

## CONSULTATION RESPONSES

## CONSULTEE

## Comhairle Engineering (Roads)

Date of Response – 20 September 2024

Measures to be taken to prevent surface water flowing on to the main road from the ATV track. This water should be led into a suitable watercourse.

The first 3m of the track should be surfaced with bitmac.

## CONSULTEE

## SEPA

Date of response – 28 August 2024

Thank you for the above consultation. Based on the information provided, it appears that this application falls below the thresholds for which SEPA provides site specific advice. Please refer to our consultation framework and standing advice, which is available on our website.

In addition, the planning authority can initially use the NatureScot Carbon and Peatland 2016 map (available from [Scotland's Soils - soil maps \(environment.gov.scot\)](https://www.environment.gov.scot/scotland-soils-soil-maps) - considering classes 1,2, 3 and 5 as peat and carbon rich soils), followed by local knowledge and any other information they see fit (such as photographs) to determine whether the development site is on peat or other carbon rich soils.

The planning authority should be satisfied that the submitted information (peat depth survey, site plans and photographs) demonstrates that avoidance and minimisation of peat and carbon rich soils is in line with the mitigation hierarchy as outlined in Policy 5 of NPF4. This may include a description of the measures taken to avoid, and then minimise peat disturbance, such as avoiding near-natural habitat, avoiding the deepest areas of peat, making the footprint of disturbance as small as possible, and including floating tracks.

The use of excavated peat should tie into the surrounding ground levels but not smother existing vegetation. Turves should be placed vegetation side up and tie into the vegetation layer. Where vegetation coverage is sparse, reseeding with peatland species such as cotton grass or wavy hair grass may be required. Spreading and smoothing excavated peat on the ground as would traditionally be done with other soil types is not appropriate. [The Peatland ACTION – Technical Compendium](#) provides more detailed advice on peatland restoration techniques and [Developing with Nature guidance](#) | [NatureScot](#) provides further advice on the types of measures that can be taken to improve biodiversity, in line with Policy 3 of NPF4.

I trust these comments are of assistance - please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

## CONSULTEE

## Comhairle Archaeology

Date of response – 19 July 2024

Please be advised that the Archaeology Service has reviewed the accompanying desk-based report (AOC – 70825-6) and is content with its recommendations. No additional archaeological mitigation is required.

## CONSULTEE

## Scottish Water

Date of response – 15 August 2024

Thank you for your consultation request. Scottish Water have no comment on this application.

## CONSULTEE

## NatureScot

Date of response – 27 August 2024

Thank you for seeking the views of NatureScot in respect of the above development proposal.

## South Lewis, Harris &amp; North Uist NSA

The proposal is located within the South Lewis, Harris and North Uist National Scenic Area (NSA). Having undertaken a site visit, we note that the proposed development is in proximity to existing development and

infrastructure, that there will be only limited visibility of the new track from certain directions, and that the proposal is in keeping with its context and the existing pattern of development and features within the landscape. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on the landscape character and special qualities of the National Scenic Area (NSA).

Attention should be paid to the specific design of the track itself and especially in respect of dealing with the placement of any excavated material to minimise any visual impacts and mitigate any effects on the visual amenity of sensitive local receptors within the NSA from the management of soils. Our website has guidelines on [good practice track construction](#) as well as our guidance [Constructed Tracks in the Scottish Uplands](#).

### **Protected Species**

We do not have any specific local knowledge or concerns in respect of protected species in this location. As such, we do not intend to provide tailored advice on protected species which may be affected by this proposal. Impacts on protected species should be addressed by reference to the relevant standing advice available at [Planning and development: protected animals](#). You should consider the need for species licences as part of any development and contact [licensing@nature.scot](mailto:licensing@nature.scot) regarding any licence application.

To avoid any potential impact on watercourses and the species they may support, we recommend that best practice is followed in respect of the design of track drainage and the implementation of pollution prevention and mitigation measures during construction, especially in respect of siltation. Further guidance can be found in our guidance [Constructed Tracks in the Scottish Uplands](#) linked above.

### **CONSULTEE**

#### **SSEN**

**Date of response – 19 March 2025**

As discussed please see attached which I had been in discussion with Calmax regards the pole at the end of the “S Bends”-

If the access is per the attached then SSEN would register no objections but would note that prior to works commencing the applicant will need to arrange an on-site meeting to confirm the required safety precautions when working in proximity to the 11,000V overhead line and that works will need to comply with HSE guidance note GS6.

Should it be as per your earlier email drawing reference planning B. SSEN would register an objection around the placement of the access in such close proximity to the pole as there may a risk of undermining the pole foundations when forming the access and the associated drainage ditch in such close to proximity to the existing infrastructure. We could potentially be losing 500mm of ground cover at the area around the base of the pole.

### **CONSULTEE**

#### **Crofting Commission**

No response received.