Introductory Chapters

Appendix 3A: ELC Scoping Opinion

Inch Cape Onshore Transmission Works: EIA Scoping Opinion 2017

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 – Scoping Opinion under Regulation 14

Planning Service

Development: Communities

East Lothian Council

John Muir House

Haddington

East Lothian

EH41 3HA

5 September 2017

Acronyms, Abbreviations and defined terms	
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIA Regulations	Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)(Scotland) 2017
ELC	East Lothian Council
ER	Environment Report
ES	Environment Statement
ICOL	Inch Cape Offshore Limited
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
OnTW	Onshore Transmission Works
pLDP	Proposed East Lothian Local Development Plan 2016
S36 consent	Consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989
SNH	Scottish Natural Heritage
SEPA	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
SPA	Special Protection Area, part of the Natura 2000 series
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest

1. Introduction

1.1 Inch Cape Offshore Limited (ICOL) propose to construct a windfarm off the Angus coast, with connection to the national grid at Cockenzie, in East Lothian. They have previously applied for and received consent for both the offshore and onshore works, this proposal being a revision of the onshore works. ICOL intend to apply to East Lothian Council for the onshore element of these works, and to Scottish Ministers for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 (Section 36 consent) and a Marine Licence for the offshore and intertidal works.

1.2 ICOL intends to apply to East Lothian Council for Planning Permission in Principle under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) for a substation, electricity cables and associated infrastructure (the Onshore Transmission works (OnTW)). The application site will be located on the partially restored former Cockenzie Power Station, to the east of Preston Links. The site extends to an area of approximately 12 hectares however, it is expected that the land take for the substation will be around 3.5 hectare. The existing Cockenzie substation, which forms the Inch Cape grid connection point, is located to the south of the proposed application site on the south side of the B1348.

1.3 ICOL made its Scoping Request to East Lothian Council on 13 July 2017. ICOL state in their Scoping Request that Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be undertaken for the Onshore Transmission Works (OnTW) under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 ('the EIA Regulations'), and accordingly the Scoping Request has been made under Regulation 17 of those regulations. This Scoping Opinion is therefore given under the terms of those regulations only. By agreement, the date for issue of the Scoping Opinion is 5 September 2017.

1.4 ICOL requested a Scoping Opinion from Scottish Ministers on 28 April 2017 under The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000 (as amended) and The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (as amended) for Scotland for the Offshore Works to be consented by Scottish Ministers. Prior to the issue of their Scoping Opinion (issued 28 July 2017) both sets of regulations changed, being replaced by The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 and the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. The Scoping Opinion for the offshore works was therefore issued based on the transitional provisions of the said Regulations. The Scoping Opinion Request and the Scoping Opinion for the offshore element of the project is available on Marine Scotland's

website: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Licensing/marine/scoping/ICOLRevised-2017 . ICOL state in their Scoping Report (paragraph 17) that it is their intention to construct either the original offshore windfarm and offshore transmission works, or the revised scheme subject of the Scoping Opinion requested 28 April 2017, but not both.

1.5 The EIA Regulations require that the planning authority consult the 'consultation bodies' before issuing a Scoping Opinion. These are: any adjoining planning authority, where the development is likely to affect land in their area (Fife Council, City of Edinburgh Council and Marine Scotland were consulted); Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH); Scottish Water (SW); Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA); and Historic Environment Scotland. The Health and Safety Executive was also consulted. Marine Scotland were consulted as a public body considered likely to have an interest in the proposed development by reason of that bodies specific environmental responsibilities or local or regional competencies in additional to being a neighbouring authority. No other public body was considered likely to have such an interest and accordingly no other public body was consulted. Internally, consultation was also carried out with relevant departments within East Lothian Council. Consultation responses have been appended to the Scoping Opinion in A. These responses, in addition to commenting on information to be included in the Environment Report, may also contain advice for the applicant on their views on the acceptability of the scheme, compliance with other regimes or other matters, and it is therefore recommended that they are read along with the body of the Scoping Opinion.

1.6 This is the Scoping Opinion adopted by East Lothian Council as to the scope and information to be provided in support of a proposed application for OnTW as described in the Scoping Request made by ICOL to ELC on 13 July 2017. The EIA regulations do not provide for a fixed period of time during which the Scoping Opinion remains valid. If there is a material change in circumstances prior to decision on the related application, information not mentioned in the Scoping Opinion may require to be included. The issuing of this Scoping Opinion also does not prevent the planning authority from requesting further information at a later stage as set out in Regulation 26.17 (11) of the EIA Regulations.

1.7 No indication of the likely success of an application for planning permission for the proposed development is implied in the expression of this opinion.

2. General Environment Statement (ES) Issues

Onshore/offshore ES

2.1 The Inchcape project will broadly comprise two parts. These are the main offshore works to be consented by Scottish Ministers, and the associated/ancillary onshore works to be consented by ELC. The EU Interpretation line on associated works (2011) (Interpretation line suggested by the Commission as regards the application of Directive 85/337/EEC to associated/ancillary works) states "If it appears that the associated works are inextricably linked to the main works, their approval and initiation should be considered as an initiation of the project. Thus, where the main project requires an EIA, the approval and/or physical execution of the associated works could only start once the EIA for the whole project (main and associated) was carried out." It is the Council's view that the onshore and offshore works are an integral part of the main project, which consists of the offshore Inch Cape Wind Farm and the onshore transmission works. Their approval should therefore only be considered once the EIA for the whole project is carried out.

2.2 In 2014, Scottish Ministers granted Section 36 consent and a Marine Licence for the construction of an offshore windfarm at Inchcape, and associated Offshore Transmission Works. An Environmental Statement was submitted along with the applications for the offshore works which was accepted by Scottish Ministers in determining the applications. The RSPB are taking forward legal proceedings challenging the consent for the offshore works, which are currently ongoing. ICOL also previously applied to East Lothian Council for Onshore Transmission works, the substation being located just to the south of the former Cockenzie Power Station Coal Store roughly a kilometre south of the location now proposed, and which received consent in September 2014 (subject to a suspensive condition). This application was accompanied also by an Environmental Statement. At the time of consent for the original OnTW the Environmental Statement (ES) for the offshore works was complete and publicly available, with a reference being made within the ES for the OnTW to the offshore ES. ELC considered this to satisfy the requirement in the Directive and the EIA Regulations at the time that the Environmental Statement should include a description of the whole project and various environmental effects listed.

2.3 The development proposed to be applied for and which is the subject of the Scoping Request is for the OnTW only. ICOL proposes to submit a separate Environment Report in support of the offshore works, and a Scoping Opinion for a revised scheme has been issued by Scottish Ministers in relation to this on 28 July 2017. However, if the consent for the original works is

found to be valid, ICOL may construct this as the offshore element of the project rather than the revised scheme. A brief description of the offshore works is given in section 1.3.2 paragraph 10 and Figure 1.2. The EIA for that scheme is referred to in Section 1.3 paragraph 12, with reference to the Scoping Report for this part of the scheme at paragraph 18.

2.4 ICOL proposes in the Scoping Report (section 1.3.2 paragraph 9) to cover the offshore works through consideration of cumulative impacts between the onshore and offshore works. This is not considered an acceptable approach. The Environmental Report should include assessment of the project as a whole. This includes the offshore works covered by separate consents. The ES must consist of a "single and accessible compilation" (Scottish Government Circular 2017/1 paragraph 76). Information on and assessment of the offshore works should therefore be included.

2.5 East Lothian Council has previously accepted that provided the Environmental Report (Statement as it was then known) for the offshore works is up to date and publicly available, and there is a reference to this information within the onshore Environment Report this would be acceptable. The whole project would have been assessed and information could be easily accessed by the public, and therefore a decision could be taken on the onshore works. The information which requires to be provided with regard to the Offshore Works for the revised scheme has been set out in the Scoping Opinion produced by Scottish Ministers. The information required for the original scheme has already been provided through the ES for this part of the scheme, though it may require to be updated if there has been a material change in circumstances. If a revised scheme is taken forward, a description of this scheme and its significant environmental impacts should be available, and a clear link made to this information within the ER for the onshore works. Assessment could be done by use of the 'Rochdale envelope', assessment of the worst case impact scenario if the precise details of the scheme are not known at this stage. It is likely that much of the assessment work carried out for the ES of the original offshore works would be relevant for the revised scheme.

Reference to Previous EIA

2.6 It is noted that the EIA Report for the revised OnTW will be a standalone document which may reproduce relevant information contained within the previous ES for the previously proposed OnTW. It is agreed that the baseline data and technical studies undertaken for the previous ES are likely to remain broadly relevant, though may require supplementing or updating as noted below.

Embedded Mitigation

2.7 The approach set out in the Scoping Report to embedded mitigation is broadly accepted. However, where further studies are to be done (such as coastal regime studies) if these show significant effects, this will require to be reported as additional information to the ER. This also applies where mitigation measures that are not known now are proposed will themselves have significant effects.

Defining Magnitude and Sensitivity

2.8 Table 4.2 in Section 4.4.3 sets out how a combination of magnitude of effect and sensitivity of receptor will be described, ranging from Negligible/Minor to Major. Paragraph 71 of this section notes that unless otherwise stated, effects that are considered Moderate/Major or Major (depending on the interaction between sensitivity of the receptor and impact) will be considered significant. A 'Moderate' impact is defined in Table 4.1 as a "partial loss or alteration to one or more of the key elements/features or the baseline conditions". This could cover loss or alteration which affect the integrity of a key element or feature, as well as those which do not, with both being described as Moderate Impact.

2.9 There is some potential for effects which are described as 'Moderate' in Table 4.2 to be significant. A Low magnitude effect on a highly sensitive receptor could have this impact as any shift away from baseline could (potentially) have a significant effect on such a receptor. The inclusion of impacts which affect the integrity of a key feature as 'Moderate Impact', if impacting on a Moderately sensitive receptor could also be significant. The total loss (High impact) of a Low sensitivity receptor might also in some circumstances be considered significant. Impacts that are described as 'Moderate' on this table should therefore be considered as 'potentially significant' and a further justification provided as to whether they are or are not.

Qualifications

2.4 The developer must ensure that the ER is prepared by competent experts. The ER should be accompanied by a statement outlining the relevant qualifications and experience of those involved in preparing the study.

2.5 The assessment should be focussed on the **significant** impacts of the proposal on the environment. Less attention should be paid to impacts which are not significant, and where the impact is of little or no significance a short paragraph outlining a particular aspect to show

it that possible relevance has been considered will be sufficient. To encourage focus on significant impacts of the proposal the developer is encouraged to submit separately any information they wish to include in support of the planning application but which is not required for the purposes of the ER.

Administrative issues

2.6 Developers should be aware that on receipt of a planning application, the Council will require to make the ER available for public viewing and also to place it on its website. The ER should therefore be submitted in a suitable electronic format, preferably as a pdf, as well as in hard copy. If the ER is less than 10MB it should be submitted as one document. If not, it would be helpful if it is split into parts of less than 10MB each, with the parts clearly labelled so it is obvious what each contains. If the ER contains any confidential information, such as the location of breeding sites of rare birds, this should be submitted as a separate document and clearly marked as confidential. The Council must comply with data protection legislation, and therefore no personal information that the Council is unable to publish should be included in the ES.

2.7 In any related application for planning consent, the developer should clearly state whether any part of the ES (such as the mitigation, construction methods, &c) forms part of the application for consent.

2.8 For the hard copy, diagrams and photographic material should be reproduced at the appropriate size. It would be appreciated however if any large sections of text are presented on portrait A4 sheets. Paragraphs should be numbered.

2.9 The Non-Technical Summary should summarise information contained within the ES. If the information on the offshore part of the project is not included within the ER for the OnTW the Non-Technical Summary should provide a clear indication of where this information can be found.

2.10 Scottish Government Planning Circular 1/2017[1] notes that the Non-Technical summary is particularly important for ensuring the public can comment fully on the ER. It should set out the main findings of the EIA report in accessible, plain English. It should be noted that the average reading age in Scotland is 11 years[2]; as this is an average many people will be below

[1] Available at http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0051/00518122.pdf
[2] Scottish Health Council, see http://www.scottishhealthcouncil.org/patient__public_participation/participation_toolkit/written_information.aspx#.WZ7rxmeWyLg

this level. This proposal is located close to some of the most deprived areas of East Lothian, including areas within the most deprived 20% of areas of Scotland according to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation[3]; low reading age is linked to social deprivation. It is therefore particularly important that care is taken over language used in the Non-Technical summary.

3. Description of the development

3.1. The EIA regulations require a description of the development comprising information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development. The description should include any demolition works required, as well as land use requirements in the construction and operational phases. The main characteristics of the operation phase of the development should be set out, including likely maintenance activity, landscaping and lighting. An estimate of residues and emission should be included. This should include noise and vibration, any emissions to air, light, heat, pollutants, electro-magnetic field emissions, including construction, operational, and as far as possible decommissioning phases.

3.2. This description should include information on the offshore element, either within the ER for the onshore works or by reference to a publicly available ES/ER for the offshore works. It is acceptable for the description to use the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach of using the 'worst case' parameters of the proposal. If the description is done by reference to existing material in an ES/ER for the offshore element, it should make clear where any part of that description has been superseded. If a material change to the description is made later outwith the description or parameters of any 'Rochdale Envelope' a further EIA process will be required.

3.3. If there are other changes required as a consequence of or to enable the development, a description of these should also be included, including any grid strengthening beyond that applied for in this proposal.

3.4. All maps should be based on the Ordnance Surey 1:10,000 scale or greater base mapping to provide an adequate scale with which to assess the information.

3.5. The expected lifetime of the development should be included, along with a Decommissioning Statement. Proposals to discard materials that are likely to be classed as waste would be unacceptable under current waste management licensing and under waste management licensing at time of decommissioning if a similar regulatory framework exists at that time. Further guidance on this may be found in the document Is it waste - Understanding the

[3] Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, see mapping at http://simd.scot/2016/

definition of waste. The layout and the general principles for decommissioning must demonstrate waste minimisation and compliance with the above waste regulatory position

3.6. SEPA require the following information to be included:

a) Map showing assessment of all engineering works within and near the water environment including buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications.

b) Map showing assessment of all impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers.

c) Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures

d) Map of proposed waste water drainage layout.

e) Map of proposed surface water drainage layout.

3.7. Scottish Water require the following information to be included: all Scottish Water assets potentially affected by the development should be identified, with particular attention being given to access roads and pipe crossings.

4. Reasonable Alternatives

4.1. The EIA regulations require a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, relevant to the proposed project, and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of environmental effects. The alternatives should cover any alternatives to the project as a whole, for example any other locations within the UK or elsewhere that were considered.

4.2. The alternatives should also include any alternative locations considered for the OnTW alone, considering both any alternative locations for connection to the grid, and alternative locations using the grid connection proposed. This should include a comparison of the environmental effects.

5. Baseline

5.1. The EIA regulations require a description of the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment (the baseline scenario) and an outline of its likely evolution without the project, as far as is reasonably foreseeable using relevant available information and scientific knowledge. This is likely to be most usefully included alongside the factors which are likely to be significantly affected by the development. The Scoping Report states (Section 4.3, paragraph 63) that due to the industrial/brownfield nature of the site, it is not proposed to forecast natural changes to the environment without the development.

5.2. The EIA regulations do not give exemption from this requirement for industrial sites. The evolution of the site without the development is part of the baseline: an idea of what would

have happened without the proposal is necessary to fully consider the significance of impacts of the development. It is appreciated that this exercise cannot deal in certainties and an amount of speculation will be involved.

6. Significant effects on the environment

6.1. The EIA regulations require that a description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development, including, in particular, population, biodiversity, land, soil (including erosion, compaction, sealing), water, air, climate (including greenhouse gas emissions, impacts relevant to adaptation), material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological aspects, and landscape.

6.2. The ER should include a description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from:

- the construction and existence of the development including decommissioning
- the use of natural resources in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity, considering as far as possible the sustainable availability of these resources
- the emission of pollutants, noise, vibration, light, heat and radiation, the creation of nuisances, and the disposal and recovery of waste
- risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment for example due to accidents or disasters
- cumulative effects with other existing or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the use of natural resources
- the impact of the project on climate (for example the nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change
- the technologies and substances used

6.3. The description of the likely significant effects should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, transboundary, short-term, medium-term and long term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the development. The description should take into account the environmental protection objectives established at European Union or Member State level which are relevant to the project, in particular those relevant to protection of Natura 2000 sites.

6.4. The particular aspects of the environment where it is considered there is the potential for a significant effect are set out below. The following table shows issues that are scoped in and

out as relevant to the onshore part of the works. The table generally follows the Tables set out at the end of most chapters in the Scoping Report but is grouped into EIA topics. Some additional specific matters not included in the Scoping Report tables have been included. Socio-economic effects (Chapter 12) are included under 'population and human health' as are EMF effects (Chapter 14) and Noise and vibration (Chapter 10). There are linkages between topics for example dust, considered under air quality, is linked to health.

TABLE 1: Scoping Issues

EIA issue	Scoped in?	Reason?
Population and human health (see Air Quality for Dust impacts)		
Construction Noise	Yes	Construction noise may be audible at a number of receptors
Construction Traffic	Yes	Potential increase in traffic on local roads due to additional vehicles during construction
Construction vibration	Yes	Certain construction activities may result in vibration impacts
Operational sound and cumulative noise	Yes	Operational sound (including penalties) and operational traffic, including the effect of cumulative noise
Operational vibration	No	Significant vibration is related to construction rather than operation.
Onshore Substation: impacts of construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning – expenditure, employment and economic activity, land use, public access and recreation and tourism	Yes	Impacts on expenditure, employment and economic activity including from impacts on tourism Impacts on public access and recreation including on Core Paths, rights of way, National cycle routes and informal recreational use of the Green Hills area.
Landfall and Onshore export cable: impacts of construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning – expenditure, employment and economic activity, land use, public access and recreation and tourism	Yes	Impacts on expenditure, employment and economic activity including from impacts on tourism should be considered. Impacts on public access and recreation including on Core Paths, rights of way, National cycle routes and informal recreational use of the Green Hills area. It is not clear what impact the landfall and export cable in operation (other than their contribution to allowing export of the electricity from the project as a whole) would have given that they are underground and the operational phase could be scoped out unless extensive disruption from maintenance is envisaged.
Landfall and Onshore export cable corridor: impacts of construction, operation, and	Yes	It is agreed that given the cable will be underground operational effects on access and recreation can be scoped

maintenance and decommissioning – tourism and recreation		out provided there is no 'exclusion zone' required and normal use can continue above the route as envisaged. Construction and decommissioning could potentially have effects on recreation and access and although temporary and these should be briefly considered. Other than this it is agreed that this can be Scoped out.
Impact due to proximity to a major hazard site or major accident hazard pipeline, or any other consideration falling within the remit of the HSE	No	Consultation with HSE does not raise any such issue.
Biodiversity		
Permanent Habitat Loss	No	The impact of this is not expected to be significant. The biodiversity value of the habitat of the site is low. The evolution of the site without the proposal is likely a Cockenzie Power Station decommissioning and restoration plan. It is unlikely to develop as a coastal habitat.
Temporary Habitat Disturbance	Yes	Construction of the revised OnTW is anticipated to involve disturbance to intertidal habitats. There could be impacts in a wider area than the site itself.
Disturbance of wildlife	Yes	Construction is anticipated to pose a disturbance risk to some species of the Firth of Forth SPA/Ramsar/SSSI. There is also the potential for disturbance of marine mammals. There is the potential for disturbance of otters along the foreshore including barriers to movement.
Killing or injury of locally occurring wildlife	No	There is limited potential for sensitive wildlife species to occur. Protected species are unlikely to occur here, other than otters which can be covered in Disturbance of Wildlife above. It is unlikely that they will actually be there and even if they are the area will be used only for passing through.
Pollution of habitats	Yes	Construction of the Revised OnTW is anticipated to pose a risk of pollution to terrestrial and coastal habitats.
Cumulative permanent habitat loss	No	This site is unlikely to provide valuable habitat.
Cumulative Temporary Habitat Disturbance	Yes	Construction is anticipated to involve disturbance to intertidal habitats.
Cumulative disturbance of wildlife	Yes	There anticipated to be disturbance of species associated with the Firth of Forth SPA/Ramsar/SSSI, and this is likely to accumulate with other sources of disturbance.

		There are also potential effects on marine mammals and otters.
Cumulative Killing and/or injury of locally occurring wildlife	No	As 'Killing and/or injury of locally occurring wildlife' above.
Cumulative pollution of habitats	Yes	Construction is anticipated to pose a potential risk of pollution to terrestrial and coastal habitats.
Impacts and cumulative impacts on Natura Sites	Yes	For avoidance of doubt, impacts on Natura 2000 sites including Firth of Forth, Outer Firth of Forth and St Andrews Bay complex should be included.
Land and soil (including erosion, compaction, sealing), Water (Geology and hydrogeology section of the Scoping Report)		
Flooding of the works or revised application site during construction (fluvial, wave, tidal)(construction, decommissioning and operation)	Yes	Location close to the coast means that wave and tidal flood risk should be assessed in detail. Risk from Fluvial, surface and ground water should also be included. There is potentially a culvert running through the site which could increase risk.
Surface erosion due to wind or water (construction, decommissioning and operation)	No	Risk is low without mitigation, and standard good practice on construction sites (embedded mitigation) can be expected to be applied and should mitigate this risk.
Construction de-stabilising sea wall	Yes	SEPA requests flood defences should be investigated.
Disturbance of subsurface; made ground (infilled colliery waste) possible demolition rubble/historic foundations left following demolition of power station (construction and decommissioning)	Yes	Potential for effects to site staff, public, subsurface infrastructure, surface waters (Firth of Forth) and groundwater.
Residual contamination from power station (leaks and spills of hydrocarbons)(construction and decommissioning)	Yes	In advance of review of PPC Permit Surrender documentation it is not possible to assess potential effects.
Destabilisation of coal mine workings and release of gases from coal mine	Yes	Part of the site is in a Coal Authority Referral Area and part is covered by their Standing Advice. A Coal Mining Risk Assessment will therefore be required.

workings (construction, operation and decommissioning)		
Effects of dredging or other works in inter-tidal zone on possibly contaminated sediments (construction and decommissioning)	Yes	Means of construction in the inter-tidal zone are not yet defined.
Impact on subsurface infrastructure and off site areas from offsite contamination (operation)	Yes	Impact on subsurface infrastructure from aggressive ground conditions.
Impact on off-site areas and infrastructure from historical contamination (operation)	Yes	In advance of review of PPC Permit Surrender documentation it is not possible to assess potential effects.
Pollution of private water supplies (operation)	Maybe	The 2014 scoping did not identify any private water supplies and ELC Environmental Health and Protection have made no comment on this matter. If there are no such supplies (which can be confirmed with ELC Environmental Health and Protection) there is no need to report on this in the ES.
Cumulative: concurrent groundwater impacts with an adjacent operational substation – pollution of private water supplies	Maybe	Consent for the Combined Cycle Gas Power Station on the adjacent site has expired. If the PPC permit is surrendered and there is no Scoping Request or application on the adjacent site prior to application this can be scoped out.
Cumulative: concurrent groundwater impacts with an adjacent operational substation – impact from historical contamination	Maybe	Consent for the Combined Cycle Gas Power Station on the adjacent site has expired. If the PPC permit is surrendered and there is no Scoping Request or application on the adjacent site prior to application this can be scoped out.
Disposal of waste from welfare facilities (construction)	Yes	The ER should set out how sewage waste from welfare facilities will be disposed of.
Flooding of property off-site as a consequence of development	Yes	SEPA requires Flood Risk Assessment, which includes assessment of flood risk elsewhere.
Air		
Dis-amenity effects resulting from deposited Fugitive Dust from construction and decommissioning, and cumulative impacts of the same	Yes	Different receptors within 200m therefore assessment required as per IAQM guidance.

Health effects due to release of suspended particulate matter from construction and decommissioning activities and vehicular movements, and cumulative impacts of the same	Yes	Different receptors within 200m therefore assessment required as per IAQM guidance.
Health effects due to release of combustion pollutants from construction and decommissioning activities and vehicular movements, and cumulative impacts of the same	Yes	Different receptors within 200m therefore assessment required as per IAQM guidance.
Dis-amenity or health effects resulting from deposited fugitive dust, combustion or other airborne pollutants from operational activities, and cumulative impacts of the same	No	No sources of emission identified during operational phase
Climate (including greenhouse gas emissions, impacts relevant to adaptation),		
Flooding is relevant to adaption but is considered in 'Land &c above'.		
Material Assets		
Impacts on Scottish Water assets	Yes	There are Scottish Water assets on and near the site which could be effected. Potential impacts are direct impacts and impact from vibration and tree root growth.
Risk from accidental damage to Scottish Water assets	Maybe	The potential consequences of accidental damage to Scottish Water assets should be considered, and included if this is considered significant.
Roads; impact of construction traffic on severance, driver delay, pedestrian delay, pedestrian amenity, accidents and safety and hazardous loads	Yes	The traffic generated by the construction of the works is exptect to be at a level that warrants assessment to determine residual significant effects.
Impact of construction traffic on severance, driver delay, pedestrian delay, pedestrian amenity, accidents and safety and hazardous loads – cumulatively with	Yes	The cumulative traffic generated by the construction of the revised OnTW and Blindwells development is expected to be at a level that warrants assessment. There may be other developments which should be considered including housing development at Longniddry South.

Blindwells and other housing development in East Lothian		
Impact of abnormal indivisible loads	Yes	The movement of abnormal indivisible loads will not in themselves result in any significant environmental effects but an assessment of the ability to travel along the road network will be undertaken.
Impact of operational and maintenance traffic	No	Very low and infrequent traffic flows generated during this phase would not result in significant effects
Impact of decommissioning traffic including cumulative impact	Yes	Decommissioning is likely to be a long time into the future, and its impacts are therefore necessarily speculative. The baseline at that time could be more sensitive and the future cumulative position uncertain. Assessment possible now is therefore limited, however it should be recognised that decommissioning traffic could potentially have a significant impact, broadly similar to or less than that of construction. Approval of a final decommissioning plan is likely to be subject to condition, Further Environmental Information may be more appropriately required at that time.
Cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological aspects,		
Direct Impacts	No	The brownfield nature of the site means in situ archaeological and cultural heritage assets are not likely to be present.
Setting effects	Yes	The ZTV submitted with the Scoping Report shows considerable visibility which has the potential to affect the setting of cultural heritage receptors.
Setting effects, cumulative	Yes	The ZTV submitted with the Scoping Report shows considerable visibility which has the potential to affect the setting of cultural heritage receptors. There is the potential for cumulative impact on any sensitive receptors with other consented development in the area.
Landscape		
Impacts on local visual amenity and landscape including the coast and nearby recreational areas	Yes	There are likely to be a considerable change to baseline conditions which could affect many people in their homes
Landscape and visual impact on residents	Yes	The site is close to both Cockenzie/Port Seton and Prestonpans and likely to be highly visible to residents going about their daily business or from homes.
Impacts on local landscape designations	Yes	There are locally designated landscapes which could be impacted by the proposal.
Landscape and Visual Impact on people engaged in outdoor recreation	Yes	The experience of using John Muir Way, Core Paths and Rights of way as well as the open space known as the Green Hills could be affected.