

MachairWind Offshore Windfarm

Appendix 15 Design Strategy



This page is intentionally blank



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	7
2	NatureScot Collaborative Working.....	8
2.1	Background	8
2.2	Terms of Reference.....	8
2.3	Collaborative Workshops	8
3	Objectives of the Design Process	10
3.1	Landscape and Visual Design Objectives.....	10
4	Securing Design Within The Section 36 Consent.....	12
4.1	Design Development.....	12
4.2	Summary	14

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Design objectives	10
-----------------------------------	----

List of Figures

Figure 1 Evolution of the WDA	13
-------------------------------------	----

List of Annexes

- Annex A Terms of Reference for Collaborative Working with NatureScot;
- Annex B Collaborative Working Minutes: Workshop 1 Project Requirements & Design Evolution;
- Annex C Collaborative Working Minutes: Workshop 2 Draft Design Objectives; and
- Annex D Collaborative Working Minutes: Workshop 3 Pre-submission Collaboration.



Glossary of Acronyms

Term	Definition
DSL P	Design Specification and Layout Plan
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIAR	Environmental Impact Assessment Report
ETG	Expert Topic Group
GW	Gigawatts
NSA	National Scenic Areas
RWCS	Realistic worst-case scenarios
SLQ	Special Landscape Qualities
ToR	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom
WDA	Windfarm Development Area



Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	The process of evaluating the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed development over and above the existing circumstances (or 'baseline').
Fishing ground	An area of water or seabed targeted by fishing activity.
MachairWind Offshore Windfarm	<p>An offshore windfarm capable of exporting around 2 GW of renewable energy to the National Electricity Transmission System. MachairWind Offshore Windfarm comprises three Development Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WDA – located on the west coast of Scotland to the northwest of Islay and west of Colonsay; • The Offshore Export Cable Corridor – a preliminary boundary extending from the WDA to mean high water springs at a landfall location near Girvan, South Ayrshire; and • The Onshore Transmission Development Area – a preliminary boundary which extends landward from mean low water springs and includes the land required for the landfall of the offshore export cables and their route up to but not including the proposed high voltage direct current switching station which will be developed and constructed by Transmission Owner, ScottishPower Transmission. <p>Separate consent and licence applications will be submitted for each Development Area.</p>
Mean High Water Springs (MHWS)	The average, over a year, of the heights of two successive high waters during those periods of 24 hours (once every fortnight) when the range of the tide is greatest.
Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS)	The average, over a year, of the heights of two successive low waters during those periods of 24 hours (once every fortnight) when the range of the tide is greatest.
National Electricity Transmission System	The high-voltage electricity power transmission network serving Great Britain which receives electricity from generators (such as offshore windfarms) and transmits that electricity to anywhere on the National Electricity Transmission System to satisfy demand.
Offshore Export Cable Corridor (ECC)	The preliminary boundary extending from the WDA to mean high water springs near Girvan, South Ayrshire and within which the offshore export cable(s) will be located. A separate marine licence application will be submitted for the offshore export cable(s) located within the Offshore ECC.
Onshore Transmission Development Area (OnTDA)	The preliminary boundary which extends landward from mean low water springs and includes the land required for the landfall of the offshore export cables and their route up to but not including the proposed high voltage direct current switching station which will be developed and constructed by Transmission Owner, ScottishPower Transmission. This Transmission Owner is responsible for consenting the high voltage direct current switching station. Onward connections to the National Electricity Transmission System will be consented by National Grid Electricity Transmission and ScottishPower Transmission. Where relevant, these are considered as part of cumulative effects assessment in the EIA.
Option Agreement Area (OAA)	The seabed area awarded to ScottishPower Renewables in January 2022 through the ScotWind leasing round.
Plan Option	A spatial plan area proposed through the Sectoral Marine Plan for offshore wind energy (as adopted in 2020). As part of the ScotWind leasing round, offshore wind developers submitted bids for Plan Options which, following a successful bid, become OAAs.
ScotWind	A Crown Estate Scotland seabed leasing round which enabled developers to propose offshore wind projects and apply for seabed rights to plan and build windfarms in Scottish waters.
The Applicant	The legal entity submitting consent applications for the MachairWind Offshore Windfarm, namely MachairWind Limited.
The Lighthouse	The Dubh Artach lighthouse.



Term	Definition
The Project	MachairWind Offshore Windfarm including all its Development Areas and associated infrastructure.
Windfarm Development Area (WDA)	The application boundary within the OAA where consent will be sought for the proposed WDA infrastructure. The WDA infrastructure is subject to Section 36 consent and marine licence applications (generation and transmission) which are being applied for separately from the Offshore ECC infrastructure and OnTDA infrastructure.
WDA infrastructure	The offshore generation and transmission infrastructure located within the WDA including but not limited to: WTGs, WTG fixed foundations (and associated scour protection), OSP(s), OSP fixed foundations (and associated scour protection), IACs, OSP link and offshore export cable(s) and their associated external cable protection (insofar as these are located within the WDA) and fibre optic cables.
Wind Turbine Generator (WTG)	A wind turbine generator which converts wind energy into electrical energy. Each wind turbine generator is a complex system composed of a high number of components. Typically, the main components include the rotor assembly (composed of three blades and a hub); the nacelle (containing a generator, shaft and gearbox, power electronic converter and transformer); and the tower (containing lifting equipment and the switchgear).



1 INTRODUCTION

1. MachairWind Limited ('the Applicant'), wholly owned by ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited, is developing the MachairWind Offshore Windfarm ('the Project'), a major offshore wind project located north-west of Islay and west of Colonsay which will generate around 2 gigawatts (GW) of clean, renewable electricity. The Project secured the rights to develop the entire W1 Plan Option Area under an Option to Lease Agreement awarded by Crown Estate Scotland in 2022 through the ScotWind leasing round.
2. The Applicant's vision is for MachairWind to deliver an offshore windfarm in a responsible and collaborative way, respectful of local needs and focused on delivering long-term benefits to its host communities, Argyll and Bute, the West of Scotland and the UK more broadly.
3. This Design Strategy sets out the design response to date, and the Design Objectives which have been developed for the Project. The Design Objectives align with the suite of wider Project Objectives which have been defined to guide all aspects of the consenting and development of the Project, as set out in **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives**. The Design Objectives have been developed through a collaborative process between the Applicant and NatureScot, with specialist support provided by LUC (landscape consultant) and Haskoning (Lead Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultant).
4. The Design Objectives will guide the final design of the Project in a way that seeks to safeguard the integrity and objectives of nationally important landscapes. This will be done by striving to reduce likely significant effects on National Scenic Areas (NSAs), while recognising that some seascape and visual change as a result of the Project is unavoidable. The Design Objectives will be balanced against the wider Project Objectives, which include the minimum project requirements and other constraints, as noted in **Section 4** below.
5. The Design Objectives focus on ways in which the final design of the Project can be influenced to address relevant landscape and visual issues, including by reducing effects on key landscape and visual receptors where possible. In particular, the focus has been on measures that would reduce effects on the Special Landscape Qualities (SLQs) of NSAs, where possible. SLQs are defined by NatureScot for each NSA. There are three NSAs of relevance to the Project:
 - Jura NSA;
 - Loch na Keal, Isle of Mull NSA; and
 - Scarba, Lunga and the Garvellachs NSA.
6. The three NSAs are shown in the context of the Project's Windfarm Development Area (WDA) in **Figure 16.8a**.
7. This Design Strategy should be read alongside **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives** and **Chapter 16 Seascape Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA)**.
8. This Design Strategy comprises the following sections:
 - **Section 2 NatureScot Collaborative Working** describes the collaborative working process that was undertaken between the Applicant and NatureScot, and describes how the Design Objectives were developed;
 - **Section 3 Objectives of the Design Process** presents the Design Objectives agreed with NatureScot and describes how each is intended to minimise the effects of the Project on nationally important landscapes; and
 - **Section 4 Securing Design Within the Section 36 Consent** sets out the post-consent design process and shows how the Design Objectives will feed into this.



9. The following documents relevant to the development of the Design Objectives are appended to the Design Strategy:
- **Annex A** Terms of Reference for Collaborative Working with NatureScot;
 - **Annex B** Collaborative Working Minutes: Workshop 1 Project Requirements & Design Evolution;
 - **Annex C** Collaborative Working Minutes: Workshop 2 Draft Design Objectives; and
 - **Annex D** Collaborative Working Minutes: Workshop 3 Pre-submission Collaboration.

2 NATURESCOT COLLABORATIVE WORKING

2.1 BACKGROUND

10. In March 2020 NatureScot submitted a response to the consultation on the Draft Sectoral Marine Plan (2019), including welcoming the draft plan and endorsing the systematic process through which Draft Plan Option (DPO) areas were derived. At this time, design guidance was provided by NatureScot to inform the finalisation of the Sectoral Marine Plan, including in respect of the W1 DPO as identified in the draft plan. The boundary of the W1 Plan Option was subsequently refined in the final Sectoral Marine Plan – Offshore Wind Energy adopted by the Scottish Ministers in October 2020 and remains unchanged in the Draft Updated Sectoral Marine Plan – Offshore Wind (2025).
11. In a meeting with the Project team in May 2025, NatureScot accepted that the 2020 design guidance was now only of limited relevance and stated that their focus now is working to influence design development at project level instead. It was therefore agreed that the Applicant and NatureScot would work collaboratively to define an appropriate Design Strategy and suite of Design Objectives with the aims of safeguarding the integrity and objectives of nationally important landscapes and responding to the key parameters of developing an offshore wind farm within the W1 Plan Option.

2.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

12. At the outset of this process, Terms of Reference (ToR) were agreed between MachairWind and NatureScot, and these are included in **Annex A**. These ToR guided the collaborative working process and established key parameters. The purpose of the Design Objectives was agreed as being to minimise likely significant effects on the SLQs of relevant NSAs, while recognising that some seascape and visual change as a result of the Project is unavoidable.

2.3 COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOPS

13. The process comprised a series of collaborative workshops between landscape consultants at LUC (Land Use Consultants) on behalf of the Project, and landscape officers at NatureScot. A series of four workshops was agreed in the ToR. Due to changes in Project timescales, this was rationalised to three workshops, which were facilitated by the Applicant and LUC and attended by NatureScot who accepted the minutes, with amendments, in each case. The agreed minutes are presented in **Annexes B, C and D**.

2.3.1 Project Requirements and Constraints

14. Prior to the first workshop, the Applicant circulated a technical note that outlined the evolution of the Project design. The note outlined a number of key parameters that have influenced the site refinement, and which will continue to influence the final design. These provide the context within which the Design Objectives will be applied, and include:
- The need to maximise the grid connection capacity and competitive procurement of infrastructure to ensure the Projects economic viability; and



- Hard constraints, which present significant engineering or development challenges that cannot be overcome or altered.

15. These requirements and constraints are set out in full in **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives**.

2.3.2 Workshop 1 Project Requirements & Design Evolution

16. Workshop 1 took place on 12 August 2025, and agreed minutes are included in **Annex B**. The key points discussed and agreed at this meeting were:

- Agreement of goals for the collaborative working process;
- Presentation of the Project Objectives (including requirements and constraints as set out in **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives**) and the evolution of the WDA to date;
- Presentation of the SLQs that were scoped in for each of the three NSAs, and initial justification for these choices; and
- Next steps were discussed and agreed.

17. NatureScot agreed the selection of SLQs was appropriate, subject to a number of suggestions that other SLQs could be grouped alongside the selected examples, to ensure that the full experience of the NSA was considered in each case. The Project agreed to these suggestions. The SLQs formed the basis of the impact assessment presented in **Appendix 16.2 Assessment of Effects on Special Landscape Qualities** and **Chapter 16 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**.

18. The SLQs serve as the basis for the Design Objectives, as the latter are designed to reduce, where possible, the effects of the Project on the selected SLQs. Draft Design Objectives were circulated to NatureScot prior to Workshop 2.

2.3.3 Workshop 2 Draft Design Objectives

19. Workshop 2 took place on 27 August 2025, and minutes are included in **Annex C**. The key points discussed and agreed at this meeting were:

- The worst-case scenario (WCS) layout for SLVIA was presented and discussed (refer to **Chapter 16 SLVIA**), and updated photomontages were shared showing this layout in views from each NSA;
- The draft Design Objectives (see **Section 3** below) were presented and discussed; and
- Next steps were discussed and agreed.

20. The draft Design Objectives were agreed by NatureScot via the meeting minutes with a minor amendment. Following the meeting the Applicant shared a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) plan of the WCS layout with NatureScot.

21. It was intended to hold a third workshop in December 2025. However, following an SLVIA Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting held on 09 October, the decision was made to rationalise the third and fourth workshops, and the third workshop was held in February 2026. The collaborative approach to Design Objectives was discussed at the ETG held on 09 October, which was attended by NatureScot and an officer from Argyll and Bute Council.

2.3.4 Workshop 3 Pre-submission Collaboration

22. Workshop 3 took place on 12 February 2026, and minutes are included in **Annex D**. The key points discussed and agreed at this meeting were:

- The overall Project Objectives and updated Design Objectives, amended by the Applicant, were presented and discussed;
- The initial findings of the SLVIA were presented and discussed. This included a summary of the significant seascape, landscape and visual effects identified including effects on SLQs; and



- Next steps were discussed and agreed, including those relating to the collaborative working process.
23. NatureScot provided feedback on the updated Design Objectives, and were generally in agreement, subject to the following observations:
- Turbine height should continue to be a consideration, accepting the need for the Project to remain viable;
 - The Project should commit to seeking agreement to a reduced lighting scheme with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA);
 - Design considerations should also include the siting of the Offshore Substation Platforms (OSPs);
 - Although the focus is on NSAs, cognisance should be given to landscapes outwith national designations; and
 - Argyll and Bute Council should continue to be engaged to agree any key design viewpoints outside NSAs.
24. These comments have informed the finalisation of the Design Objectives presented in **Section 3**.

3 OBJECTIVES OF THE DESIGN PROCESS

3.1 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL DESIGN OBJECTIVES

25. The intention of the Design Objectives is to reduce, where possible, the effects of the Project on SLQs, while recognising that some seascape and visual change as a result of the Project is unavoidable. These Project-specific Design Objectives supersede the design recommendations provided by NatureScot in response to the W1 Plan Option Area, which were set out in the Draft Sectoral Marine Plan for Offshore Wind (2020).
26. The Design Objectives that have been agreed through the collaborative working process are set out in **Table 3.1** below. This presents the objectives under four themes, as follows:
- Theme 1 Project Scale – measures to reduce the overall scale of the Project, within the parameters set by the Project requirements;
 - Theme 2 Project Extent and Orientation – measures to reduce the apparent scale and density of the Project, as viewed from NSAs;
 - Theme 3 Turbine Layout – measures to adjust the arrangement of turbines in views to reduce visual impact; and
 - Theme 4 Location Specific – measures focused on particular locations or views that should be given due cognisance in development of the final design.
27. Each Design Objective is briefly stated in **Table 3.1**, with a supporting explanation. It is recognised that not all of the objectives can be achieved in full. The objectives should be taken together to inform design development, and a careful balance will be required between individual objectives.

Table 3.1 Design objectives

Design Objective	Explanation
Theme 1: Project scale	
Subject to project requirements, maximise the distance between the turbines and shorelines of the islands, particularly NSAs	The final design will, subject to project requirements and other environmental and technical constraints, seek to maximise the distance between the turbines and the coast. Any increase in the distance from the shorelines would help to reduce the visual presence of the turbines in coastal views. In particular, the Applicant will seek to maximise the distance between the turbines and NSAs.



Design Objective	Explanation
Subject to project requirements, limit nighttime lighting in the WDA	<p>The need for marine and aviation lighting is set out in statutory guidance that must be complied with.</p> <p>A range of measures exist that can reduce the lighting effects of the Project on environmental receptors at night whilst ensuring aviation and navigational safety is maintained and the required UK aviation standards are adhered to. The Applicant will work with the relevant stakeholders to identify appropriate mitigation. The Applicant has already initiated engagement with the CAA to explore a reduced lighting scheme and will continue this proactive engagement in the determination phase of the Project.</p>
Subject to project requirements, consider the effect of turbine height on visual impact	<p>It is recognised that turbine height will influence visibility and perception. Smaller turbines, within the overall Project envelope, could reduce visibility from sensitive receptors, including those viewpoints within NSAs and could also reduce visibility where there is landform in the intermediate distance. Taking account of Project requirements and objectives, turbine height will be a consideration in the design process.</p>
Theme 2: Project extent and orientation	
Subject to project requirements, seek to minimise the overall horizontal spread of MachairWind	<p>With particular reference to views from NSAs, the shape of the WDA should seek to be made as compact as feasible within the project requirements, by aiming to minimise outlying turbines. Limiting, where possible, the extent of the turbines across the skyline would reduce visual impact.</p>
Subject to project requirements, orientate MachairWind to expose the narrowest part of the WDA to the most sensitive receptors	<p>Subject to project requirements, orientation of the WDA should be informed by seeking to avoid broad spreads of turbines in key views from NSAs, aiming to reduce the potential dominance of the Project in these views.</p>
Theme 3: Turbine layout	
Subject to project requirements, create a visually balanced, simple and cohesive layout when seen from key viewpoints	<p>Key viewpoints within NSAs will be used to examine emerging layouts during the final design process. Subject to project requirements, the layout will be adjusted to avoid uneven visual densities and overlapping turbines. Where appropriate, key viewpoints outside NSAs will also be considered. The Applicant has secured initial feedback from Argyll and Bute Council on this matter and will continue this engagement in the determination phase of the Project.</p>
Subject to project requirements, seek to balance the logic of a grid layout with the more organic appearance of an irregular layout	<p>NatureScot indicated some preference for a more irregular layout, reflecting the rocky, irregular coastline of the area. Regular straight lines may lead to stacking of turbines in views.</p>
Subject to project requirements, consider the location of the Offshore Substation Platforms (OSPs) within the layout	<p>The maximum height of OSPs will be smaller than that of the wind turbine generators, but they will be of a different form and massing. Increasing the distance between OSPs and the coast would help to reduce their visual presence. Taking account of all project requirements and objectives, their positioning within the turbine layout will be carefully considered.</p>
Theme 4: Location specific	
Subject to project requirements, avoid the turbines 'filling' specific views	<p>There is potential for the WDA to occupy the whole seaward horizon, as viewed from some more enclosed bays and sounds. Particular locations that will be considered during detailed design are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loch Tarbert, Jura; and • Sound of Iona, as seen from locations in the Loch na Keal NSA, including from Staffa.




4 SECURING DESIGN WITHIN THE SECTION 36 CONSENT

4.1 DESIGN DEVELOPMENT


4.1.1 Pre-application Design

28. The evolution of the WDA and design development which has taken place to date is set out in **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives**. This has arrived at a project envelope which forms the basis for the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR), with realistic worst-case scenarios (RWCS) identified for each topic.
29. Factors that influenced the refinement of the WDA included:
- Seeking to reduce likely significant effects on coastlines, communities and NSAs, by refining WDA boundaries away from Jura, Islay and Colonsay;
 - Reducing the horizontal spread of turbines in views, by removing areas to the north and south of the WDA;
 - Decreasing the overall project footprint to reduce potential impacts on ecological and ornithological interests;
 - Refining the WDA boundary away from heritage assets including the Dubh Artach lighthouse;
 - Refining the WDA boundary away from Colonsay to increase the available sea room for vessels transiting between Colonsay and the WDA;
 - Refining the southern WDA boundary to avoid potential for isolated WTG's presenting an allision risk for vessels;
 - Refining the WDA boundary to reduce potential for interaction with Ministry of Defence interests; and
 - Avoidance of fishing grounds.
30. Several of these factors formed the basis for the Design Objectives listed in **Table 3.1**, and were key themes informing discussion through the collaborative working process outlined in **Section 2**.
31. **Figure 1** shows the refinement to the WDA, based on these factors, from site award to scoping and EIAR submission.





-  Option Agreement Area (754km²)
-  EIA Scoping Windfarm Development Area (510km²)
-  Windfarm Development Area (448km²)



1	05/03/2026	AB	GC	CC	CG
REV	REV DATE	GIS CREATOR	GIS REVIEWER	TECHNICAL CHECKER	TECHNICAL APPROVER

DRAWING NUMBER: MCW-DWF-ENV-MAP-RHS-000193

DATUM	ETRS89	PROJECTION	UTM Zone 29N
SCALE	1:400,000	PAGE SIZE	A3

PROJECT TITLE: MachairWind

Figure 1: Evolution of the Windfarm Development Area

© Haskoning UK Ltd, 2026.
 Service Layer Credits: World_Hillshade: Esri, Ordnance Survey, NASA, NGA, USGS
 World Ocean Reference: Sources: Esri, TomTom, Garmin, GEBCO, National Geographic, NOAA,
 and the GIS User Community
 World Topographic Map: Sources: Esri, TomTom, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap
 contributors, and the GIS User Community
 World Ocean Base: Esri, GEBCO, Garmin, NaturalVue

NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION



4.1.2 Post-Consent Design Development

32. Further design development will take place should the Project receive consent. This will be a process of refinement of the project envelope towards a fixed, buildable design. Final details will be informed by design and engineering needs, supply chain engagement and the design objectives. This will be agreed with relevant stakeholders prior to discharge of the relevant consent conditions. This process ensures that the effects of the final scheme will never be greater than those of the RWCS assessed for EIA purposes.
33. Design and engineering will be informed through the collection and analysis of geotechnical survey data that will be collected in the post-consent phase. This will identify hard and soft constraints across the site informing final buildable area, foundation types and cable layouts.
34. Supply chain engagement will also be carried out to identify economically competitive procurement of infrastructure.
35. Following the selection of infrastructure, and the identification of buildable area based on hard and soft constraints, the Design Objectives will provide guidance on the final design to help the Project reduce impacts on nationally important landscapes. This will be displayed in the following management plans, which will be submitted to the relevant stakeholders for review and Scottish Ministers for approval prior to construction.¹
- **Design Specification and Layout Plan (DSLPL)** – this document will set out the location and dimensions of all turbines, including their numbers, height, colour and so on, to confirm the final Project layout and will be informed by the relevant design objectives set out in **Table 3.1**.
 - **Lighting and Marking Plan** – setting out how the Project will be lit and marked in accordance with current aviation and navigation safety requirements and will include the specific proposed mitigation for the final layout.
 - **Design Statement** – to include visualisations illustrating the daytime and nighttime appearance of the DSLPL layout, to be signed off by a qualified Landscape Architect.
36. The Applicant has drafted a proposed condition to apply the design objectives in the detailed design phase, as detailed in Section 2.4.2 of the **Planning Statement**. The Applicant will continue to engage collaboratively with NatureScot as the final design emerges.

4.2 SUMMARY

37. Following consent, the Applicant will drive the Project through a robust design process that safeguards key principles and objectives, ensuring concepts and commitments translate into delivery, guaranteeing a strong and future-proof design and one which reduces impacts on nationally important landscapes.

¹ These requirements are informed by the consent of Berwick Bank Offshore Wind Farm by the Scottish Ministers, dated 31 July 2025.



ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR COLLABORATIVE WORKING WITH NATURESCOT



MachairWind Offshore Windfarm

Terms of Reference for Collaborative Working with NatureScot



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction 3
2 Purpose of Collaboration 4
3 Objectives 4
4 Scope of Work 4
5 Roles and Responsibilities 5
 5.1 MachairWind & Consultants 5
 5.2 NatureScot 5
6 Communication / Evidence Plan Protocol 5
7 Confidentiality 6
8 Amendments 6

List of Tables

Table 1 – Proposed Workshop Aims and Details 5
 Table 2 – Proposed Approach to Documentation 6

List of Figures

Figure 1 – Collaboration and Design Evolution 4



1 INTRODUCTION

1. This Terms of Reference document provides a framework for collaborative working between NatureScot and MachairWind (including its consultants Haskoning and Land Use Consultants 'LUC') (together 'the Parties') in relation to the design development of the MachairWind Offshore Windfarm Project (the Project).
2. On 1st May 2025, a meeting was held between NatureScot, ScottishPower Renewables' MachairWind Team (MachairWind), their Lead Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultants (Haskoning) and specialist sub-contractor Land Use Consultants (LUC) to discuss the NatureScot 2019 design guidance which supported the 1st Sectoral Marine Plan and its implications for the MachairWind Offshore Windfarm (the Project).
3. MachairWind recognises that NatureScot's design guidance aims to ensure the protection of Scotland's rich and diverse seas and the unique and distinctive character of our coastlines. In the meeting held on 1st May 2025, MachairWind explained that they share these ambitions. MachairWind also highlighted that much has changed in the policy landscape since 2019, including the adoption of NPF4, and acknowledged that NatureScot is currently advising on a revised Sectoral Marine Plan resulting from the Iterative Plan Review process.
4. NatureScot noted that the intent of the design guidance was to inform the finalisation of the 1st Sectoral Marine Plan and acknowledged that the Scottish Ministers had subsequently adopted the Plan in 2020. This plan included a refined version of Plan Option W1, reduced in area with the aim to mitigate potential impacts, including on landscape and coastal character, within which MachairWind is located. NatureScot confirmed they do not intend to update their 2019 design guidance for the new Sectoral Marine Plan and acknowledged that the original context for the guidance has evolved, given that Plan Option W1 has already been assessed and approved at plan-level by the Scottish Ministers. Instead, their focus will be on developing an appropriate project-level response to relevant landscape and visual sensitivities.
5. A key action from the meeting, suggested by NatureScot, was that NatureScot, MachairWind and its consultants engage in a collaborative working process to help shape the Project's design development. MachairWind agreed to prepare a document that sets out a proposal and timeline for collaborative working for NatureScot's review. These Terms of Reference outline an approach that MachairWind, Haskoning and LUC consider to be logical, achievable and would work well for all parties.
6. Submission of the Windfarm Development Area (WDA) Section 36 application is currently scheduled for Q1 2026. To enable the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process to commence, a 'design freeze' is required to allow the relevant modelling and assessment work to be undertaken. This will entail a freeze of the WDA Red Line Boundary (RLB) and indicative design parameters for the Project's infrastructure (including Wind Turbine Generator coordinates and indicative windfarm layout) to enable the EIA to commence. Preparation of the EIA is currently scheduled to begin in July.
7. Design development does not stop at design freeze but will continue in parallel with the EIA. It is proposed that collaboration with NatureScot continues in tandem with the EIA process and after Section 36 submission to maintain an open dialogue. Figure 1 illustrates a timeline for the envisaged collaboration. It is anticipated that by the time of Section 36 submission, the Parties will be able to identify a timeframe within which final collaborative work can be completed.



	Q2 '25	Q3 '25	Q4 '25	Q1 '26	Q2 '26 onwards
MachairWind & NatureScot Collaboration					
Design Evolution & EIA process					
Design Freeze (Project Design Envelope - Realistic Worst Case parameters)					
Environmental Impact Assessment/Consent Application				Submission	
Design Development	Pre-application				Post submission/Detailed design
Consideration of post design freeze application refinements					

Figure 1 – Collaboration and Design Evolution

2 PURPOSE OF COLLABORATION

8. This collaboration between NatureScot and MachairWind is intended to facilitate the refinement of the MachairWind WDA design objectives and associated design response to safeguard the integrity and objectives of nationally important landscapes. This will be done by minimising likely significant effects on the SLQs, while recognising that some seascape and visual change as a result of the Project is unavoidable.

3 OBJECTIVES

9. Through a series of design development workshops MachairWind will analyse and respond to applicable Special Landscape Qualities (SLQs) of relevant National Scenic Areas (NSAs) to influence the preliminary WDA siting and design objectives, by:
- understanding the minimum requirements which need to be fulfilled for the Project to remain viable and achieve the generating capacity set out in its grid connection agreement;
 - identifying and agreeing on which SLQs may be affected by the Project, and are therefore of importance to Project design objectives;
 - understanding what particular project parameters are likely to present a challenge in landscape and visual terms and how the design can potentially be refined to meet those needs, especially in relation to relevant SLQs; and
 - understanding what other landscape, visual and wider environmental considerations, beyond nationally important landscapes, the project may need to take account of to ensure that the design process takes a holistic approach, as part of the wider iterative design process. Scope of Work
10. MachairWind proposes a workshop approach to the collaborative working process. Aims and details such as location, date and duration are set out in Table 1 below for workshops up to application submission, Q1 2026. A more detailed agenda will be provided one week ahead of each workshop to allow NatureScot time to prepare. The requirement for post consent workshops, Q2 2026 onwards, will be assessed following submission.



Table 1 – Proposed Workshop Aims and Details

Workshop	Aim	Details
Workshop 1 – Understanding of Project Requirements & Design Evolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline Project design evolution so far Discussion on minimum Project requirements & hard constraints Discuss and agree goals for collaborative working Identify & agree on key SLQs of importance to design objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MachairWind / LUC will provide initial information pack and briefing note: week commencing 4th August Follow up call via MS Teams to discuss detail and agree goals and objectives (~1hr): week commencing 11th August
Workshop 2 – SLQs and the Design Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share and discuss photomontages Discuss how the design can potentially be refined to meet the needs of both the project minimum requirements and key SLQs Seek to agree on design objectives/principles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person meeting, or MS Teams as agreed with NatureScot Week commencing 25th August ~2.5hrs
Workshop 3 – Design response to Workshop 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share updated RLB, updated indicative WTG layouts (EIA / updated photomontages) Demonstrate how the project has responded to workshop 2, applied the design objectives/principles and taken key SLQs into account within WDA refinements Seek to agree that the design objectives have been applied to the emerging layout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person meeting, or MS Teams as agreed with NatureScot Week commencing 22nd or 29th September ~2.5hrs
Workshop 4 – Pre-submission collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share and discuss EIA findings (based on worst-case design freeze) Discuss any implications of post design freeze design refinements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MachairWind / LUC will provide summary of findings and draft Design Strategy (see Table 2) Follow up call via MS Teams to discuss findings November / December 2025 ~1hr

4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 MACHAIRWIND & CONSULTANTS

- Schedule workshops, prepare workshop materials and take minutes.
- Facilitate collaborative workshops providing engineering guidance and Lead EIA and SLVIA expertise to ensure two-way dialogue;
- Attendance at workshops (depending on each agenda not all may be required to attend): [REDACTED]

4.2 NATURESCOT

- Actively participate in collaborative workshops providing regulatory guidance on behalf of NatureScot to ensure two-way dialogue to achieve purpose and objectives;
- Review and approve workshop minutes on behalf of NatureScot (sharing any comments or changes as appropriate);
- Attendance at workshops: [REDACTED]

5 COMMUNICATION / EVIDENCE PLAN PROTOCOL

11. MachairWind proposes that the collaborative working process is documented, and conclusions endorsed by the Parties, in order to:



- Provide tangible evidence of NatureScot’s involvement and contributions, including during the period prior to application submission when the MachairWind EIA will be completed in tandem with the proposed workshops;
- Demonstrate transparency whereby NatureScot remains actively engaged throughout the design evolution process; and
- Submit with the Section 36 application, demonstrating a collaborative design process.

12. The proposed documentation process is outlined in Table 2.

Table 2 – Proposed Approach to Documentation

Document Type	Purpose	Content
Minutes of Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record discussions, decisions and actions from each workshop • Submit with Section 36 application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include key points, agreements and any feedback from NatureScot • Formally approved on behalf of organisations via email
Design Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing Design Objectives: Ensure design objectives and best practice approaches are carried through to achieve a robust array design, that demonstrates reduced significant effects on SLQs of NSAs • Submit with Section 36 application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Objectives & Principles: Outline a coherent set of design objectives and principles • Timeline: Map out a timeline for the post-consent design process

6 CONFIDENTIALITY

13. NatureScot and MachairWind (together with its consultants, Haskoning and LUC) agree to maintain the confidentiality of all shared information and documents.

7 AMENDMENTS

14. Any amendments to these Terms of Reference must be agreed upon in writing by NatureScot and MachairWind.



ANNEX B: COLLABORATIVE WORKING MINUTES: WORKSHOP 1 PROJECT REQUIREMENTS & DESIGN EVOLUTION



Project Name:	MachairWind	MoM Title:	MachairWind & NatureScot Collaborative Working Workshop 1 Project Requirements & Design Evolution
Date and Time:	12/08/2025 13:00 to 13:50	Venue:	Microsoft Teams
Name	Position / Organisation		Initials
██████████	SPR MachairWind Project Lead		KW
██████████	SPR MachairWind Development Project Manager		PA
██████████	SPR MachairWind Stakeholder Manager		EK
██████████	SPR Policy Lead		DS
██████████	Haskoning Lead EIA Project Manager		CG
██████████	Associate Landscape Planner, LUC		LC
██████████	Senior Landscape Planner, LUC		JH
██████████	Landscape Advisor, NatureScot		LW

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Goals for collaborative working
3. Summary of Project minimum requirements & design evolution
4. Key SLQs of importance to design objectives
5. Next Steps
6. Actions
7. AOB

MINUTES

1. Introductions:

All attendees introduced themselves and SPR started recording the meeting to assist with minute-taking, with NatureScot's approval.

2. Goals for collaborative working:

KW set the context for this meeting, outlining that the collaboration between NatureScot and MachairWind is designed to assist with the refinement of the windfarm design objectives; and in turn inform the design response to help safeguard the integrity and objectives of nationally important landscapes.

SPR's approach seeks to minimise the likely significant effects on the SLQs, while recognising that some seascape and visual change as a result of the Project is unavoidable.

In line with the agreed Terms of Reference, the first two main objectives of this process are to:

MINUTES

- Understand the minimum requirements which need to be fulfilled for the Project to remain viable and achieve the generating capacity set out in its grid connection agreement; and
- Identify and agree on which SLQs may be affected by the Project and are therefore of importance to Project design objectives (to be agreed on at following workshops).

Ahead of this meeting, SPR circulated a briefing note that outlines the how the project's windfarm design has evolved to date and why, and this includes setting out the changes we have made more recently to inform our final red line boundary (RLB) for EIA design freeze.

KW highlighted that we shouldn't focus too heavily on the RLB that we arrived at for EIA, given the time pressures we are working under to reach EIA design freeze (driven by the need to submit the planning application before datasets time out). It is the view and hope of the Project that this collaborative working could be a longer-term workstream, with design development continuing beyond design freeze, i.e. continuing in parallel with the EIA and after Section 36 submission. Ultimately, the project is eager to maintain an open dialogue and continue discussions on the ongoing design refinement.

KW and DS noted that the key intended outcome from this collaborative process is the development of a design strategy, including coherent design objectives, principles and project responses to key landscape issues. This will both support the consenting applications and inform more detailed design post-consent.

LW had no comments on this approach, noting this sounded acceptable. LW added that she would have to take what we've discussed back to the wider team at NatureScot.

DS reiterated that this new phase of structured engagement is not the start of the landscape design process given the discussions which have taken place between the project and NatureScot over the last year and the design evolution which occurred from Plan Option award to WDA scoping to statutory consultation and EIA Design Freeze.

A series of site refinements have been undertaken from scoping to now, which were set out in the briefing note (MCW-NS Collaborative Working Workshop 1 Project Requirements and Design Evolution Briefing Note_Final_05 August 2025'). Opportunities for further design refinements and responses to key landscape issues will be considered through this collaborative engagement process in parallel with the completion of assessments for the project's consenting applications. DS highlighted that a key role of the intended design strategy will be to look beyond the submission of consenting applications themselves and provide confidence that, through detailed design work at the post-consent stage, the project will be able to provide an appropriate response to key landscape sensitivities.

3. Summary of Project minimum requirements & design evolution:

On 5th August, a briefing note was issued to NatureScot to provide a useful basis for discussion on an appropriate design response to ultimately address the landscapes sensitivities over the course of this collaborative workstream. LW confirmed she read the briefing note.

KW provided an overview of the minimum requirements and factors that have driven the design evolution to date, as presented in the briefing note. Since SPR was awarded the W1 plan option area, and through the different iterations, we have ultimately arrived at a 41% reduction in the overall plan option area. These refinements were driven by:

- Minimum project requirements, such as those associated with the HVDC transmission infrastructure and the constraints around wind turbine technology;
- Hard constraints that we've identified through analysis of the site and through engagement with key stakeholders; and
- Other key development considerations identified through stakeholder engagement on the project to date.

KW highlighted that the project, due to its high generating capacity and long distance to our connection point (around 150km), is planning to use HVDC bi-pole technology, as captured in the connection

MINUTES

agreement. The export capacity for that technology is 1.8GW. This is giving us a minimum development capacity for the project.

KW also explained that based on the discussions that we have had with the market to date, it is expected that by construction the turbines will likely be in the range of 15 to 24MW. Turbine parameters included in our design envelope were calculated on that basis.

A number of hard constraints are listed in the note, including:

- Water depths: Design envelope excludes areas with depths over 60m, which is considered an economic tipping point for fixed bottom technology.
- Shallow bedrock identified through geophysical surveys to date.
- 2 nautical mile buffer around the Dubh Artach Lighthouse, enabling access for maintenance, following discussions with the Northern Lighthouse Board (NLB).
- Other hard constraints in the note include turbine spacing, turbine alignments, air gap requirements, and other key factors such as SLVIA.

KW explained that modifications to our boundary and assumptions were informed by feedback received through the scoping process and wider stakeholder consultation that we have undertaken at national, local and regional level, where possible and appropriate.

The map in the briefing note shows the new RLB in relation to the previous WDA refinements; the new RLB includes moving the WDA further from the Jura NSA, the NSA on Mull and island communities. It also shows refinements to the northern and southern WDA areas, reducing the horizontal spread of the turbines from different views.

Through more discussions with the market, we have also adjusted our turbine parameters, such as the maximum blade tip height, which has been reduced from 340m to 335m.

KW offered to answer any questions. LW did not have any questions at this point.

4. Key SLQs of importance to design objectives:

LC and JH presented the key SLQs of the three NSAs closest to the project, including the rationale for those scoped in and those scoped out. LC noted that the aim is to reach agreement with NatureScot on these, as this will help SPR frame the design objectives. Note, draft design objectives will be presented at the next workshop on 27th August.

JH commented that the technical note that was circulated only includes a brief commentary regarding each SLQ. LUC will send detailed written justification for those SLQs scoped in or out, for discussion with the wider NatureScot team.

JH shared his screen with the GIS interactive map to show the locations being discussed, which overlaid the ZTV for the Scoping 25MW scenario of the taller turbines. *Note this ZTV is now outdated as the EIA RLB has been refined since the Scoping stage.*

The Jura NSA is focused on the southern part of Jura, with the underlying larger wild land area. Our intention is to focus on the 8 SLQs associated with the NSA. As the technical note suggests, we propose to scope in 4 and scope out 4 SLQs. JH presented the visibility of the WDA from the NSA, focused on the upland spine of southern Jura, with the Paps centrally and the intermediate peaks to the South and the northeast, and larger tracts of the moorland that extends to the west coast and Loch Tarbert.

SLQs that we propose are scoped in:

1. **'The distinctive Paps of Jura'**, focused on the visual prominence of the Paps from the NSA and the surrounding islands and their distinctive profile and physical characteristics. This also references the unparalleled views from the Paps which the WDA has the potential to affect by introducing turbines into the view. From the Paps themselves, which are usually ascended from

MINUTES

the southeast across the moorland, the widest extent of theoretical visibility is the central and southern Paps, Beinn an Òir and Beinn a'Chaolais.

2. **'The large tracts of wildland'**, focused on the sense of remoteness and naturalness and the sense of nature being in charge. That's most evident from parts of the NSA where you're removed from settlement, such as the Paps, the west coast and Loch Tarbert. We propose to include that in the detailed assessment due to the fairly extensive theoretical visibility of the WDA from these areas.
3. **'The inaccessible Loch Tarbert'**, a location-specific SLQ. The description focuses on the physical characteristics of the loch and coastline, and that sense of inaccessibility; it notes this as a lonely and remote place so is related to the 'large tracts of wildland' SLQ. Given the extensive theoretical visibility of Loch Tarbert, we propose to include this SLQ in the detailed assessment.
4. **'The continually varying coastline'**, focused on the varying physical geography of the coast around the island. It notes various features on the East Coast and the South Coast, where WDA isn't visible, but also references the West Coast and the North Coast. It includes the raised beaches and physical aspects of these coasts, but it also notes that they are uninhabited, and they have that sense of remoteness. We feel like this is potentially covered off by 'the large tracts of wild land' and 'The inaccessible Loch Tarbert' SLQs, but we would probably include this SLQ in the assessment if we were taking a precautionary approach. We would therefore welcome NatureScot's feedback.

SLQs that we propose are scoped out:

1. **'Human settlement on the margins of a vast moorland terrain'**, focused on the presence of a narrow strips of settlement on the East Coast and the South Coast, which contrasts with this extensive moorland interior. This can be appreciated from the ferry route, where one can see the settlement backdrop by the moorland interior of the island, but from the settled areas itself there is no visibility of the WDA from these areas - we don't feel like it would be significantly affected.
2. **'The raised beaches of the West Coast'**, focused on the geomorphology of the raised beaches there. It doesn't mention wider coastal views so we don't feel like that would be significantly affected.
3. **'An island of deer'**, focused on the fact that you see a lot of deer on Jura, and we don't feel like that's got any potential to be affected by the WDA; perhaps only in the wider context of a sense of naturalness, but on balance we feel it won't be significantly affected.
4. **'An island close yet remote'**, which relates to the sense of remoteness and seclusion that can be experienced on Jura. It references the long journey required to get to the mainland and the geographical relationship of Jura to its surroundings that despite being close, Jura feels isolated. We feel like that that wider context isn't going to be affected by the WDA and the sense of journeying is separate, so we think this wouldn't be significantly affected. We feel like the aspects of remoteness are covered by 'The large tracts of wildland', 'The inaccessible Loch Tarbert' and 'The distinctive Paps of Jura' SLQs.

LW confirmed she was largely in agreement with what LUC are proposing for scoping in and scoping out for the Jura NSA. LW commented on the 'An island close yet remote' SLQ, because this also refers to the journeys within the island itself and the related qualities of remoteness and seclusion. LW agreed that the qualities of remoteness and seclusion are captured in the other SLQ's like 'large tracts of wildland' and 'The inaccessible Loch Tarbert'. LW suggested SPR give some more consideration over grouping 'An island close yet remote' SLQ with the 'large tracts of wildland' and 'The inaccessible Loch Tarbert' SLQs. JH confirmed that LUC would draw the connections on how the SLQs are experienced together.

MINUTES

The Loch na Keal NSA on Mull is described by 9 special qualities.

LC added that the Jura NSA is around 25km from the Scoping WDA, and the Mull NSA is about 30km away from the Scoping WDA.

SLQs that we proposed are scoped in:

1. **'The highly distinctive Seaways and shores'**, with a geological element to this SLQ, in addition to views and that sense of remoteness, particularly the experience from the outer loch. As shown on the ZTV, the theoretical visibility from the inner lochs is more limited.
2. **'The voyage from enclosed sea loch to the open Atlantic'**, the sea views from the sea-based receptors (e.g. people on boats and yachts) have the potential to be affected by the project.
3. **'The vast natural world dwarfing human settlement'**, in a currently remote and natural landscape with few human elements and detractors in in the current views. A windfarm, albeit a distant one, would have the potential to affect that SLQ.

SLQs that we proposed are scoped out:

1. **'The dramatic coast of basalt terraces and cliffs'** as the WDA wouldn't have the potential to affect the geological features and physical geography of the coast that are described as the special qualities.
2. **'Views of an island-studded sea'**, which focuses more on the views between the islands and then back to the mainland, rather than those outward sea views. We think that those outward sea views are captured in the descriptions of the 'highly distinctive seaways and shores' and 'voyage from enclosed sea loch to the open Atlantic' SLQs.
3. **'The islands and islet groups of astonishingly varied character'**, because the WDA wouldn't be affecting the physical characteristics of those individual islets and island groups.
4. **'The Staffa and Fingal's cave', 'Horizontal Treshnish Isles' and 'Instantly recognisable Dutchman's cap'** for similar reason, and we wouldn't be affecting the experience of those features within that seascape setting.

LW asked a question around grouping, suggesting that the SLQs 'views of an island-studded sea' and place-based SLQs (such as Staffa) could be grouped with the 'voyage from enclosed sea loch to the open Atlantic' SLQ given their shared 'views from' qualities. LC confirmed that LUC would take this recommendation away.

Scarba, Lunga and the Garvellachs NSA

LC indicated that this NSA is around 35 kilometres away from the Scoping WDA.

SLQs that we propose are scoped in:

1. **'Uninhabited remote wild islands'**, since the presence of the WDA in views from those remote islands could affect the characteristics of wildness, which are experienced from that island group.
2. **'Seascape of distinctive and contrasting island groups'**, since the WDA could affect the views of and from these islands.

The SLQs that we propose are scoped out:

- **'The solitude, sanctuary, reflection and retreat'** relating to historical qualities of the islands which we do not think we would have the potential to affect.
- **'The exceptional marine life'** which we do not think we'd have the potential to affect the bird or marine life associated with this SLQ.

MINUTES

- **'The notorious Corryvreckan and the Grey Dogs'** tidal currents and channels around the islands wouldn't be affected by the WDA.
- **'The pyramidal island of Scarba'** and the other special qualities which relate to Lunga, Belnahua and the Garvellachs because these relate to the character of those individual islands, which we don't think we would have the potential to affect by virtue of being a windfarm 35km or so away.

LW confirmed she was in general in agreement with the qualities that are scoped in.

LC asked which, if any, of the NSA's NatureScot think at this stage are a key consideration for the project, or if they have similar concerns for the ones that we've been talking about. LW appreciated that the ZTV had already been prepared at this stage and said it would be very helpful if this could be shared. LC confirmed LUC would share the Plan and associated shapefiles. LW confirmed that these three NSAs were the main focus for NatureScot. LC thanked LW for her feedback.

LC added that we will be following the NatureScot special qualities guidance in terms of assessing the effects of the development on the special qualities of nationally and locally designated landscapes; the guidance will be informing these workshops and the approach that we'll be taking for the iterative design process. JH added that LUC could send on the detailed justification on each of the SLQs.

5. Next steps:

For the next workshop, LUC will prepare the photomontages for our newly updated RLB and layout, and present a comparative analysis of the of the changes from key viewpoints. KW asked LW for her initial thoughts on this approach for Workshop 2. LW confirmed that it would be very useful for her to get the understanding of how the design is evolving, taking all this into consideration.

DS added that as part of the preparation for the workshop 2, SPR and LUC would put together some draft design objectives for discussion. DS noted that the initial objectives have already been discussed in this meeting, however defining the landscape objectives is what we hope to achieve in Workshop 2. KW noted that the draft objectives will be shared with LW before the next workshop.

LC added that it would be helpful to understand NatureScot's experience of working on other offshore windfarm projects and the types of objectives that have been agreed for those.

KW mentioned SPR's upcoming expert topic group (ETG) meetings for SLVIA, with broad thinking being that we hold one ETG in the autumn to present and agree on the photomontages to be scoped into the assessment, and a second ETG in Q1 2026, presenting the findings of the assessment. KW acknowledged the time already taken by NatureScot to attend this collaborative workstream and highlighted that the hope was that both NatureScot and Argyll and Bute Council could attend the SLVIA ETGs. KW asked LW to consider whether NatureScot could make some time to attend.

LW noted that towards the end of the briefing note there is mention of other landscape, visual and wider environmental considerations, and pointed out that coastal character would need to be picked up and covered in the assessment. LC stated that as part of the SLVIA assessment, LUC are undertaking a regional coastal assessment and are also planning to undertake a more detailed coastal character assessment as the regional areas are quite broad scale. All datasets are available on the NatureScot website (LUC to check if they already have the dataset; LW to provide links to SPR and LUC if needed). Fieldwork to inform that has been done and that will form part of the SLVIA; this was well received by LW.

KW confirmed that SPR would share minutes from this workshop and share them with LW for reviewing and sign-off formally via e-mail.

The date for workshop 2 was agreed: Wednesday, August 27th at 2:00 PM on MS Teams.

ID	Actions	Responsible Person
1	Prepare and circulate minutes for review and approval	PA
2	Draft initial design objectives and principles and share with NatureScot	SPR and LUC
3	Prepare photomontages of updated RLB for workshop #2	LC
4	Check that LUC have got access to the NatureScot database	LC
5	Send detailed written justification for those SLQs scoped in or out	LC/JH
6	Share the ZTV Plan and associated shapefiles with NatureScot	LC/JH
7	Provide examples of design objectives from other offshore wind projects	LW

ID	Agreements	Agreement confirmed on
1	Workshop #2 date: August 27th at 2:00 PM on MS Teams.	12/08/2025
2	The Jura NSA: LW largely in agreement with what LUC are proposing for scoping in and scoping out for the Jura NSA. LW suggested SPR give some more consideration over grouping 'An island close yet remote' SLQ with the 'large tracts of wildland' and 'The inaccessible Loch Tarbert' SLQs. JH confirmed that LUC would draw the connections on how the SLQs are experienced together.	12/08/2025
3	The Loch na Keal NSA on Mull: LW suggested that the SLQs 'views of an island-studded sea' and place-based SLQs (such as Staffa) could be grouped with the 'voyage from enclosed sea loch to the open Atlantic' SLQ given their shared 'views from' qualities.	<u>TBC</u> - LC to take recommendation away.
4	Scarba, Lunga and the Garvellachs NSA: LW confirmed she was in general in agreement with the qualities that are scoped in.	12/08/2025
5	LW confirmed that these three NSAs were the main focus for NatureScot.	12/08/2025
6	Coastal character to be assessed.	12/08/2025

ANNEX C: COLLABORATIVE WORKING MINUTES: WORKSHOP 2 DRAFT DESIGN OBJECTIVES



Project Name:	MachairWind	MoM Title:	MachairWind & NatureScot Collaborative Working Workshop 2 – Draft Design Objectives
Date and Time:	27/08/2025 14.00-15.30	Venue:	Microsoft Teams
Name	Position / Organisation	Initials	
██████████	SPR Head of Offshore Development	MG	
██████████	SPR MachairWind Project Lead	KW	
██████████	SPR MachairWind Stakeholder Manager	EK	
██████████	Haskoning Lead EIA Project Manager	CG	
██████████	Associate Landscape Planner, LUC	LC	
██████████	Senior Landscape Planner, LUC	JH	
██████████	Landscape Advisor, NatureScot	LW	

Agenda

1. Introductions and housekeeping
2. SLVIA Worst Case Scenario (WCS) layout
3. Draft Design Objectives - Discussion
4. Next Steps
5. Actions
6. AOB

MINUTES

1. Introductions and housekeeping:

MG re-introduced herself to LW. LW agreed to the meeting being recorded.

LW confirmed receipt of the first workshop minutes but has been on annual leave so unable to review them.

KW introduced the purpose of workshop 2:

- Show photomontages from statutory consultation round 1 and show the updated photomontages based on the refined SLVIA worst case scenario (WCS) layout; and
- Discuss and agree draft design objectives.

2. SLVIA worst-case scenario (WCS) Layout

LC presented the WCS layout, 24MW wind turbines at a height of 335m, as shown on slide 3:

- Redline Boundary in red delineates the windfarm development area (WDA) shown at statutory consultation round 1 (May to July 2025).
- Redline Boundary in purple delineates the WDA boundary to be taken forward for statutory consultation round 2 (October to November 2025) and for the EIA submission.

LC talked through all of the NSA SLQs (slides 4-20); the SLQs highlighted in bold are what will be taken forward for assessment. LC also presented the updated photomontages from various viewpoints, to

MINUTES

show how the refined WDA would sit between landforms and across the skyline; for comparison, she showed the statutory consultation round 1 photomontages from the same viewpoints:

Jura NSA

- Viewpoint 10: Loch Tarbert, Jura: WDA is filling available sea view when looking along the loch, framed by landforms either side.
- Viewpoint 11: Beinn an Oir, Jura: Reduction in the field of view occupied by the turbines (as southern tip has been removed from WDA). Updated photomontages show a more irregular and organic layout.

Loch na Keal, Isle of Mull NSA

- Viewpoint 26: B8073 Mull: Views looking southwest, with turbines sitting behind the Ross of Mull and Iona.
- Viewpoint 28: Cruachan Treshnish Cairn, Mull: High point on the road, with turbines sitting on the skyline framed by landforms.
- Viewpoint 25: Ulva: Turbines visible on the skyline, between intervening islands.
- Viewpoint 24: Staffa: Wireline only. Views looking along the Sound of Iona.

Scarba, Lunga and the Garvellachs NSA

- Viewpoint 18: Scarba: Wireline only. WDA would likely be visible on a clear day on the horizon.
- Viewpoint 17: Oban-Colonsay Ferry: Closest viewpoint photomontage to NSA. Visible turbines on the skyline.

LW acknowledged it was helpful to see how the design is developing.

3. Draft Design Objectives - Discussion

LC introduced the design objectives, highlighting that these have been developed to reduce the project's impact on visual receptor areas and to link in with all the NSAs to reduce impacts on SLQs.

LC presented the drafted objectives by theme:

- Theme 1: Project scale:
 - To maximise the distance between the turbines and shorelines of the islands, particularly NSAs – taking onboard environmental and technical constraints.
 - To consider a turbine specification (tip height and rotor diameter) which responds to the scale of the coastline, and reduces visibility from sensitive receptors, including those within NSAs – from some viewpoints smaller turbines would help to reduce visibility where there is landform in the intermediate distance.
 - To seek to develop a reduced lighting scheme to reduce significant effects from both marine and aviation navigation lighting - need marine & aviation lighting as an operational requirement, however aiming to minimise lighting where possible.

LW stated that these objectives are going down the right route, particularly in relation to reducing scale through distance and/or horizontal spread and agree that a reduced lighting scheme should be developed. LW requested ZTV, which LC agreed to send on post-meeting.

LC reiterated that statutory consultation round 2 (October to November) will show photomontages from all SLVIA viewpoints for the larger turbine layout (except wirelines for Staffa and Scarba).

- Theme 2: Project extent and orientation:
 - To seek to minimise the overall horizontal spread of MachairWind, especially in views from NSAs, by forming a compact layout within the Windfarm Development Area without outlying turbines.
 - To orientate MachairWind to expose the narrowest part of the Windfarm Development Area to the most sensitive receptors, for example Jura NSA or Loch na Keal, Isle of Mull NSA.

MINUTES

LC acknowledged that considering orientation is difficult due to the WDA's exposure to multiple islands. LW stated that she agrees with these objectives around reducing the extent and also agrees it would be helpful to explore the orientation of the windfarm.

- Theme 3: Turbine layout:
 - To aim to create a visually balanced, simple and cohesive layout when seen from key viewpoints, including within NSAs, avoiding uneven visual densities and overlapping turbines, where possible.
 - To seek to balance the logic of a grid layout with the more organic appearance of an irregular layout, in key views from NSAs.

LC pointed out that the layout being presented at the upcoming statutory consultation, and that will be submitted in the EIA, is a regular layout, it does have a more organic layout from the Paps of Jura and other viewpoints. LC is keen to understand whether regular straight lines or organic layouts would be preferred, due to the location being natural & rugged.

LW noticed when moving through the visuals that there is a difference when looking at the windfarm from elevation and agrees that an irregular layout fits better with the rocky, irregular coastline, based on the information presented.

- Theme 4: Location specific:
 - To avoid the turbines 'filling' specific views, such as the seaward horizon visible from Loch Tarbert, Jura and the Sound of Iona, as seen from locations in the Loch na Keal NSA including from Staffa.

LC would like to avoid filling the sea views where possible and setting the development back from low-lying rugged coast.

In relation to filling sea views, LW acknowledged that on the West of Orkney there were similar issues around the indented coastline, so it is something to consider, particularly in relation to the coastal character of the area. LW noted that this is an important objective and should be considered wider than the NSAs.

4. Next steps:

KW encouraged LW to share any additional thoughts and recommendations on the information presented after the workshop, should anything come to mind.

In relation to upcoming workshops, KW noted that the next workshop was due to cover how the draft objectives have been taken into account through updating the RLB, however as highlighted in workshop 1, due to time pressure for the EIA, the project has now reached design freeze. With this in mind, the project is viewing this collaborative working as longer term, with design development continuing beyond design freeze and EIA submission; the hope is to have ongoing dialogue with NatureScot about project design refinement.

KW suggested the next workshop takes place in early December to cover the aims of workshop 4 (i.e. setting out the initial outcomes of the EIA), followed by a workshop in February which is focused on how the design objectives and key SLQs could shape refinement of the windfarm design. KW reminded LW that the project is currently preparing to hold an Expert Topic Group meeting on SLVIA in October, which we hope will be joined by NatureScot and Argyll and Bute Council. LC stated that this approach sounds reasonable.

KW noted that there is real value in looking at how the design objectives could be put into practice. KW highlighted that final decisions around turbine layouts won't be achieved until after consent, as geophysical surveys need to be undertaken post-consent.

MINUTES

LW questioned whether two layouts were being taken forward for EIA. LC stated that for SLVIA the larger turbine layout is being used for both day and nighttime assessment and noted that statutory public consultation round 2 will include 5 nighttime photomontages. CG highlighted that there are two layouts: 1. regular grid evenly spread across the site 2. a layout with a packed boundary. CG pointed out that each topic specialist will determine which the WCS layout is for their topic; for SLVIA, the WCS is the larger turbines with the packed boundary.

KW agreed to:

- Work up an agenda for the proposed workshop in February
- Share the minutes for workshop 2 for LW's review and comment
- Re-share the minutes for workshop 1 for LW's review and comment
- Contact LW on her availability for the SLVIA Expert Topic Group
- Share the ZTV

ID	Actions	Responsible Person
1	Prepare and circulate minutes for review and approval	EK
2	Re-share the minutes for workshop 1 for LW's review and comment	EK
3	Contact LW on her availability for the SLVIA Expert Topic Group	EK
4	Share the ZTV	LC
5	Share agenda for the proposed workshop in February	LC/JH
6	Provide any additional feedback or amends to workshop 1 & 2 minutes and presentations	LW

ID	Agreements	Agreement confirmed on
1	Workshop #3 to take place in early December, focused on initial EIA findings	27/08/2025
2	Workshop #4 to take place in February, focused on how the design objectives and key SLQs could shape the refinement of the windfarm design	27/08/2025
3	General agreement on draft design objectives	27/08/2025

ANNEX D: COLLABORATIVE WORKING MINUTES: WORKSHOP 3 PRE SUBMISSION COLLABORATION



Project Name:	MachairWind	MoM Title:	MachairWind & NatureScot Collaborative Working – Workshop 3
Date of meeting:	12/02/2026	Venue:	Microsoft Teams
Name	Position / Organisation	Initials	
██████████	Project Lead / SPR	KWI	
██████████	Head of Offshore Development for Scotland / SPR	MGL	
██████████	Assistant Project Manager / SPR	PAN	
██████████	Assistant Project Manager / SPR	RJE	
██████████	Senior Policy Manager / SPR	DSM	
██████████	Stakeholder Manager / SPR	EKA	
██████████	Human Environment Lead / Haskoning	CCA	
██████████	Project Manager / Haskoning	CGO	
██████████	Graduate Environmental Consultant / Haskoning	MIR	
██████████	Associate Landscape Planner / LUC	LCA	
██████████	Director of Landscape Planning / LUC	PMA	
██████████	Marine Sustainability Advisor / NatureScot	KMC	
██████████	Landscape Advisor / NatureScot	LWE	
██████████	Marine Energy Advisor / NatureScot	EKN	

Agenda

1. Discuss feedback from SLVIA ETG (October 2025)
2. Present updated project and design objectives
3. Present draft EIA findings (based on worst-case design freeze)
4. Next Steps
5. Discussion and AOB

ITEM	MINUTES
Agenda	KWI provided overview of the Agenda as presented on Slide 2.
Discuss feedback from SLVIA ETG (October 2025)	<p>LCA provided a recap of the feedback received from NatureScot at the October 2025 ETG meeting and summarised LUC's corresponding responses. NatureScot advised that MD-LOT should be consulted on the cumulative shortlist, and LUC confirmed that the cumulative short-list is being finalised and will be issued to MD-LOT shortly for review.</p> <p>NatureScot requested that the 15 MW (144-turbine) layout will be considered in the night-time assessment and that additional visualisations be provided. In response, LUC has prepared further night-time visualisations from Kilchoman on Islay, the B8086 south of Lower Kilchattan on Colonsay, and the Mull-Iona Ferry at Fionnphort Pier and confirmed that effects relating to the 15 MW layout will be assessed within the SLVIA.</p>

ITEM	MINUTES
	<p>NatureScot additionally sought wirelines and comparative analysis for the full 144-turbine layout, as well as wirelines for alternative layouts considered at design stage. LUC confirmed that ZTVs and wirelines for the 144-turbine scenario from all 30 viewpoints were submitted to NatureScot on 21 November 2025.</p> <p>It was also explained that, for SLVIA purposes, the indicative 24 MW dense-perimeter 91-turbine layout is considered the worst-case due to the larger turbine size and increased visibility associated with the denser perimeter configuration. This layout therefore forms the principal scenario for the SLVIA.</p>
<p>Present updated project and design objectives</p>	<p><u>Overall Project Objectives</u></p> <p>DSM provided a recap of the overall project objectives, highlighting that these project objectives directly inform both the site selection methodology and the iterative design process, ensuring alignment between policy drivers, spatial constraints, environmental considerations and technical feasibility.</p> <p>DSM confirmed there were six high-level objectives, defining what a successful project would look like in terms of what it would deliver.</p> <p>DSM noted that MachairWind has a clear and strategic role in supporting Scotland's offshore wind ambition, particularly in relation to the Scottish Government's updated target of deploying up to 40 GW of offshore wind by 2040. As a fixed bottom development, the project is considered less constrained and less exposed to development risk than floating ScotWind projects and thus can make an important and more reliable contribution to the national 2040 ambition. In addition to enabling renewable energy delivery, the project seeks to go above and beyond standard mitigation, identifying opportunities for nature positive development and wider social and economic benefits. Spatial design objectives encourage the efficient use of the W1 Plan Option Area to maximise operating capacity while managing interactions with other users, supporting positive development, and delivering wider social and economic benefits.</p> <p>DSM confirmed the six objectives as outlined on Slide 4.</p> <p><u>Updated Design Objectives</u></p> <p>KWI provided an update on changes made to the Project's design objectives, specifically noting that the previous objective relating to turbine parameters had been removed.</p> <p>KWI explained that, in practice, turbine selection will be constrained by what is available on the market at the time of procurement, and that the Project must retain sufficient flexibility to remain viable. It was acknowledged that the project is ultimately subject to market forces, and it would not be realistic to commit to turbine specifications at this stage.</p> <p>EKN recognised the dependency on market availability but queried whether, where multiple turbine options exist, smaller turbines that are on the market might be considered instead of larger models. KWI clarified that when it comes to the final decision on turbine selection, project economics would need to be weighed up with other factors. If the available smaller turbines made the project unviable, they would not be selected.</p> <p>EKN asked whether, in circumstances where both turbine sizes maintain project viability, there could be consideration of smaller turbines to reduce visual impacts, acknowledging that it could impact the economics of the wind farm. KWI responded that the project team intends to do what it can to reduce impacts wherever possible; however, a balance must be struck between reducing impacts and maintaining a competitive, deliverable project. KWI added that the team wanted to avoid over-committing at this stage but confirmed that they will continue to optimise opportunities to minimise impacts during design development.</p> <p>EKN confirmed they were content with removal of the specific turbine-parameter objective, provided supporting explanatory text is included. MGL agreed that SPR would provide that additional text, reiterating that market-driven availability will be a key determinant in turbine selection.</p>

ITEM	MINUTES
	<p>Action: SPR to add supporting explanatory text in the design strategy setting out the rationale behind being unable to commit to a specific turbine-parameter at this point in time, and outlining that the project will consider all turbine models available on the market at the procurement stage if it is economically viable to do so, whilst noting that a balance must be struck between reducing impacts and maintaining a competitive, deliverable project.</p> <p>LCA then presented a summary of the updated design objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Theme 1: Project Scale <p>The first theme focuses on managing the overall scale and visual presence of the Project. Subject to technical, engineering, and environmental constraints, the design aims to maximise the distance between the turbines and the Scottish coastline, and particularly the National Scenic Areas (NSAs). Increasing the separation distance helps reduce the apparent scale and visibility of turbines in coastal and designated landscapes.</p> <p>This theme also includes the objective to limit the amount of night-time lighting required within the WDA. Marine and aviation lighting are governed by statutory safety requirements, and these must be met. However, the Project will explore available measures that minimise unnecessary lighting spill or visual intrusion, ensuring safe navigation is maintained while reducing lighting-related effects wherever possible.</p> <p>EKN informed the group that NatureScot staff will soon undertake a site visit to review potential night-time visual effects on east coast projects to look at a comparison with what was provided at EIA and real-life to undertake a comparison exercise. NatureScot may return with follow-up questions and to share useful information. LCA confirmed they would be happy to address any queries that arise from this visit.</p> 2. Theme 2: Project Extent and Orientation <p>This theme focuses on shaping and orienting the WDA to reduce its visual influence from key viewpoints. The Project will seek to create as compact an array footprint as possible, balancing technical feasibility with visual constraints and specific viewpoints identified through the SLVIA.</p> <p>The WDA should be oriented to minimise its horizontal spread across the skyline when seen from sensitive receptors, particularly NSAs. This means limiting, where possible, the extent to which turbines extend across the horizon in distant views. Orientation will also consider how best to narrow the perceived width of the array in views from nationally important landscapes, aiming to limit the potential dominance of the Project.</p> 3. Theme 3: Turbine Layout <p>This theme relates to the internal arrangement of turbines within the WDA. The Project aims to create a turbine layout that appears visually balanced and coherent while still reflecting the natural irregularity of the coastline.</p> <p>NatureScot has indicated a preference for layouts that avoid strictly regular or grid-based patterns, favouring more organic, irregular layouts that better relate to the surrounding marine context. However, it was noted that simple or more regular layouts may be appropriate in certain cases, particularly where they help reduce stacking (overlapping of turbine nacelles in a single line-of-sight). Key viewpoints within NSAs will be used during the final design process to identify and refine layout options based on visual performance.</p> 4. Theme 4: Location-Specific Considerations

ITEM	MINUTES
	<p>The final theme addresses locations where the Project may be visible across the entire seaward horizon, particularly from more enclosed bays or coastal landscapes. Specific locations that require detailed attention at later design stages include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loch Tarbert on Jura; • Sound of Iona; and • Viewpoints within the Loch na Keal NSA, including views from Staffa. <p>In these locations, careful design work will aim to avoid the impression that turbines “fill” the entire horizontal view, ensuring that visual balance and landscape character are maintained.</p> <p>LCA invited further comment on the updated objectives. KMC noted that NatureScot will take away the design objectives and come back in writing. Action: NatureScot to respond to SPR in writing on the updated design objectives.</p> <p>DSM noted that the updated design objectives have a role now during EIA and consenting process but also, crucially, post-consent too, when more detailed design information becomes available. The objectives will continue to guide the Project as design choices become more refined and as market and technical information becomes clearer.</p>
<p>Present draft EIA findings (based on worst-case design freeze)</p>	<p>LCA provided a detailed summary of the visual effects arising from the Project, beginning with an overview of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The ZTV mapping illustrated the geographical extent within which turbines may be visible, highlighting variation in effects across Colonsay, Oronsay, Islay, Mull, Iona and Jura.</p> <p><u>Visual Effects</u></p> <p><i>Colonsay and Oronsay (12-21 km from WDA)</i> LCA summarised that significant visual effects are expected for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents in small coastal communities on Colonsay (Viewpoints 14 and 15); • Visitors to Oronsay (Viewpoint 13); • Road users on parts of the B8085, B8086 and B8087 (Viewpoint 14); • Recreational receptors using the Core Path network (C045, C046, C047, C048); including Viewpoint 16; and • People travelling between Colonsay and Islay on the Colonsay–Port Askaig ferry (Viewpoint 9). <p>PMA confirmed to EKN that the distance to Colonsay visualisation viewpoints is approximately 14 km.</p> <p><i>Islay (15–48 km from WDA)</i> Significant visual effects are predicted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents in small coastal communities including Kilchoman (Viewpoint 3); • Road users on parts of the B8017 and B8018 and the wider local road network (Viewpoint 5); • Recreational users along the north-west coast of Islay and in elevated inland locations (Viewpoints 1, 2, 4, 7); and • Users of the Core Path network in northwest Islay (C057, C512, C058, C054, C511, C055, C056, C061). <p><i>Mull and Iona (20 km to >60 km from WDA)</i> Significant effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents and visitors to Iona, including Baile Mòr, the summit of Dun I (Viewpoint 22) and travellers on the ferry across the Sound of Iona (Viewpoint 21); • Recreational receptors on Erraid (Viewpoint 20); and • Core Path users on Iona (C483, C484) and Mull (C040, C041). <p><i>Jura (27–52 km from WDA)</i></p>

ITEM	MINUTES
	<p>Significant effects predicted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People at Loch Tarbert (Viewpoint 10); and • People at the Paps of Jura (Viewpoint 11). <p><u>Night-Time Effects</u></p> <p>LCA presented night-time visual effects and showed example images from Kilchoman on Islay (confirmed by EKN to be approx. 21 km from the WDA).</p> <p>Significant effects from turbine aviation and marine navigation lighting are expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and coastal character at Colonsay, Oronsay and Islay; • Visual receptors at Islay (Viewpoints 1–5), the Colonsay to Islay ferry (Viewpoint 9), Oronsay (Viewpoint 13), Colonsay (Viewpoints 14, 15, 16), and parts of Mull (Viewpoints 20, 21, 22). <p>EKN asked about lighting requirements. LCA explained that aviation lighting largely applies to perimeter turbines. EKN noted that previous work indicated lighting is not expected to extend more than ~5 km offshore and that marine navigation lighting requirements are lower. EKN acknowledged they may revisit this topic following the planned site visit due to concerns raised by residents and visitors regarding lighting at night now that there are more operational offshore windfarms across Scotland.</p> <p>The discussion expanded to lighting spacing. EKN asked whether perimeter lighting must be on every turbine. LCA confirmed that spacing must meet minimum requirements. PMA added that lighting schemes may be negotiable depending on turbine spacing and overall windfarm size, but any reduction is subject to CAA approval. EKN acknowledged that it can be negotiated closer to the build out of the Project and queried whether lighting was incorporated into one of the design objectives; KWI confirmed it was. EKN requested future engagement with SPR and CAA post-consent regarding lighting strategy. DMS noted that CAA guidance exists on reduced lighting and EKA reiterated that NatureScot would welcome the opportunity influence reduced lighting and be part of these conversations. KWI thanks EKN and acknowledged that this was helpful for the Project to be aware of.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Coastal Character</u></p> <p>LCA provided a detailed summary of the landscape and coastal character effects arising from the Project, beginning with an overview of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The ZTV mapping illustrated the geographical extent within which turbines may be visible in relation to landscape character types.</p> <p><i>Colonsay and Oronsay</i></p> <p>Significant effects on landscape/coastal character occur along west-facing slopes and summits and north/south-facing coasts along The Strand, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCT 49 - Island Mixed Farmland • LCT 58 - Sand Dunes and Machair • CCA 9 - Kiloran Bay to Eilean Dubh • CCA 11 - West Colonsay • CCA 12 - The Strand (Colonsay/Oronsay) • CCA 13 - Oronsay <p><i>Islay</i></p> <p>Significant effects identified from the north-west-facing coast between Coul Point and Rubha a' Mhail, extending inland to hills between Loch Gorm and Ardnave:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCT 49 - Island Mixed Farmland • LCT 58 - Sand Dunes & Machair

ITEM	MINUTES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCT 48 - Lowland Bog & Moor • LCT 41 - Plateau Moorland (Argyll) • CCA 18 - Sgairail (Islay) • CCA 20 - Ardnave Point to Rhinns Point (Islay) <p><i>Mull and Iona</i> Significant effects identified for east Iona, west Ross of Mull and Sound of Iona:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCT 49 - Island Mixed Farmland • LCT 44 - Boulder Moors • CCA 5 - Sound of Iona • CCA 7 - Ross of Mull South <p><i>Jura</i> Significant coastal character effects on the west coast of Jura:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCA 14 - Rubha an t-Sailein to Glendebadel Bay • CCA 15 - Loch Tarbert (Jura NSA) <p><u>Designated Landscapes (using NatureScot Guidance)</u></p> <p>LCA provided a detailed summary of the landscape and coastal character effects arising from the Project, beginning with an overview of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The ZTV mapping illustrated the geographical extent within which turbines may be visible in relation to designated sites.</p> <p><i>National Scenic Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jura NSA - significant effects on Special Landscape Qualities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Inaccessible Loch Tarbert” - “Distinctive Paps of Jura” - “Large tracts of wild land” • Loch na Keal, Isle of Mull NSA - no significant effects on SLQs • Scarba, Lunga and the Garvellachs NSA - no significant effects on SLQs <p><i>Local Landscape Areas (LLAs)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North and West Islay (Coast) LLA - significant effects • Central, South and West Mull LLA - significant effects <p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>LCA noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant landscape character effects up to 20 km generally, and up to ~35 km on Jura's more sensitive west coast; • Significant visual effects on receptors up to 39 km; • Significant effects on Jura NSA SLQs; • All findings based on a worst-case scenario (WCS) layout; and • Post-consent refinement through design objectives will seek to reduce WCS effects. <p>LCA invited questions; none were raised.</p> <p>KWI noted the importance of understanding that NSAs cannot be considered in isolation, and effects must be interpreted holistically. KWI also acknowledged the need to strike a balance between project requirements, design objectives and the impacts on different NSAs when developing the objectives through, to reduce the impact on nationally significant landscapes overall.</p>

ITEM	MINUTES
	<p>KWI asked NatureScot whether they had views on which areas should be prioritised for further refinement. EKN welcomed SPR's commitment to reduce impacts, noting where to make reductions requires more internal discussions as, although the assessment represents a WCS, the varying nature and visitor experience of different NSAs means further thought is required. NatureScot recognises that this exercise has not been undertaken for offshore developments yet. EKN requested the slides to enable discussion with NatureScot directors. Action: SPR to share slides with NatureScot post-meeting.</p> <p>DSM added that this meeting had been delayed to enable the team to refine the assessment so that a more robust and honest picture could be presented. EKN welcomed this and stated that the process had been robust, noting it was helpful to see SPR's process, however NatureScot need time to provide a response.</p>
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>KWI provided a summary of the next steps for the Project, noting that the design strategy, including all current design objectives, will be submitted alongside the consent applications planned for April / early May 2026. These design objectives will continue to shape the Project beyond submission, informing the more detailed design work that will occur post-consent.</p> <p>KWI explained that, if the Project is consented, engagement with NatureScot will continue throughout the post-consent design phase, such as discussions on the lighting and marking plan.</p> <p>During this stage, the design will undergo a more detailed refinement process. Key post-consent tasks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical surveys, which will be critical in defining site constraints and determining the buildable area, foundation options, and cable routing; • Detailed engineering design, geotechnical analysis and supply-chain engagement, with stakeholder discussions held in advance of discharging relevant conditions; • Supply-chain engagement, which will identify economically viable infrastructure solutions. • Once site constraints and infrastructure parameters are fully understood, the Design Objectives will guide the final layout, ensuring effects on nationally important landscapes are reduced as far as reasonably practicable. • The final design will be documented and submitted through management plans for stakeholder review (including the Design Specification and Layout Plan, Lighting & Marking Plan, and the Design Statement). <p>EKN sought clarification regarding activity during the determination period, asking whether there would be any further refinement to the project envelope during this phase. KWI emphasised that the post-consent period is the point at which more detailed refinement occurs, not the submission-to-determination window.</p> <p>EKN noted the concern that NatureScot must resource the review of the application and provide guidance and would not want to be placed in a situation where ongoing design changes complicate their role. KWI confirmed that no significant refinement to the project envelope is anticipated between submission and determination. The first major trigger point for design evolution will be the geotechnical survey, which is not expected to take place until 2028. Until this ground-condition information is available, there is little scope for meaningful refinement.</p> <p>KWI reassured NatureScot that the design envelope will remain stable during determination, avoiding the risk of conflicting positions or shifting baselines. EKN noted they were reassured to hear this, as they had concerns around resourcing and wished to avoid being drawn into iterative design discussions during the application review period.</p> <p>EKN then raised a query regarding Aircraft Detection Lighting Systems (ADLS), noting uncertainty about whether ADLS was being considered solely for the onshore components</p>

ITEM	MINUTES
	<p>or for offshore turbines as well. KWI confirmed that a range of lighting mitigation measures are being explored. KWI explained that ADLS is an area of growing interest and has been deployed on offshore windfarms projects in other European countries, such as Germany, and could form part of a negotiated lighting strategy, subject to aviation safety requirements. There may be scope for a reduced lighting scheme, but this would depend on the CAA's position and the layout of perimeter turbines.</p> <p>EKN highlighted that lighting strategy will also be of importance to the ornithology team, who will need to consider effects of lighting on movements and behaviour of storm petrel and manx shearwater. NatureScot welcomed the indication that mitigation options could be explored and encouraged early discussions with CAA post-consent. EKN asked to be included in these conversations, as lighting has been a source of concern for residents and visitors. KWI noted that proposed developments off the north and west coast have commissioned a study exploring the ornithological implications of offshore lighting systems and confirmed that SPR will update NatureScot separately on that workstream.</p>
<p>Discussion and AOB</p>	<p>KWI highlighted the actions assigned to SPR, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulating the slides and minutes to NatureScot for review and approval; • Adding explanatory text in the project design strategy on the rationale behind being unable to commit to a specific turbine-parameter at this point in time, and outlining that the Project will consider all turbine models available on the market at the procurement stage if it is economically viable to do so, whilst noting that a balance must be struck between reducing impacts and maintaining a competitive, deliverable project; • Submitting the project design strategy alongside the WDA consent application; • Continuing collaborative engagement with NatureScot during the post-consent design phase, as the Project evolves. <p>KWI then invited any other business. KMC noted an action to return with further comments on the updated design objectives and to provide feedback following NatureScot's upcoming night-time lighting site visit.</p> <p>EKN added that they would also follow up if any information from the meeting could support the consent application. EKN reiterated that continued clarity on forthcoming steps is helpful and confirmed they will update the applicant once internal discussions are complete.</p>

ID	Actions	Responsible Person
1	Adding explanatory text in the project design strategy on the rationale behind being unable to commit to a specific turbine-parameter at this point in time, and outlining that the Project will consider all turbine models available on the market at the procurement stage if it is economically viable to do so, whilst noting that a balance must be struck between reducing impacts and maintaining a competitive, deliverable project.	<u>SPR</u>
2	Circulate the slides and minutes to NatureScot for review and approval.	<u>EKA</u>
3	Review the minutes and provide comment and/or approval.	<u>KMC</u>
4	Feedback any questions / useful information following site visit to assess night-time visuals.	<u>EKN / KMC</u>
5	Return any further comments on the updated design objectives	<u>KMC</u>
6	Submit the project design strategy alongside the WDA consent application	<u>SPR</u>

ID	Actions	Responsible Person
7	Continue collaborative engagement with NatureScot during the post-consent design phase as the project evolves	<u>SPR and NatureScot</u>