ABERDEENSHIRE COUNCIL

Aberdeenshire COUNCIL

Our Ref: ENQ/2026/0062
Your Ref: 00011012 / 00011013 / 00011014 / 00011015

Ask for: Galina Fomina
Tel: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]

Scottish Government Marine Directorate
Scottish Government
Marine Laboratory
Aberdeen
AB11 9DB

28 January 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

Marine Licence Consultation for Consent Under Section 36 of The Electricity Act 1989 and Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 and Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 for the Erection of Offshore Wind Farm and Associated Infrastructure (Additional Information) at Caledonia Offshore Wind Farms (North And South), ScotWind NE4 Site, Moray Firth

Thank you for the above consultation. As the additional information provided relates to offshore development, Aberdeenshire Council has no objections or comments on it in regards to the proposed development at this time.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Paul Macari
Head of Planning and Economy

BRITISH TELECOM

From:	radionetworkprotection@bt.com
To:	MD Marine Renewables
Cc:	[Redacted]
Subject:	RE: WID14202 - MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026
Date:	23 February 2026 16:42:11
Attachments:	image002.jpg image003.png image004.jpg image005.png

---

General

-

-

OUR REF; WID14202

Thank you for your email dated 13/01/2026.

We have studied the ‘Additional Information’ provided with respect to EMC and related problems to BT point-to-point microwave radio links.

The conclusion is that, as there appears to be no change to the planned location of the Offshore Windfarm, this project should not cause interference to BT’s current and presently planned radio network.

HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS AIRPORT

Benjamin Taylor

From: Safeguarding <Safeguarding@hial.co.uk>
Sent: 25 February 2026 16:48
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: Safeguarding
Subject: Re: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Categories: Saved in eRDM
Objective: -1

OFFICIAL

Good afternoon.

HIAL has no comment to make on the additional information provided.

In regards to the impacts upon Wick Aerodrome HIAL's Holding objection still stands and HIAL continues to engage with the developer in seeking resolution.

Kind regards

Michael Balmain

Safeguarding
Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd
Inverness Airport Dalcross IV2 7JB
www.hial.co.uk

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ENVIRONMENT AND RURAL AFFAIRS

To: MD.MarineRenewables@gov.scot <MD.MarineRenewables@gov.scot>
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

ELECTRICITY ACT 1989

The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

The Electricity (Applications for Consent) Regulations 1990

MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010

The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009

The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007

APPLICATION FOR CONSENT UNDER SECTION 36 OF THE ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 AND MARINE LICENCES UNDER PART 4 OF THE MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND THE MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009 TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE CALEDONIA NORTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM, APPROXIMATELY 28 KM FROM WICK AT ITS NORTHERNMOST POINT AND 48 KM FROM BANFF AT ITS SOUTHERNMOST POINT.

AND

APPLICATION FOR CONSENT UNDER SECTION 36 OF THE ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 AND MARINE LICENCES UNDER PART 4 OF THE MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND THE MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009 TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE CALEDONIA SOUTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM, APPROXIMATELY 45 KM FROM WICK AT ITS NORTHERNMOST POINT AND 35 KM FROM BANFF AT ITS SOUTHERNMOST POINT.

MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional – Marine and Fisheries Division Response

Marine Conservation Response

We have reviewed this additional information associated with the original consultation and went back to check the original EIA scoping report. Rathlin island SPA was considered for Fulmar and Copeland Islands for Manx Shearwater. There are no further results from the Population Viability Analysis technical report attached for either species, and we remain content with the conclusions of the original EIA report.

We suggest highlighting the new evidence of Manx Shearwater returning to Rathlin Island, as this should be considered in the assessment of potential LSE.

Marine Licensing Response

Activities taking place below the mean high water springs mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009.

Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the Mean High Water Spring Tide (MHWST). It is the applicant's responsibility to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether their works will fall below the Mean High Water Springs mark.

If any parts of this proposal are on, in or over the licensable area, contact must be made with the Marine Licensing Team, DAERA Marine and Fisheries Division, Clare House, 303 Airport Road West, Sydenham Intake, Belfast, BT3 9ED, Tel: 028 90569247, Email: MarineLicensingTeam@daera-ni.gov.uk. Further guidance on the application process and associated forms are available on the DAERA website at Marine Licensing | Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND

Benjamin Taylor

From: Mary Macleod Rivett [redacted]
Sent: 16 January 2026 08:13
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Categories: Saved in eRDM

Dear Ms McGhie

Thank you for your consultation dated 13 January 2026 about the additional information provided for the proposed Caledonia North and Caledonia South Wind Farms.

Historic Environment Scotland has no further comments to make on these proposals.

Yours sincerely

Mary

Dr Mary MacLeod Rivett | Senior Planning, Consents and Advice Officer
Historic Environment Scotland | Ã€rainneachd Eachdraidheil Alba
Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH
E: [Redacted]
Pronouns: she/her
www.historicenvironment.scot
I am sending this email at a time that suits me - I do not expect a response outside normal working hours. I do not normally work on Wednesdays.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND | ÀRAINNEACHD EACHDRAIDHEIL ALBA

JOINT NATURE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Benjamin Taylor

From: JNCC Offshore Industries Advice <OIA@jncc.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 January 2026 16:01
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia OWF – Further Info - JNCC

Categories: Saved in eRDM

Good Afternoon Christine,

Thank you for consulting JNCC regarding the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm – Further Information.
JNCC's role in relation to offshore renewables in Scottish waters has been delegated to NatureScot. NatureScot is now authorised to exercise the JNCC's functions as a statutory consultee in respect of certain applications for inshore and offshore waters (0-200nm) adjacent to Scotland.
Therefore, NatureScot should provide a full response. NatureScot will contact JNCC directly if additional input is required.
As such JNCC have not reviewed this document and will not be providing further comment at this time.

Kind regards,

Jon Connon
Offshore Industries Advice Officer
Marine Management Team
JNCC, Inverdee House, Baxter Street, Aberdeen, AB11 9QA
[Redacted]
Working pattern: Monday to Friday
Website **Twitter** **Facebook** **LinkedIn**
Sign up to the JNCC Nature News monthly enewsletter

MARINE ANALYTICAL UNIT

Benjamin Taylor

From: Christopher Bradbury
Sent: 14 January 2026 11:01
To: MD Marine Renewables [Redacted]
Cc: Marine Analytical Unit; Jonathan Edosomwan; Yousaf Kanan; Peter Greene
Subject: RE: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Categories: Saved in eRDM

Hi Christine,

As noted, the additional information does not include any updates to the socio-economic information. As such, this is to confirm that the Marine Analytical Unit are providing a nil response.

Best regards,

Chris

MARITIME AND COASTGUARD AGENCY

Benjamin Taylor

From: navigation safety <navigationsafety@mcga.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 February 2026 15:14
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: RE: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Categories: Saved in eRDM

Good afternoon, Christine.

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the updated information for the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm.

We note that the additional information submitted by the developer is in regard to ornithological assessment, namely Population Viability Analysis. As this is not in regard to shipping and navigation, we will not be providing a response on this occasion. Please take this as a 'nil response' from us.

Kind regards,

Vaughan.

Vaughan Jackson
Offshore Renewables Project Lead
UK Technical Services Navigation
[redacted]

Maritime & Coastguard Agency

Maritime & Coastguard Agency
Bay 2/25, Spring Place
105 Commercial Road,
Southampton SO15 1EG

Safer Lives, Safer Ships, Cleaner Seas
www.gov.uk/mca

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Wendy Talbot
Assistant Safeguarding Manager
Ministry of Defence
Safeguarding
Defence Infrastructure Organisation
St George's House
DMS Whittington
Lichfield, Staffordshire
WS14 9PY
United Kingdom

E-mail: DIO-Safeguarding-Wind@mod.gov.uk

Application Ref: 00010861 / 00010862

Our Reference: DIO10058405

Christine McGhie
Licensing Operations Team
Marine Directorate
Scottish Government
Marine Laboratory
ABERDEEN
AB11 9DB

28 January 2026

Dear Christine

ELECTRICITY ACT 1989
The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017
The Electricity (Applications for Consent) Regulations 1990

MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010
The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009
The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007

APPLICATION FOR CONSENT UNDER SECTION 36 OF THE ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 AND MARINE LICENCES UNDER PART 4 OF THE MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND THE MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009 TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE CALEDONIA NORTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM, APPROXIMATELY 28 KM FROM WICK AT ITS NORTHERNMOST POINT AND 48 KM FROM BANFF AT ITS SOUTHERNMOST POINT.

AND

APPLICATION FOR CONSENT UNDER SECTION 36 OF THE ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 AND MARINE LICENCES UNDER PART 4 OF THE MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND THE MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009 TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE CALEDONIA SOUTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM, APPROXIMATELY 45 KM FROM WICK AT ITS NORTHERNMOST POINT AND 35 KM FROM BANFF AT ITS SOUTHERNMOST POINT.

Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on documents relating to the additional information provided by the Applicant with regard to the Caledonia North and Caledonia South Offshore Wind Farms on 13 January 2026.

The MOD have reviewed the information provided and published on the Caledonia North and Caledonia South Offshore Wind Farms Project Page of the marine.gov.scot website. We note that as there are no changes with regard to the proposed Caledonia North and Caledonia South Offshore Wind Farm project, the MOD's position previously communicated by letter dated 24 February 2025, and re-confirmed 10 November 2025, remains extant.

I trust this is clear however should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Wendy Talbot
Assistant Safeguarding Manager

Natural England

Date: 25 Feb 2026
Our ref: 538270
Your ref: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013

Licensing Operations Team
Marine Directorate
Scottish Government
Marine Laboratory
Aberdeen
AB11 9DB

Tyneside House,
Skinnerburn Road,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne,
NE4 7RA

0300 – 060 3900

Via email only

Dear MDLOT

MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – In-combination Population Viability Analysis

Summary of advice

- Natural England do not consider the in-combination effects of Caledonia will have a meaningful contribution to declining populations of English Special Protection Areas.

Thank you for seeking our advice on the additional information provided by Ossian Offshore Wind Farm Limited in support of their Section 36 Application to construct and operate the Ossian Offshore Wind Farm (OWF), in your consultation which we received on the 13th of January 2026.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

The advice contained within this letter is provided by Natural England, which is the statutory nature conservation body within English territorial waters (0-12 nautical miles). As the application is located outside English territorial waters then the advice from NatureScot, the statutory nature conservation body in offshore Scottish waters should be sought.

Due to our remit, our advice on this consultation is restricted to species within England and to protected species from English designated sites which may be impacted by the proposed wind farm.

We provide our advice based on the following documents:

- Cover letter
- PVA technical note
- PVA Screening tool

Detailed Advice

Without prejudice to any future advice, we do not consider the in-combination effects of Caledonia will have a meaningful contribution to declining populations of English Special Protection Areas.

Other Relevant Matters

Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again.

To provide the further information requested in this advice and for subsequent consultations, please email consultations@naturalengland.org.uk, marked for my attention. Please also cc me.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Cantrell

Senior Officer
Northumbria Marine Team
Email: [redacted]

NATURESCOT

NatureScot
Scotland's Nature Agency
Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba

Marine Directorate
Scottish Government
Marine Laboratory
Aberdeen
AB11 9DB

25 February 2026

Our ref: CNS – REN – OWSF – NE4 – Caledonia - Application

Dear Sir/Madam,

CALEDONIA NORTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM & CALEDONIA SOUTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO THE APPLICATIONS FOR CONSENT UNDER SECTION 36 OF THE ELECTRICITY ACT 1989 AND MARINE LICENCES UNDER PART 4 OF THE MARINE (SCOTLAND) ACT 2010 AND THE MARINE AND COASTAL ACCESS ACT 2009 TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE CALEDONIA NORTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM AND CALEDONIA SOUTH OFFSHORE WIND FARM

Thank you for consulting us on the Additional Information submitted for the proposed Caledonia North Offshore Wind Farm and Caledonia South Offshore Wind Farm. This follows on from the original Application consultation on 04 December 2024, and the first Additional Information consultation on 17 October 2025.

The Caledonia North proposal, located approximately 28km from Wick, includes a project design envelope comprising up to 77 fixed wind turbines, associated infrastructure, and a proposed 35-year lease. The Caledonia South proposal, located approximately 45 km from Wick, includes a project design envelope comprising up to 78 wind turbines (up to 39 of which may be floating and the remainder fixed), associated infrastructure, and a proposed 35-year lease. Caledonia North and Caledonia South combined will not exceed 140 wind turbines and will have an installation capacity of 2 GW.

The second Additional Information includes information relating to the in-combination Population Viability Analysis (PVA) work undertaken by Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia to take account of the respective revised ornithology assessments.

We have reviewed the Additional Information, along with the relevant documents submitted with the original EIA Report and first Additional Information submission and provide advice below.

NatureScot advice

In-combination PVA for Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia

Overall, we are content with the approach taken for the in-combination assessment. However, there are various points relating to the Cumulative Effects Framework (CEF) PVA selection tool spreadsheet and supporting report, which we raise in Appendix A to this response, to assist future Applicants in the interpretation of the spreadsheet and use in future assessments.

Our detailed conclusions on the PVA outputs are presented in Appendix A to this response.

For the qualifying species and sites listed below, we have concluded AEoSI in-combination for Caledonia with Ossian and/or Muir Mhòr wind farm projects:

- Kittiwake at Copinsay SPA
- Puffin at Forth Islands SPA
- Puffin at Hoy SPA
- Puffin at North Caithness Cliffs SPA
- Kittiwake at Rousay SPA

Based on our assessment and conclusions reached above, we advise Marine Directorate will be required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment.

In Appendix A, we also provide an updated summary table of in-combination conclusions of AEoSI and comparison with previous advice.

We hope this advice is helpful. Please contact Jenna Turner [Redacted] in the first instance for any further advice, copying in our marine energy mailbox – marineenergy@nature.scot.

Yours sincerely,

Erica Knott

Head of Marine Energy – Sustainable Coasts and Seas.

Contents

NATURESCOT ADVICE ON MUIR MHÒR OFFSHORE WIND FARM

Appendix A – Marine and intertidal ornithology

In our advice dated 15 December 2025, we highlighted an issue with the in-combination assessment, stemming from Muir Mhòr, Caledonia and Ossian submitting Additional Information at a similar time to each other. Assessments within the respective Additional Information submissions were based on the latest publicly available information, however, this information was out of date given all three projects had submitted revised ornithology assessments within their Additional Information. As such, individual project numbers used within the in-combination assessments may differ and we requested additional/updated PVAs for certain sites and species.

This consultation has provided an updated in-combination assessment for Muir Mhòr, Caledonia and Ossian, using the updated assessment figures for the three respective projects and the existing mortalities collated by the North East and East Ornithology Group (NEEOG) Cumulative Effects Framework (CEF) work. We note an issue in the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet relating to the inclusion of compensated projects for the in-combination assessment, which we discuss further in A.1.2.2 below.

As indicated in our response to the Muir Mhòr first Additional Information Report (dated 18 November 2025), Muir Mhòr only presented an in-combination scenario which included full, uncompensated impacts from Berwick Bank (and Green Volt), as this was the agreed position at the time. However, Caledonia and Ossian have independently opted to remove Berwick Bank (and Green Volt) compensated impacts from the individual assessments presented within their first Additional Information (see our advice dated 02 December 2025 and 15 November 2025 respectively). This joint in-combination work has removed any projects that have compensated impacts (including Berwick Bank) through the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet. We highlight this difference in approach to Scottish Ministers for consideration.

A.1 Approach to in-combination assessment

We note that each of the three projects (Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia) undertook their in-combination PVAs on the basis that if the individual project alone mortalities were less than 0.2 birds/annum then a PVA was not required. This was based on the advised threshold for tangible impacts from the project and the requirement for PVA at the time of the Applicants' assessment.

We no longer recommend the use of this threshold because of the increasing number of features and sites where AEoSI was being concluded in-combination and the concern that even small additional mortalities could have a detrimental effect, particularly on already declining or small populations. Currently, we advise consulting NatureScot if mortalities are less than 0.2 birds/annum and the increase in adult mortality equals or exceeds 0.02 percentage points.

Given the change in advice, we highlight where the 0.2 birds/annum threshold would not have been reached, for consideration by MD-LOT:

- Kittiwake at Copinsay SPA for Ossian and Caledonia
- Kittiwake at Fair Isle SPA for Muir Mhòr and Ossian
- Kittiwake at Marwick Head SPA for Muir Mhòr and Ossian
- Kittiwake at Rousay SPA for Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia
- Puffin at Hoy SPA for Muir Mhòr.

The in-combination counterfactuals for all the above features, except kittiwake at Marwick Head, are significantly low and all these populations are in serious decline. Therefore, we considered it important that PVAs were undertaken for these features, despite the low project alone mortalities.

These PVAs have been presented within this consultation, so no further information from the Applicants is required in this instance.

A.1.1 Approach to screening SPA qualifying features

We have reviewed the accompanying Additional Information for MD-LOT report (issue D, dated 12 December 2025), and note that the description of the process does not fully align with the steps in the In-combination PVA selection tool spreadsheet. Additionally, the numbered bullet points in Section 2.1 of the report do not fully align with the fuller description of the steps in the report either. We recommend the wording is revised if relied upon for future assessments. Please also note the following additional aspects as set out below that should also be addressed.

We have identified an error in the wording of Step 4 of the PVA screening approach in Section 2.1 of the report, whereby it states, "**Include** only SPA qualifying features where an Adverse Effect on Site Integrity has been concluded, and compensation is proposed, by at least one of the Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia projects." We highlight that 'include' should actually be 'exclude'. This reflects the approach originally taken in the PVA screening tool.

However, we previously expressed concern with this approach which would prevent the impacts of two uncompensated projects from being screened into the PVA assessment if they exceed the relevant threshold. This is likely only a possibility in a scenario where one project reached AEoSI in the project-alone assessment and has committed to compensating for its impacts, and both of the other two projects have connectivity and predicted impacts on that same feature. Therefore, with the compensated project impacts zeroed, there is still the potential for the other projects to cause AEoSI in-combination.

Similarly, it appears there may be an error in the following paragraph: "Finally, it is not possible to conclude **no** Adverse Effect on Site Integrity in-combination if one (or more) of the Muir Mhòr, Ossian or Caledonia projects alone have already concluded an Adverse Effect on Site Integrity (and are proposing compensation for that SPA qualifying feature) within their respective project Reports to Inform Appropriate Assessments (RIAAs). Consequently, fifteen SPA qualifying features were removed due to an existing Adverse Effect on Site Integrity (and proposed compensation) from one, or more, of Muir Mhòr, Ossian or Caledonia". Our understanding is that this should read "Finally, it is not possible to **conclude Adverse Effect on Site Integrity** in-combination" to be consistent with the earlier statements.

Muir Mhòr were advised in a meeting in December 2025 that a PVA for guillemot at Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA may have been missed based on this approach as the Muir Mhòr RIAA and AEI concluded no AEoSI for this feature. As a result of our advice on the AEI submission, Muir Mhòr have now concluded AEoSI from their project on guillemot at Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA. Along with the existing AEoSI conclusion for Ossian, this means two of the three projects in question will now compensate their impacts to this feature. Thus, in our view, an in-combination PVA is not required for the project-alone impacts of Caledonia, noting that this is based on NatureScot conclusions, as the Appropriate Assessment has not yet been completed.

We believe that the approach taken in the in-combination PVA assessment has not excluded any in-combination PVAs because of these differences as there are no scenarios that would allow this to occur. We do however wish to flag the issues with the wording of this approach, in the case that any future applicants may refer to this report to inform their own assessments.

A.1.2 CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet

Whilst we accept the Cumulative Effects Framework (CEF) PVA selection tool spreadsheet submitted as part of this Additional Information, we highlight various points to assist future Applicants in the interpretation of the spreadsheet and use in future assessments.

A.1.2.1 Razorbill non-breeding

In the 'RA Non-Breeding' sheet of the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet, Fowlsheugh SPA winter passage is entered twice. Instead, one set of winter impacts should be for Troup, Pennan and Lion's Heads SPA and this applies to all projects listed.

As a result, there is also an error in the 'Summary' sheet of the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet. The corrected impact values in column C should be 90.56664719 for Fowlsheugh SPA and 18.34788324 for Troup, Pennan and Lion's Heads SPA.

However, as neither SPA was taken through to the PVA stage, there are no implications for our advice for Caledonia, although future Applicants should be made aware of this when using the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet.

A.1.2.2 Kittiwake non-breeding

In the 'KI Non-Breeding' sheet of the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet, for East Caithness Cliffs SPA in both autumn and spring migration seasons, and for both collision and displacement impacts, the value for column M 'Project consented and committed to all compensation' was set to 'Y' for almost all projects, so all impacts were set to zero. The only Scottish projects which should have been set to 'Y' (i.e. consented projects with requirement for compensation) and have impacts zeroed are:

- Berwick Bank
- Green Volt
- Salamander
- West of Orkney

Please note, we have not reviewed the non-Scottish projects in this column, however, it is likely that most of the projects listed have also been incorrectly set to 'Y' and zeroed.

This affects the non-breeding season total impact for East Caithness Cliffs SPA and the annual total impact. However, East Caithness Cliffs SPA was not taken through to the PVA stage, so there are no implications for our advice for Caledonia. Changing column M to 'N' for the affected projects would resolve this issue and future Applicants should be made aware of this when using the CEF PVA selection tool spreadsheet.

A.2 Summary of Additional Information in-combination conclusions

Our assessments of AEoSI are primarily based on the PVA Counterfactual of Population Size (CPS) outputs, after 35 years (2067). However, in reaching our conclusions we also consider a range of other factors including:

- counterfactual of Population Growth Rate (CGR) outputs and the % decrease in population growth rate
- status of the population including short and long-term trends, at SPA, national and UK levels
- condition of the feature
- species ecology
- proportional importance of species in Scotland and UK
- impacts of HPAI and other recent mortality events.

PVAs were undertaken for the following impact pathways:

- collision
- distributional responses
- collision and displacement combined for gannet and kittiwake.

*Table A-1. Summary of in-combination assessment for Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia where PVA has been undertaken for this Additional Information. Conclusions of AEoSI are bolded. *no project alone mortality for Ossian. **no project alone mortality for Muir Mhòr.*

Special Protection Area (SPA)	**Qualifying species**	**CPS (35 years)**	**CGR (35 years)**	**Determination of AEoSI**
Cape Wrath	Kittiwake*	0.978-0.970	0.999-0.999	No AEoSI
Copinsay	Kittiwake**	0.822-0.747	0.995-0.992	**AEoSI**
Fair Isle	Gannet	0.970-0.942	0.999-0.998	No AEoSI
	Puffin*	0.985-0.963	1.00-0.999	No AEoSI
Forth Islands	Puffin	0.913-0.834	0.997-0.995	**AEoSI**
Hermaness, Saxa Ford & Valla Field	Gannet	0.964-0.923	0.999-0.998	No AEoSI
Hoy	Puffin*	0.928-0.812	0.998-0.994	**AEoSI**
Marwick Head	Kittiwake	0.941-0.916	0.998-0.998	No AEoSI
North Caithness Cliffs	Puffin*	0.773-0.655	0.993-0.988	**AEoSI**
North Rona & Sula Sgeir	Gannet	0.992-0.985	1.00-1.00	No AEoSI
Noss	Gannet	0.967-0.934	0.999-0.998	No AEoSI
Rousay	Kittiwake	0.652-0.531	0.988-0.983	**AEoSI**
Sule Skerry & Sule Stack	Gannet	0.918-0.910	0.998-0.997	No AEoSI

A.3 Individual SPA assessments from Additional Information

A.3.1 Cape Wrath SPA

*Table A-2. PVA results for Cape Wrath SPA. *no project alone mortality for Ossian.*

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Kittiwake*	0.978-0.970	0.999-0.999	No AEoSI

We conclude No AEoSI for kittiwake at Cape Wrath SPA, considering:

- the high CPS value, representing only a small population decline of up to 3%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of only 0.1%.

We note the population decline of 65% between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count and the unfavourable condition of the feature. However, we consider this is outweighed by the high counterfactual values, along with the minimal contribution of the project to the in-combination mortality.

A.3.2 Copinsay SPA

*Table A-3. PVA results for Copinsay SPA. **no project alone mortality for Muir Mhor.*

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Kittiwake**	0.822-0.747	0.995-0.992	AEoSI

For kittiwake at Copinsay SPA we conclude AEoSI, considering:

- the significantly low CPS value representing a population decrease of up to 25%
- a decrease in population growth rate of up to 0.8%
- 78% population decline between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count
- the recent impact of HPAI resulting in a further 69% decline in population (Tremlett *et al.* 2024[1])
- the unfavourable condition of the feature.

A.3.3 Fair Isle SPA

*Table A-4. PVA results for Fair Isle SPA. *no project alone mortality for Ossian.*

Species	CPS	CPS	Determination of AEoSI
Gannet	0.970-0.942	0.999-0.998	No AEoSI
Puffin*	0.985-0.963	1.00-0.999	No AEoSI

For gannet at Fair Isle SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 5.8%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of only 0.2%

[1] Tremlett, C.J., Morley, N., and Wilson, L.J. (2024). UK seabird colony counts in 2023 following the 2021-22 outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza. RSPB Research Report 76. RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, SG19 2DL.

- the increasing population between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count and only a 3% decline following HPAI.

For puffin at Fair Isle SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 3.7%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of only 0.1%

We note that the population decline of 56% between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count and the unfavourable condition of the feature but, given the high counterfactual values, we do not consider the project would make a significant contribution to further decline.

A.3.4 Forth Islands SPA

Table A-5. PVA results for Forth Islands SPA.

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Puffin	0.913-0.834	0.997-0.995	AEoSI

For puffin at Forth Islands SPA we conclude AEoSI, considering:

- the significantly low CPS value for the high displacement scenario, representing a population decrease of 16.6%
- a decrease in population growth rate of up to 0.5%
- 39% population decline between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count, despite the favourable condition of the feature.

A.3.5 Hermaness, Saxa Vord & Valla Field SPA

Table A-6. PVA results for Hermaness, Saxa Vord & Valla Field SPA.

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Gannet	0.964-0.923	0.999-0.998	No AEoSI

For gannet at Hermaness, Saxa Vord & Valla Field SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 7.7%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of only 0.2%
- the increasing population between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count of 89%, though we note a 37% decline following HPAI (Tremlett et al 2024).

A.3.6 Hoy SPA

*Table A-7. PVA results for Hoy SPA. *no project alone mortality for Ossian.*

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Puffin*	0.928-0.812	0.998-0.994	AEoSI

For puffin at Hoy SPA we conclude AEoSI, considering:

- the significantly low CPS value for the high displacement scenario, representing a population decrease of 18.8%
- a decrease in population growth rate of up to 0.6%

- 32% population decline between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count
- the unfavourable condition of the feature.

A.3.7 Marwick Head SPA

Table A-8. PVA results for Marwick Head SPA.

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Kittiwake	0.941-0.916	0.998-0.998	No AEoSI

For kittiwake at Marwick Head SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 8.4%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of only 0.2%.

We note that the population decline of 84% between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count and the unfavourable condition of the feature, but a population increase of 59% was recorded in 2023 (Tremlett et al 2024). However, the counterfactual values are not of concern and the project contribution to the in-combination totals is minimal.

A.3.8 North Caithness Cliffs SPA

*Table A-9. PVA results for North Caithness Cliffs SPA. *no project alone mortality for Ossian.*

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Puffin*	0.773-0.655	0.993-0.988	AEoSI

For puffin at North Caithness Cliffs SPA we conclude AEoSI, considering:

- the very low CPS values representing a population decline of up to 34.5%
- a decrease in population growth rate of up to 1.1%
- a 56% decline in the population between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count.
- the unfavourable condition of the feature.

A.3.9 North Rona & Sula Sgeir SPA

Table A-10. PVA results for North Rona & Sula Sgeir SPA.

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI
Gannet	0.992-0.985	1.00-1.00	No AEoSI

For gannet at North Rona & Sula Sgeir SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 1.5%
- the high CGR value, with no decrease in population growth rate
- the increasing population between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count of 33%, though we note a 23% decline following HPAI
- the favourable condition of the feature.

A.3.10 Noss SPA

Table A-11. PVA results at Noss SPA.

Species	CPS	CGR	Determination of AEoSI

Gannet	0.967-0.934	0.999-0.998	No AEoSI

For gannet at Noss SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 6.6%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of only 0.2%
- the increasing population between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count of 59%, though we note a 10% decline following HPAI (Tremlet et al 2024).

A.3.11 Rousay SPA

Table A-12. PVA results for Rousay SPA.

Species	**CPS**	**CGR**	**Determination of AEoSI**
Kittiwake	0.652-0.531	0.988-0.983	AEoSI

For kittiwake at Rousay SPA we conclude AEoSI, considering:

- the very low CPS value representing a population decrease of up to 47%
- a decrease in population growth rate of up to 1.7%
- 88% population decline between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count
- the unfavourable condition of the feature.

A.3.12 Sule Skerry to Sule Stack SPA

Table A-13. PVA results for Sule Skerry to Sule Stack SPA.

Species	**CPS**	**CGR**	**Determination of AEoSI**
Gannet	0.918-0.910	0.998-0.997	No AEoSI

For gannet at Sule Skerry to Sule Stack SPA we conclude No AEoSI, considering:

- the high CPS values, representing only a small population decline of up to 9%
- the high CGR value, representing a decrease in population growth rate of up to 0.3%
- the stable population between Seabird 2000 and Seabirds Count
- the favourable condition of the feature.

A.4 Summary of in-combination conclusions from all NatureScot responses

Table A-14 includes a summary of final NatureScot advice on the in-combination conclusions of AEoSI across all consultations for Caledonia, including the original application, first Additional Information submission and second (current) Additional Information submission. This should supersede previous NatureScot advice, where relevant.

As indicated above, for the conclusions below that are based on the first Additional Information submission, Caledonia has independently opted to remove Berwick Bank (and Green Volt) compensated impacts from their individual assessments. This differs to the approach taken by Muir Mhòr. We highlight this difference in approach to Scottish Ministers for consideration.

Table A-14. Summary of in-combination conclusions of AEoSI and comparison with previous advice: original Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) from 04 December 2024, first Additional Information Report (AIR) from 17 October 2025, second

*Additional Information Report (AIR) from this consultation. Conclusions of AEoSI are bolded. *no project alone mortality for Ossian. **no project alone mortality for Muir Mhòr.*

Special Protection Area (SPA)	**Qualifying species**	**CPS (35 years) (PDO)**	**Source (original EIAR, first AIR, second AIR)**	**Determination of AEoSI (PDO)**
Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast	Guillemot	0.951-0.879	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Kittiwake	0.918-0.887	First AIR	**Unable to conclude no AEoSI**
Calf of Eday	Guillemot	-	First AIR	No AEoSI
Cape Wrath	Puffin	-	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Kittiwake*	0.978-0.970	Second AIR	No AEoSI
Copinsay	Great black-backed gull	0.135 (PDO) 0.141 (North)	First AIR	**AEoSI** (PDO & North)
		0.986 (South)		No AEoSI (South)
	Guillemot	0.984	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Kittiwake**	0.822-0.747	Second AIR	**AEoSI**
East Caithness Cliffs	Guillemot	0.843-0.724	First AIR	**AEoSI**
	Razorbill	0.869-0.750	First AIR	**AEoSI**
	Kittiwake	0.857-0.775	First AIR	**AEoSI**
Fair Isle	Gannet	0.970-0.942	Second AIR	No AEoSI
	Puffin*	0.985-0.963	Second AIR	No AEoSI
Forth Islands	Puffin	0.913-0.834	Second AIR	**AEoSI**
	Gannet	0.876-0.825	First AIR	**AEoSI**
	Kittiwake	0.917-0.873	First AIR	**Unable to conclude no AEoSI**
Foula	Puffin	-	First EIAR	No AEoSI
Fowlsheugh	Kittiwake	0.906-0.870	First AIR	**Unable to conclude no AEoSI**
Hermaness, Saxa Ford & Valla Field	Gannet	0.964-0.923	Second AIR	No AEoSI
Hoy	Guillemot	0.990-0.981	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Puffin*	0.928-0.812	Second AIR	**AEoSI**
	Great black-backed gull	-	First AIR	**See Sections A.4.2.1 and A.7 of First AIR**
Marwick Head	Guillemot	0.982	Original EIAR	No AEoSI (with & without BB)
	Kittiwake	0.941-0.916	Second AIR	No AEoSI
North Caithness Cliffs	Guillemot	0.945-0.900	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Razorbill	0.975-0.938	First AIR	No AEoSI

	Puffin*	0.773-0.655	Second AIR	**AEoSI**
	Kittiwake	0.936-0.897	First AIR	**Unable to conclude no AEoSI**
North Rona & Sula Sgeir	Gannet	0.992-0.985	Second AIR	No AEoSI
Noss	Gannet	0.967-0.934	Second AIR	No AEoSI
Rousay	Guillemot	-	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Kittiwake	0.652-0.531	Second AIR	**AEoSI**
St Abb's Head to Fast Castle	Kittiwake	0.923-0.884	First AIR	**Unable to conclude no AEoSI**
Sule Skerry & Sule Stack	Guillemot	0.586	First AIR	**AEoSI**
	Puffin	0.990	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Gannet	0.918-0.910	Second AIR	No AEoSI
Troup, Pennan and Lion's Head	Guillemot	0.961-0.916	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Razorbill	0.965-0.912	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Kittiwake	0.864-0.822	First AIR	**AEoSI**
West Westray SPA	Guillemot	0.989	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Razorbill	0.967-0.925	First AIR	No AEoSI
	Kittiwake	0.882-0.798	First AIR	**AEoSI**

A.4.1 *Seabird assemblage features*

For those SPAs which have a seabird assemblage feature, where we have concluded AEoSI for at least one named species of the seabird assemblage, then the same conclusion is reached for the seabird assemblage feature.

NatureScot conclusions for seabird assemblage features are included below to update those provided within our previous advice.

For the seabird assemblage feature (and named species) we therefore **conclude AEoSI in-combination** at:

- Copinsay SPA (kittiwake, great black-backed gull for PDO and North)
- East Caithness Cliffs SPA (kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill)
- Forth Islands SPA (gannet, puffin)
- Hoy (puffin, great black-backed gull)
- North Caithness Cliffs SPA (puffin)
- Rousay SPA (kittiwake)
- Sule Skerry & Sule Stack SPA (guillemot)
- Troup, Pennan and Lion's Heads SPA (kittiwake)
- West Westray SPA (kittiwake)

For the seabird assemblage feature (and named species) we are **unable to conclude No AEoSI in-combination** at:

- Buchan Ness to Collieston Coast SPA (kittiwake)
- Forth Islands SPA (kittiwake)
- Fowlsheugh SPA (kittiwake)
- North Caithness Cliffs SPA (kittiwake)
- St Abbs Head to Fast Castle SPA (kittiwake)

NORTHERN LIGHTHOUSE BOARD

Benjamin Taylor

From: Adam Lewis [redacted] on behalf of navigation <navigation@nlb.org.uk>
Sent: 13 January 2026 15:30
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: [EXT] MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Categories: Saved in eRDM

Good afternoon,

NLB have no comment to provide with regard to this ornithological update.

Regards

Adam

Adam Lewis
Coastal Inspector
Northern Lighthouse Board

[redacted]

ORKNEY ISLANDS COUNCIL

Benjamin Taylor

From: Marine Planning <marine.planning@orkney.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 February 2026 11:59
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026

Categories: Saved in eRDM
Objective: -1

Classification: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Dear Christine,

Thank you for sending through the additional information on ornithology. OIC Marine Planning have no further comments to add.

Kind regards,
Danny

Danny Morris | Marine Planner
Development and Marine Planning | Planning and Regulatory Services
Infrastructure and Organisational Development | Orkney Islands Council
[redacted] OIC Marine Planning

ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF BIRDS

RSPB Scotland Response to Caledonia OWF Additional Information Report

March 2026

The Caledonia Additional Infomation Report addresses the need for in-combination PVAs across Muir Mhòr, Ossian and Caledonia identified by NatureScot.

The in-combination PVA screening identifies 16 SPA qualifying features, covering gannet, kittiwake and puffin across multiple SPAs. At each of these the % change in adult survival exceeded the 0.02% threshold. While these SPAs were previously identified as having connectivity, they were not identified as having AEoSI.

Having reviewed the PVA results included in the Additional Information Report we would flag seven SPAs where the estimated in combination impact is of concern (Table 1). These SPAs are estimated to have reductions in population size of up to *ca.* 50% over 30 years when many populations are already declining.

Table 1. Summary of focal species counterfactual of population size (CPS) and associated confidence intervals (CI) for Special Protection Areas (SPAs) identified during revised scoping. CPS relate to NatureScot "High" Impact Scenario in combination with consented developments and relate to combined collision (kittiwake) and displacement (all species) impacts after 30 and 50 years.

Species	SPA	CPS 30y	CI	CPS 50y	CI
Guillemot	Sule Skerry	0.910	0.875-0.947	0.877	0.838-0.918
Kittiwake	Copinsay	0.747	0.617-0.906	0.667	0.544-0.815
	Fair Isle	0.812	0.697-0.948	0.748	0.636-0.879
	Rousay	0.531	0.439-0.639	0.414	0.338-0.506
Puffin	Forth Islands	0.834	0.810-0.856	0.777	0.748-0.803
	Hoy	0.812	0.572-1.130	0.750	0.468-1.170
	North Caithness Cliffs	0.655	0.579-0.734	0.555	0.472-0.653

Table 2. Summary of species population count and percentage change since last census for selected SPA populations taken from the Seabirds Count database

Species	SPA	Population	Unit	% change
Guillemot	Sule Skerry	9000	Individuals	-21%
Kittiwake	Copinsay	955	Apparently Occupied Nests	-78%
	Fair Isle	448		-95%
	Rousay	330		-88%
Puffin	Forth Islands	42923	Apparently Occupied Burrows	-39%
	Hoy	430		n/a
	North Caithness Cliffs	3039		-56%

Analysis

1. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising

from distributional change associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Guillemot at the Sule Skerry SPA declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.996 and 0.998. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 87.5 and 94.7% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

2. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising from distributional change associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Kittiwake at the Copinsay SPA declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.987 and 0.996. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 61.7 and 90.6% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

3. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising from distributional change and collision mortality associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Kittiwake at the Fair Isle SPA declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.991 and 0.998. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 69.7 and 94.8% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

4. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising from distributional change and collision mortality associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Kittiwake at the Rousay SPA declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.978 and 0.987. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 43.9 and 63.9% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

5. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising from distributional change associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Puffin at the Forth Islands SPA

declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.994 and 0.996. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 81.0 and 85.6% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

6. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising from distributional change associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Puffin at the Hoy SPA declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.985 and 1.000. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 57.2 and 113.0% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

7. Within the range of likely mortalities derived using the methods advocated by NatureScot, Marine Scotland Science and the RSPB during scoping, the impacts arising from distributional change associated with Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm in combination with other North Sea wind farms (including Ossian and Muir Mhòr) are predicted to result in the annual population growth rate of Puffin at the North Caithness Cliffs SPA declining with a ratio of impacted to unimpacted population growth rate of between 0.985 and 0.991. This means that after the 30-year lifetime of the Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm, the population size of the SPA is expected to be between 57.9 and 73.4% of what it would have been in the absence of the development.

SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AGENCY

Benjamin Taylor

From: Planning.North <Planning.North@sepa.org.uk>
Sent: 15 January 2026 19:00
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: PCS-20007754 SEPA Response to MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013

Categories: Saved in eRDM

To Whom It May Concern,

Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017
MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013
Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms Approximately 28KM from Wick at its Northmost Point and 48KM from Banff at its Southmost Point

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

In addition, please also refer to our SEPA standing advice for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and Marine Scotland on marine consultations available here.

If there is a significant site-specific issue, not addressed by our guidance or other information provided on our website, with which you would want our advice, then please reconsult us highlighting the issue in question and we will try our best to assist.

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

Kind regards,
Aden McCorkell
Senior Planning Officer

sepa Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Buidheann Dìon Àrainneachd na h-Alba
For the future of our environment

SCOTTISH FISHERMEN'S FEDERATION

Benjamin Taylor

From: [redacted]
Sent: 25 February 2026 12:53
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms – Further Additional Information Submission - Consultation – Response Required by 25 February 2026
Attachments: Outlook-_Users_ali

Categories: Saved in eRDM

Hi Christine,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the statutory consultation regarding MS-00011014/ MS-00011015/ MS-00011012/ MS-00011013 Further Additional Information Submission for Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms. After reviewing the materials provided, we have no comments or suggestions to offer at this time. Please consider this as a formal response indicating no comments from Scottish Fishermen's Federation.

I would appreciate confirmation of receipt of this email for our audit purposes.
Regards,
Oliwia

Oliwia Biros
Offshore Consents Assessments Manager

Scottish Fishermen's Federation
24 Rubislaw Terrace | Aberdeen | AB10 1XE
[redacted] | sff.co.uk
Follow us: Facebook | Twitter

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND

Benjamin Taylor

From: Iain Clement
Sent: 29 January 2026 14:15
To: MD Marine Renewables
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: EIA - Caledonia Offshore Wind Farm Limited – Additional Information Submission - TS Consultation Comments - 29-Jan-26

Categories: Needs to be saved

FAO Christine McGhie

Afternoon Christine,

Thank you for the opportunity for Transport Scotland to comment on the Additional Information (AI) submitted in support of the Caledonia North and South Offshore Wind Farms. Transport Scotland was consulted on the EIAR prepared by Ocean Winds and provided comment in our letter dated 13th February 2025. In this, we sought Conditions be placed upon any consent that may be granted.

Having reviewed the AI, I note that this comprises revised in-combination ornithology assessments which have no bearing on the potential impact on the trunk road network. As such, Transport Scotland has no comment to make on the AI itself, and I can confirm that the conclusions of our previous response remain valid.

Kind regards,

Iain

Development Management
Roads Delivery & Operations

transport.gov.scot

Transport Scotland, 177 Bothwell Street, Blythswood New Town, Glasgow, G2 7ER

Transport Scotland, the national transport agency
Còmhdhail Alba, buidheann nàiseanta na còmhdhail