring outside of 10km for the wind turbine scenario.	Chapter 16: Section 16.5.3 Page 16-22
THC	21	The applicant has confirmed that a Transport Assessment (TA) will be required for all development proposed to give an understanding of the likely transport impacts that will arise. The current baseline situation shall be established and the increase in transport and parking demand against this baseline situation calculated for the expanded port. Up to date traffic count data will be required and the details of this will need to be agreed as part of detailed scoping discussions; the information provided in section 13 of the Scoping Report does not provide sufficient information to act as a scoping	Transport Assessment

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
		agreement for the Transport Assessment. The TA should be prepared in accordance with the current Transport Scotland document, Transport Assessment Guidance, and the attached Council document, Transport Statement –Guidelines.	
THC	22	A travel plan (TP) is a document that sets out a package of positive and complementary measures for the delivery of more sustainable travel patterns for a specific development. The TA should include details of a framework TP and include targets, monitoring proposals and measures to promote sustainable travel. An obligation may be sought to ensure that the plan is implemented, monitored and enforced.	Transport Assessment
THC	23	These shall be identified and the impact on the existing road network assessed; the long-term access proposals for the port should be clarified and the situation regarding the temporary access resolved. The visibility splays required for the access points shall be identified on plans together with a dimensioned plan of the layout, the drainage (to prevent outflow onto the public road) and the surfacing proposed. They shall be in accordance with the Council's Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments. Due consideration to any ro-ro traffic will need to be given as this would be a significant change in the nature of the traffic currently accessing the port.	Transport Assessment Note No Ro-Ro incorporated in the development.
THC	24	The design should give consideration to access by foot, cycle and public transport. Access arrangements for heavy goods and abnormal load vehicles shall also be considered. Swept path analysis will be required. Due consideration to any ro-ro requirement will need to be given. Routing of heavy goods and abnormal load vehicles to/from port. The routing arrangements for heavy goods and abnormal load vehicles from the port to and from the A9 should be identified (for operation and construction) and the impact of any increase in traffic identified together with appropriate mitigation. Traffic management proposals for the port operation may be required.	Transport Assessment Note No Ro-Ro incorporated in the development.
THC	25	The safety at the site frontage and on the active travel links adjacent to the port and to the car parks and public transport facilities should be considered. There are also road safety concerns on both the B817 out with the town itself where the accident rates are high and on the route to the Tomich junction on the A9. The principle of no net detriment should be applied and the impact of any increase in traffic should be carefully considered.	Transport Assessment
THC	26	There were problems with earlier phases of development due to routing of HGV's through the settlements of Ardgay and Edderton. The number of heavy goods vehicles required for the construction phase should be identified as part of the TA. Routes for HGV.s during should be identified and a framework construction traffic management plan submitted.	Transport Assessment Chapter 19: Section 19.5.1 Page 19-11
THC	27	Mitigation required may include; new or improved infrastructure, road safety measures and traffic management. Traffic management shall include measures to ensure that construction traffic adheres to approved routes.	Transport Assessment Chapter 19: Section 19.6 Page 19-19

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
THC	28	The application should identify any road/surface water drainage which will be affected by the reclamation and provide appropriate solutions to ensure that they function effectively. These details will require to be approved by the Council.	Chapter 9: Section 9.5.2.3 Page 9-10
THC	29	The scoping report provided discusses that the level of the reclaimed land is to be 5.9m above sea level. It is noted from the major pre app meeting documents that a new substation is proposed to be located within boundary of the new site, however the plan included in the scoping report there is no proposed substation. If a substation is proposed within the boundary of the development it needs to be protected from the 1:1000 year coastal event as substations are classified as "essential infrastructure" under Scottish Planning Policy. If the proposed development does not include a substation then it only needs to be protected from the 1:200 year event. Therefore for the EIA the proposed level of the reclaimed land needs to be assessed against either the 1:200 or 1:1000 year coastal flood level depending if a substation is proposed.	Chapter 9: Section 9.5.2.3 Page 9-11
THC	30	It is noted that Coastal Processes are scoped in and this is welcomed by the Council as Coast Protection Authority. As the development entails c. 19 million metric tonnes of water displaced, this is likely to result in coastal squeeze i.e. flooding and/or erosion implications. With climate change impacts and continuing development in the firth, this piecemeal approach to development is a concern for longer term implications.	Chapter 9: Section 9.5.2.3 Page 9-12
THC	31	Some harbour authorities are statutory consultees for planning applications, as a function of owning the seabed, and thus being the adjacent landowner. Where this is not the case, harbour authorities should be alert to developments on shore that could adversely affect the safety of navigation. Where necessary, consideration should be given to requiring the planning applicants to conduct a risk assessment in order to establish that the safety of navigation is not about to be put at risk. Examples of where navigation could be so affected include : · high constructions, which inhibit line of sight of microwave transmissions, or the performance of port radar, or interfere with the line of sight of aids to navigation; · high constructions, which potentially affect wind patterns; and · lighting of a shore development in such a manner that the night vision of mariners is impeded, or that navigation lights, either ashore and onboard vessels are masked, or made less conspicuous.	Chapter 20: Sections 20.4 & 20.5 - Page 20-2 & 20-6
MSS	32	The report states that potential impacts include the creation of sediment plumes and dredging disposal (if required) during the construction phase. If dredging disposal is required coordination with other companies for the disposal at Sutors would be good in order to spread out the disposal in time.	Chapter 21: Section 21.5.1.1 & 21.5.2.1 - Pages 21-7 & 21-9
MSS	33	During the operational phase there is a potential to cause localised changes to currents and sedimentation rates. This will need to be evaluated in more detail but might already be planned as part of the hydrological modelling. The changes to currents will need to be small and localised!	Chapter 9: Section 9.5.2.1 - Page 9-9
MSS	34	MSS would suggest that the developer or their consultants also undertake video/photography transect observations over the development area.	Chapter 15: Section 15.4.3 - Page 15-8

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
MSS	35	We note that a Marine Licence will be sought for this activity and will advise of any marking and lighting requirements in our response to that application. We would anticipate a requirement to relocate the navigation light marking the Southwest corner of the Phase 3 development.	Chapter 20: Sections 20.5.1 Page 20-6
RSPB	36	We are concerned about construction and operational disturbance that this development may cause and changes to the extent and availability of intertidal habitat as a consequence of altered wave, tidal and sediment patterns.	Chapter 11: Section 11.5 - Page 11-32
RSPB	37	This proposal is to the west of the breeding tern colony and to the west of the previous development works which have been undertaken already. We therefore feel that the impact on the breeding tern colony should be minimal, but would insist ES reflects any impact the project may have on the breeding terns and takes into consideration other estuarine birds using the SPA. New works would also give the opportunity to re-think positive measures which could be undertaken to improve the productivity of breeding terns and we would welcome positive suggestions.	Chapter 11: Section: 11.5.1.4 - Page 11-37
SEPA	38	It should be recognised that the overall classification of ecological status under WFD is made up of several different tiers of classification and includes the consideration of chemical, biological and hydromorphological parameters (e.g. structure and integrity of intertidal and subtidal zones), not just water quality. Land claim in coastal areas results in loss of morphological capacity/habitats. Our initial assessment of the proposals is that they are unlikely to result in a deterioration in the hydromorphological status of the Inner Cromarty Firth water body. However it should be recognised that the loss of intertidal/subtidal area will result in the hydromorphological status classification moving towards the High/Good boundary. We would likely object to any development proposal which resulted in the downgrade of the water body from High to Good, and the applicant, planning authority and Marine Scotland should take this into consideration when considering this and future proposals in this area.	Chapter 21: Section 21.5.3 Pages 21-16
SEPA	39	The potential exists for there to be changes to coastal and sediment transport processes in the adjacent water body. The application should assess the significance of such alterations and discuss the implications of these with respect to shoreline and seabed morphology, and wider ecosystem health in line with RBMP objectives.	Chapter 21: Section 21.5.3 Pages 21-16
SEPA	40	If any waste materials are to be used then these should be outlined along with a justification as to why they are suitable for use. Note such proposals could require an exemption from waste management licensing from SEPA.	Chapter 18: Section 18.6 - Page 18-9
SEPA	41	The application should include information on surface water drainage treatment from the area. The system is likely to require a mixture of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) (designed to meet the requirements of The SUDS Manual) with oil interceptors if machinery is to be operating on the quayside and is likely to be similar to that developed for Phase 3. The information provided should include a clear plan, annotated to explain how treatment is being achieved. Industrial sites like this are usually supported by three different levels of SUDS treatment. The proposal will require an authorisation under the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations (CAR) - further information on CAR is	Chapter 21: Section 21.5.2.2 - Page 21-14

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
		available from our website.	
SNH	42	The key natural heritage issues arising from this development are the effects it will have on the designated features of the Cromarty Firth SPA, Ramsar site and SSSI. There will be effects on the Moray Firth SAC (dolphin interest) and the Dornoch and Morrish More SAC (common seal). European Protected Species (cetaceans and otter) will also be affected.	Chapters 12 &13
SNH	43	The effects of the proposal on the Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site will be significant. The proposal involves the 'reclamation' of <i>circa</i> 7ha of the Cromarty Firth. Whilst the reclamation of approximately 2.3ha of the intertidal habitat within the Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site (and SSSI) is no longer proposed, there will still be significant effects. The effects are two-fold: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· possible alterations to areas supporting habitat via changes to hydrogeographical processes;</li> <li>· disturbance and displacement of feeding and possibly roosting birds during the construction and operational phases of the development.</li> </ul>	Chapter 11: Section 11.5 - Page 11-32
SNH	44	Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) counts show that SPA qualifying, and assemblage species occur in the Dalmore Bay count section which is immediately adjacent to the proposed development area. The count section is quite long with an area of salt marsh at the Dalmore (western) end. It is likely that birds are not distributed evenly across the count section and not all the birds recorded in the count section use the area affected by this proposal. WeBS counts are also high tide counts and therefore mostly record roosting birds. There are five roosts within the Dalmore Bay section <sup>1</sup> , of these, one roost is just over 500m from the western edge of Phase 4. This roost could be subjected to visual, noise and light disturbance during construction and Operation.	Chapter 11: Section 11.4.2 - Page 11-9
SNH	45	The habitat in this part of the SPA appears to be comparatively sandy with a large number of stones, this is not the most attractive feeding substrate for most of the species for which the Cromarty Firth has been designated. Low Tide counts undertaken periodically by the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) in the Cromarty Firth show where birds are feeding. The section closest to the Service Base appears to be little used by most species although a low to moderate density of oystercatchers has been recorded there. Low densities of curlew have also been recorded and the area is increasingly being used by redshank, particularly in late summer, when they are disturbed from sites further south. Birds feeding outwith but close to the area to be reclaimed could still be subject to visual and noise disturbance during construction and operation of Phase 4.	Chapter 11: Section 11.4.2 - Page 11-9
SNH	46	Due to possible changes to areas of supporting habitat and the disturbance/displacement of feeding and roosting birds this proposal will have a significant effect on the SPA. To assess whether the proposal will have an adverse impact on the integrity of the site the developer will need to provide a detailed analysis of bird usage in the section of the SPA close to the proposed area.	Chapter 11: Section 11.4.2 - Page 11-9 Appendix J.1

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
SNH	47	Utilise existing baseline information and the new survey work in October to December 2015 to assess the ornithological importance of the intertidal immediately adjacent to the development. This assessment must include all stages of the tidal cycle. Please note, WeBS counts are carried out every year, not just in the years listed in Section 9.3.3. The years listed refer to the low tide WeBS counts.	Chapter 11: Section 11.3.1 - Page 11-2
SNH	48	Identify the age class of the birds present during the surveys. Despite identifying the need for this information it is unclear from the Scoping Report how this information will be used. The Report states that the information will be used to 'provide an insight in to the importance of the area'. We advise that an assessment of the birds' age class will help to provide a more robust analysis of the likely impact on the SPA. In addition to data the applicant gathers as part of their own surveys, the Highland Ringing Group may also have data on the age class which could be used in the analysis.	Chapter 11: Section 11.4.2 - Page 11-9
SNH	49	A marine invertebrate survey. An assessment of the prey base adjacent to the proposal area will help assess the importance of the habitat for SPA birds in comparison to the rest of the Firth. Potential impacts on intertidal flora should also be undertaken as intertidal plants provide an important source of food for certain species (e.g. Zostera sp).	Chapter 11: Section 11.4.2 - Page 11-9 Appendix K.4 Chapter 15
SNH	50	Use of the hydrology modelling to inform the assessment. The information coming from the hydrology modelling should be used to predict the possible changes to the infauna and epi-flora of the intertidal areas of the SPA to estimate changes in the food resources available. It should also be used to assess possible changes to roosting sites. The potential for hydrological changes to change the time period that the intertidal areas are exposed and available for feeding should be assessed. Although the applicant identifies changes in sediment movements as having a potential impact during the operational phase, it is unclear if they have recognised this as an impact during the construction phase. The need for hydrology modelling is consistent with SEPA's response of 11th September 2015 in which they state, 'The potential exists for there to be changes to coastal and sediment transport processes in the adjacent water body. The application should assess the significance of such alterations and discuss the implications of these with respect to shoreline and seabed morphology, and wider ecosystem health in line with RBMP objectives.'	Chapters 9, 11, 15 and 21
SNH	51	Water quality impacts on the interests of the designated site. In Section 14 of the Scoping Report the applicant refers to water quality issues resulting from construction however it is not clear if this includes sediment deposition on the intertidal areas in the SPA.	Chapter 11: Section 11.5.1.4 - Page 11-37 Chapter 9 21
SNH	52	The non-specific statement in Section 9.3.3 that 'A full assessment of impacts on the ornithology in the surrounding area and the wider effects on the designation will be considered as part of the assessment' does not make it clear whether the applicant will be assessing all the issues that might affect the designated sites, especially noise, lighting and the presence of tall structures which could act as perches for predators.	Chapter 11: Sections 11.4.1 & 11.5.1.5 - Pages 11-5 & 11-40

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
SNH	53	The applicant should consider cumulative effects associated with Phase 4, particularly in relation to previous disturbance or habitat loss associated with the earlier phases of work at Invergordon and elsewhere in the Firth.	Chapter 11: Section 11.7 - Page 11-47
SNH	54	In addition to the issues raised above, we advise that the EIA should consider the mitigation that could be deployed to reduce the adverse effects of the proposal. This could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· timing of works to avoid the main non-breeding bird concentrations;</li> <li>· the type of lighting used during both the construction and operational phases;</li> <li>· noise reduction/attenuation measures;</li> <li>· reducing the presence of tall structures closest to the intertidal areas that can be used by predators;</li> <li>· provision of alternative disturbance free roost sites - either during construction or permanently;</li> <li>· consideration of how the proposal may be designed to provide benefit to the common tern interest.</li> </ul>	Chapter 11: Section 11.6 - Page - 11-47 Chapter 6
SNH	55	The effects of the proposal on the bottlenose dolphin interest of the Moray Firth SAC are likely to be significant. Underwater noise arising from piling activities, increased vessel traffic and dredging and disposal operations may all result in disturbance to the dolphins.	Chapter 12: Section 12.5 - Page 12-10
SNH	56	Underwater noise – we are pleased to note that the current proposal will not involve the use of percussive piling and that the new quays will be constructed using only vibro piling. This premise needs to be confirmed within the ES and it will presumably be substantiated by further ground investigations. We are pleased to note that the applicant carried out comprehensive and thorough underwater noise modelling as part of Phase 3 and this showed that noise associated with the previous vibro piling works fell within acceptable limits for the dolphins, with higher noise levels being localised to the working areas. This data will be very helpful for assessing the current proposal. The applicant should provide details about the timing and duration of the piling works envisaged and if necessary what monitoring and mitigation will be deployed. In our view the mitigation carried out as part of the Phase 3 development should inform mitigation for Phase 4. If percussive piling is a possibility then the ES should include assessment of this also and the mitigation measures to be deployed to minimise underwater noise.	Chapters 3, 7 & 9: Sections 3.4.5, 7.5 & 12.5.1.2 - Page 3-3, 7-3 & 12-3
SNH	57	Dredging and disposal - we recommend that the applicant provide details on the dredging and disposal operations including the quantity, duration, timing and seasonality of any works. As far as possible, vessel movements associated with dredging and disposal operations for the construction and operational stages should be quantified and if material is to be disposed of between the Sutors then the ES should stipulate how disturbance or injury to the dolphins will be avoided. We note and welcome that the applicant will adhere to the latest best practice guidance available at the time in relation to the disposal operations at the Sutors.	Chapters 12 & 20 Sections 12.5.1- Page 12-10
SNH	58	The effects of the proposal on the subtidal sandbank interest of the Moray Firth SAC are also significant through smothering of the habitats and species present at the disposal site. The applicant should provide information on the volume and type of material to be disposed of at the Sutors.	Chapter 18: Section 18.4.1.2 - Page 18-6

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
SNH	59	Significant numbers of common seals occur in the Cromarty Firth, particularly at haul outs near Foulis. This is less than 50km from the Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC and common seals are a qualifying interest of that site. There is therefore connectivity between that SAC and the common seals that occur in the Cromarty Firth. This proposal has the potential to disturb common seals during the construction and operational phases as a result of ship movements, lighting and terrestrial and underwater noise. The ES should consider the impact of the proposal on the common seals that use the haul out site near Foulis, the potential implications of this for the Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC and how any impacts can be mitigated.	Chapter 12: Section 12.5 - Page 12-10
SNH	60	The activities described for bottlenose dolphins above may also have the potential to disturb other cetaceans, most notably harbour porpoise. Any mitigation measures aimed at safeguarding the dolphins will also benefit harbour porpoise, however the habits of these species varies. The ES should therefore assess the potential impact of the proposal on both bottlenose dolphins and harbour porpoise. An EPS licence may be required from Marine Scotland for disturbance to cetaceans.	Chapter 12: Section 12.5 - Page 12-10
SNH	61	Otters use the site, particularly along the foreshore and the existing rock armouring installed as part of the Phase 3 development. The ES should complement existing data on otters gathered by the applicant through the provision of an up to date otter survey and mitigation plan. This should include an area 250m beyond the development footprint. An EPS licence may be required from us depending on the outcome of any survey.	Chapter 13: Section 13.4- Page 13-2
TS	62	With regard to the potential environmental impacts of the development on receptors adjacent to the trunk road network, there are a number of issues which should be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of the development. The ES should provide information with regard to the construction stage including the preferred route options for the movement of any heavy loads, an estimate of vehicle trip generation from the site and an indication of distribution / assignment of these trips.	Transport Assessment Chapter 19: Section 19.5.1 Page 19-11
TS	63	We would generally advise that the assessment of environment effects of road traffic should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance set out within the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) publication "Guidelines on the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (Guidance Note 1)", 1993. The IEMA guidelines generally advise that further assessment should be undertaken on: · "Highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of HGV's will increase by more than 30%); and · Any specifically sensitive areas where the traffic flows have increased by 10% or more."	Transport Assessment Chapter 19: Section 19.5.1 Page 19-11
TS	64	Potential trunk road related environmental impacts such as driver delay, severance, pedestrian amenity, safety etc should be considered and assessed where appropriate (i.e. Where IEMA thresholds for further assessment are exceeded). In the case of the ES the methods adopted to assess the likely traffic and transportation impacts on traffics flows and transportation infrastructure should comprise: · Determination of the baseline traffic and transportation conditions, and the sensitivity of the site and existence of any receptors likely to be affected in proximity of the trunk road network;	Transport Assessment Chapter 19: Section 19.5.1 Page 19-11

Consultee	No.	Point for consideration within ES	ES Section/Page
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Review of the development proposals to determine the predicted construction and operational requirements; and</li> <li>· Assessment of the significance of predicted impacts from these transport requirements taking into account impact magnitude (before and after mitigation) and baseline environmental sensitivity.</li> </ul>	
TS	65	Impacts to sensitive receptors associated with noise and vibration arising from the proposed development during the construction and operational phases should be considered, and we note that an assessment of construction noise will be carried out in line with BS 5228-1:2009 and appropriate mitigation measures will be identified. This approach is acceptable.	Chapter 6
UK Chamber of Shipping/British Shipping	66	The chamber would expect to find reference to the safeguarding of navigational safety within the report, specifically within Section 13 Traffic and Transport, when examining the potential impacts of the construction phase. Despite this, no comment is made to ensure safe maritime navigation nearby the site during the construction phase for vessels using the port or transiting the area. The chamber would hope that sufficient aids to navigation by way or buoyage and lights are installed so that there is no issue for navigational safety in or around the area and that harbour users are made suitably aware and would appreciate confirmation that such measures to such effect are taken.	Chapter 20: Section 20.5 - Page 20-6
THC	67	Welcome that the present footprint draws back from the shoreline reducing the likely impact on framed views towards Little Wyvis in the Ben Wyvis SLA from Invergordon High Street. Protection of this aligned view should remain a design objective.	Chapter 16: Section 16.5 - Page 16-21
THC	68	No objection to the viewpoints selected to illustrate effects from Cruise Ship and General Laydown, but an additional location at approximately NH707671 on the High Street should be included, as per previous comments to the PoCF.	Chapter 16: Section 16.3.3 - Page 16-4