Galileo 05 Limited

Lynemore Wind Farm

Additional Information Volume 1:

Non-Technical Summary & Overview

663991 (00)

JANUARY 2026

GALILEO EMPOWER

RSK

Table of Contents

1.1 INTRODUCTION 1
Background 1
Summary of Revised Proposed Development 1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS AI REPORT 1
1.3 CONSULTATION RESPONSES 2
1.4 AI LAYOUT 3
1.5 BACKGROUND TO THE NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY AND REVISED PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 5
1.6 ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICES 13
Current Public Notice and Consultation 13
Availability of the AI Report 13
Representations 13

TABLES

Table 1 Design Elements and Key Changes 4
Table 2. Summary of Changes between AI Layout and EIA Layout 5

1.1 Introduction

Background

1.1.1 On 1st May 2025, Galileo 05 Limited (the Applicant) submitted an application to the Energy Consents Unit (ECU) of the Scottish Government under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 in respect of the proposed Lynemore Wind Farm, in the Highland Council area, and also requested a direction under section 57(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 that planning permission for the development be deemed to be granted.

1.1.2 The application was accompanied with the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIA Report). The installed capacity of the Proposed Development station exceeded 50 MW, comprising up to 14 wind turbines, with a maximum ground to blade tip height of 200 m along with a battery energy storage system.

1.1.3 Following the consultation process and subsequent discussion, the Applicant proposes to alter the design of the proposed Lynemore Wind Farm by reducing the number of turbines and redesigning sections of the Proposed Development.

1.1.4 In addition to this AI Report, the Applicant has had further engagement with ECU and consultees in the form of

- Online meetings with NatureScot and SEPA
- Correspondence (and further information issued) with NatureScot and SEPA
- Response to Findhorn Fisheries in response to concerns
- Ongoing engagement with aviation stakeholders including HIAL and CAA in relation to safeguarding concerns and aviation lighting requirements
- Correspondence with Community Councils including a formal response to key themes in objections to be submitted following the publication of this Additional Information Report.

Summary of Revised Proposed Development

1.1.5 The Revised Proposed Development has reduced the number of turbines from 14 to 12, while the tip height remains up to 200 m. Seven turbines have been relocated within 44 to 85 m from their location in the EIA layout, and the access tracks have been re-designed. Although having a reduced number of turbines translates into a reduced energy generation capacity, the Revised Proposed Development would still be in excess of 50 MW. Further detail in relation to the design changes is provided in **AI Chapter 4.**

1.2 Purpose of this AI Report

1.2.1 The Applicant has prepared this Additional Information (AI) which includes substantive information relating to the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development as amended ("Revised Proposed Development"). The AI will be published in accordance with Regulation 20 of the EIA Regulations. The Revised Proposed Development is described within **Chapter 2** of this AI Report.

1.2.2 This AI Report has been prepared to address specific consultation responses and to ensure that the assessment of likely significant effects remains up-to-date in accordance with the EIA Regulations. This document considers and assesses the difference between the environmental effects assessed in the EIA Report and describes the changes to likely significant effects of the Revised Proposed Development. Given the nature of updated information, not all chapters of the EIA Report require to be updated. Cumulative effects are considered in each chapter as appropriate. Any changes to environmental commitments are referenced in technical chapters

1.3 Consultation Responses

1.3.1 The following Statutory Consultees responded to the EIA application:

- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- NatureScot
- Transport Scotland

1.3.2 The Highland Council agreed an extension to provide their response on receipt of this AI application.

1.3.3 The following Non-Statutory Consultees provided a response to the EIA application:

- British Horse society
- BT
- Defense Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)
- Fisheries Management Scotland
- Findhorn District Salmon Fishery Board
- Health and Safety Executive
- Highland and Islands Airport (holding objection)
- Joint Radio Company
- Moray Council
- NATS Safeguarding
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
- ScotWays
- Scottish Water
- Strathnairn Community Council
- Strathdearn Community Council

1.3.4 Where consultees have objected or provided responses with concerns regarding specific EIA factors, these have been referenced and addressed in the respective chapter of this AI Report.

1.3.5 In relation to specific issues and concerns raised by Strathdearn and Strathnairn Community Councils as well as public representations, Galileo have prepared a report responding the main themes raised. This report will be issued to relevant parties following submission of the AI application and Galileo will continue to engage with the community so that the decision to amend the layout by removing two turbines and revising the proposed access route is fully understood.

1.4 AI Layout

1.4.1 The Revised Proposed Development with the reduced number of turbines is shown in **AI Figure 2.5**

1.4.2 The Revised Layout has been through the following changes:

- Turbines have decreased from 14 to 12, removing turbines T04 and T05.
- Turbines T02, T06, T07, T11, T12 and T13 have been relocated.
- Track location has changed according to the new location of the turbines.
- The route of access from the A9 has been moved to the southeast so that the length of track has reduced and the distance from the nearest properties has increased.
- The number of proposed construction compounds has been reduced from two to one.
- Of the 7 watercrossings proposed in the EIA layout, 5 were removed and 2 different ones were added in Revised Proposed Development, reducing the total number of water-crossings from 7 to 4.

1.4.3 The specific wind turbine manufacturer and model have not yet been selected as this would be subject to a tendering exercise and would be confirmed post consent. Where necessary, for the purposes of the EIA and this AI, a candidate turbine model, the Vestas-162, with rotor diameter of 162 m and hub height of 119 m has been used. The rotor diameter and hub height of the final selected turbine model may differ from these values, however the turbine tip height would not exceed 200 m. Given this committed maximum tip height, and the range of turbine models likely to be available and suitable for the local wind conditions, there is considered to be negligible potential for the significance of environmental effects to be different than as assessed based on the candidate turbine model.

- Overall, the maximum generating capacity for the turbines has reduced from 100.8 MW to 86.4 MW (based on a 7.2 MW turbine).
- Internal access tracks have been repositioned where required to allow for access to the revised turbine locations and a revision to the access route from the A9. Overall length of access tracks has reduced due to the removal of turbines T04 and T05 and from the change to the access route from the A9.
- Based on the energy output from the Wind Farm over the lifetime derived from the carbon calculator (9,460,800 MWh) (**AI Technical Appendix 13.1**) this would result in an annual electricity generation of 189,216 MWh, which, when divided by the average household electricity consumption of

3,447.8 KWh (Subnational Electricity Consumption Statistics, Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, 2025), would power the equivalent of 54,061 homes in Scotland.

1.4.4 Other changes are presented in **Table 1**Error! Reference source not found.

Table 1 Design Elements and Key Changes

Component	EIA Layout	Revised Layout
Turbines	14	12
Tip Heights	200 m	unchanged
No of wind turbines requiring aviation lighting	7	6
Maximum Capacity	100.8 MW	86.4 MW
Micro-siting	50 m	unchanged
Length of Access Tracks	13,112 m	10,260 m
Net tree felling	4.29 ha	0.74 ha
Access from A9	Access taken from T02 to A9	Access now taken from the A9 to T12
Proposed construction compounds	Two construction compounds proposed	One construction compound proposed
Number of Water-Crossings	7	4

1.4.5 **Chapter 4** of this **AI** submission provides more information as to the design evolution between the EIA Layout and Revised Layout.

1.5 Background to the Non-Technical Summary and Revised Proposed Development

1.5.1 A Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) was already prepared for the proposed Lynemore Wind Farm development

1.5.2 Based on the responses submitted to the Applicant by the consultees identified above, provided below in **Table 2** is a summary of the key points included in this AI Report in relation to the particular themes and topics addressed in the EIA, the difference between the environmental effects assessed in the EIA Report is described along with the changes to likely significant effects of the Revised Proposed Development. The information presented here is to supplement the information already provided in the original EIA Report and any changes to environmental commitments are referenced in each technical chapter which forms part of this **AI** submission (**Chapters 5 to 13**) and would continue to be committed to by the Applicant.

Table 2. Summary of Changes between AI Layout and EIA Layout

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
Landscape and Visual	In summary, significant landscape and cumulative effects resulting from the Revised Proposed Development would affect part of the Rolling Uplands, Inverness Landscape Character Type (LCT) within 1-3 km. The Revised Proposed Development is located within this LCT and due to the reduction in turbine numbers there would be a corresponding reduction in the direct effects on this landscape and its associated elements and characteristics. Due to the Revised Proposed Development there would no longer be any significant effects on the Farmed Strath – Inverness LCT - Stratherrick, Strathnairn Landscape Character Area (LCA). In summary, **significant visual effects resulting from the Revised Proposed Development would be limited to localised areas** within 10.5 km from the revised turbines. Significant visual and cumulative effects include the views from some residential properties at Balnafoich on the western side of Strathnairn as illustrated by Viewpoint 4; views from parts of transport routes (including the A9, B9154, and the main railway line from Inverness to Perth) and parts of recreational routes (including Core Path IN27.02; Heritage Paths 1, 2, and 3; and part of the Sustrans National Cycle Route 7). Notably the Revised Proposed Development would lead to reduced and non-significant visual effects from Inverness (including the area of Leachkin as illustrated in Viewpoint	A revised Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual** of the **AI Report**. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 5 in the EIA Report** (2025).

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
	16 and previously assessed as significant); the B861 in Strathnairn, also previously assessed as significant; and reduced visual effects on views from Culloden Battlefield and associated core paths; and views from Loch Duntelchaig, and Loch Ruthven Nature Reserve. The Revised Lighting Strategy follows the lighting strategy previously agreed with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and proposes a reduction in the number of lit turbines from seven to six. Although there would be a significant and cumulative effect on part of the 'host' Rolling Uplands – Inverness LCT, no other landscape receptors would be significantly affected and no significant visual effects from the surrounding area are predicted. Due to the Revised Lighting Strategy, there would be No View of the aviation warning lights from the Jim Savage-Lowden Observatory at Culloden.	
Ecology and Biodiversity	The baseline ecological data was reviewed to inform the design of the Revised Proposed Development, and to avoid potentially increasing adverse effects relative to the EIA Proposed Development or creating new impact pathways. As such, and in consideration of the nature of the changes to the design of the EIA Proposed Development, the potential impacts and Important Ecological Features (IEFs) examined for the Revised layout are the same as those considered in **EIA Report Chapter 6: Ecology and Biodiversity**. These comprise direct and indirect loss of habitats (blanket bog, dry dwarf shrub, flush and spring and semi-natural broad-leaved woodland) during the construction phase, and potential collision impacts to bats during the operational phase. Potential effects are identified as a result of the Revised Proposed Development alone, with cumulative effects with other wind farm developments also considered. As was the case for the EIA Proposed Development, assessment is undertaken based on the assumption of implementation of standard (embedded) mitigation and good practice measures, committed to as part of the EIA Proposed Development and applied also to the Revised Proposed Development. No significant adverse effects were predicted for the EIA Proposed Development. **No significant adverse direct and/or indirect effects on IEFs as a result of the Revised Proposed Development are anticipated**, with the potential for adverse effects for the Revised Proposed Development reduced relative to the adverse effects predicted for the EIA Proposed Development.	A revised Ecology and Biodiversity chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 6: Ecology and Biodiversity** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 6 in the EIA Report** (2025).

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
Ornithology	Potential impacts on birds have been reassessed for the Revised Proposed Development (12 turbine layout), with a comparison made to the impacts previously concluded for the EIA Proposed Development (14 turbine layout). The assessment has been undertaken for the same key species (termed 'important ornithological features' (IOFs)) and the same impacts that were included in the original assessment. Disturbance and displacement impacts have been assessed for several wader and raptor species, namely curlew, dunlin, golden eagle, golden plover, red kite and short-eared owl. As the number of turbines has been reduced and the project would occupy a smaller area than that which was originally proposed, the level of potential impact resulting from the Revised Proposed Development is the same as, or in most cases less than, those concluded for the EIA Proposed Development. Disturbance and displacement impacts during all phases of the project (construction, operation and decommissioning) are considered to be of negligible magnitude and **a conclusion of non-significant effects has been concluded for all IOFs assessed.** The impact of reducing the number of turbines proposed for the Revised Proposed Development has been reassessed following the undertaking of new 'collision risk modelling' in accordance with current NatureScot approved guidance, with details of modelling methods and the results of various modelling options presented. For the five IOFs assessed, namely dunlin, golden eagle, golden plover, red kite and white-tailed eagle, the collision risk is now lower, when compared to the EIA Proposed Development. **Collision impacts of the Revised Proposed Development have been determined as being of negligible magnitude and non-significant.** Impacts have further been assessed in an updated cumulative assessment in which other relevant projects have been included to determine the potential combined impact of wind farms on birds within the appropriate region (NHZ10: Central Highlands). The inclusion of four new wind farm projects, which have been proposed since the original impact assessment for the EIA Proposed Development was written, has led to an overall increase in cumulative collision risk for golden eagle and red kite, even though the risk from the Revised Proposed Development has decreased and it contributes to a very small proportion of the overall risk. Cumulative collision impacts for these two species are considered to be of small adverse magnitude, and non-significant. For white-tailed eagle the cumulative collision risk has also increased overall at a regional	A revised Ornithology chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 7: Ornithology** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 7 in the EIA Report** (2025).

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
	scale due to inclusion of these additional projects. For this species, cumulative collision risk is best assessed at a Scotland-wide scale but there is much uncertainty in this as there are many projects in planning (in addition to those already built or approved) that contribute to this risk, but which may not be consented. However, based on current knowledge, the cumulative collision risk to white-tailed eagle for the Revised Proposed Development is not considered sufficient to lead to national population decline and the conclusion remains that this would be of small adverse magnitude and non-significant. **The Revised Proposed Development itself poses a small collision risk and is considered to be in an area of low sensitivity for white-tailed eagle.**	
Hydrology, Geology, Hydrogeology and Peat	This chapter considers the potential significant effects on important hydrological, hydrogeological, geological and peat features associated with the Revised Development. The chapter builds upon information provided in **Chapter 8: Hydrology, Geology, Hydrogeology and Peat** of the **EIA report** and should be read in conjunction with this report. The assessment is based on baseline data from the EIA report plus additional field surveys undertaken for the Revised Development. The Revised Development has taken into consideration consultation responses given to the EIA report from March 2025. **Overall, the effects from the Proposed Development to the water and soil environment are assessed to be Minor (not significant)**	A revised Hydrology, Geology and Peat chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 8 in the EIA Report** (2025).
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	The Revised Proposed Development would result in a very slight improvement of the predicted effects upon Archaeology and Cultural Heritage set out in the **EIA Report Chapter 9**, relating to a reduction in direct (physical) impacts upon known heritage assets during construction. As no increased or additional adverse impacts to the EIA Report conclusions are anticipated, **it is concluded that the residual effects upon Archaeology and Cultural Heritage as a result of the Revised Proposed Development would be not significant**	A revised Archaeology and Cultural Heritage chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 9: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 9 in the EIA Report** (2025).
Traffic and Transport	The revised layout (AI Layout) proposed by The Applicant would result in additional vehicular movements than those estimated in the EIA Report due to the additional construction materials that are required to construct the updated infrastructure. However, the AI Layout does not change the predicted effects set out in the EIA Report,	A revised Archaeology and Cultural Heritage chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 10:**

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
	which are predicted to remain the same. Thus, the assessment of likely effects is as follows: • Prior to the implementation of mitigation, **Minor / Negligible** and **not significant** effect could be expected upon users on the A9 and A95, while a **Minor / Negligible** and **not significant** effect could be expected to be experienced by residents along the A9 and A95, specifically Aviemore and Inverness. • With the implementation of appropriate mitigation, not significant long lasting residual effects are anticipated in respect of traffic and transport issues. The residual effects on users of the A9 and A95 are assessed to be Minor/Negligible and not significant and the residual effects on residents along both roads are assessed to be **Minor / Negligible** and **not significant**. As the effects would occur during the construction phase only, they are temporary and reversible.	**Traffic and Transport** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 10 in the EIA Report** (2025).
Noise and Vibration	The significance of construction noise effects has reduced from moderate (pre-mitigation) effects to minor adverse effects for the noisiest activities closest to high-sensitive receptors, there are no other changes to the Revised Proposed Development that would introduce noisier construction equipment or bring construction activities significantly closer to residential properties than those assessed in the EIA. Construction vibration effects have reduced from minor to negligible and remain not significant, and changes in construction traffic noise remain negligible and not significant. Therefore, noise and vibration effects during the construction phase are not significant without additional mitigation and would be managed through the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Operational noise from the Revised Proposed Development layout has been assessed as there is a potential for the change in layout to result in changes in operational noise levels at noise sensitive receptors (NSRs). Operational noise predictions for the revised layout have been carried out for the same candidate turbine as the EIA, and the results compared with relevant noise limits derived in line with ETSU-R-97, '*The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms'*, and the associated guidance provided by the Institute of Acoustics (IOA) document, '*A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise'*. The same	A revised Noise chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 11: Noise** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 11 in the EIA Report** (2025).

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
	methodology as applied in **Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration** of the EIA Report has been used in this AI assessment. The results of the operational noise assessment, including potential cumulative effects inherent in the assessment, indicate that the relevant noise limits can be met and have reduced slightly at some receptors, therefore, **operational wind turbine noise effects remain not significant.** Operational noise from the proposed battery energy storage system (BESS) and the onsite substation was scoped out of the noise assessment of the EIA Report as operational noise from these on-site elements is likely to negligible at noise sensitive receptors, because of the associated separation distance, this remains the case.	
Socioeconomics	**Socio-economics** The analysis of net economic benefits from EIA Report Chapter 12 has been updated to take account of the changes to the proposed Lynemore Wind Farm (12 turbines rather than 14 turbines as previously proposed). Overall, it has been estimated that the Revised Proposed Development could generate: • Construction Phase – During the construction phase it is estimated that the Revised Proposed Development could generate up to £29.8 million GVA and 462.9 job years across Scotland (compared to £34.3 million GVA and 533.4 job years for the EIA layout), with approximately £9.4 million and 157.8 job years worth of this total directly benefitting the Highlands (compared to £10.9 million and 183.1 job years) and £1.6 million GVA and 16.7 job years in Inner Moray Firth (compared to £1.9 million GVA and 31.1 job years). • Operational Phase – Over the course of the operational phase, it is estimated that over the Revised Proposed Development 50-year lifetime, operation and maintenance costs could generate up to £107.1 million GVA and 1506.3 job years for Scotland (compared to £122.5 million GVA and 1722.4 job years), of which £77 million GVA and 1060 job years directly benefit the Highlands economy (compared to £88 million GVA and 1212.1 job years) and £28.2 million GVA and 386.9 job years for Inner Moray Firth (£32.3 million GVA and 442.4 job years).	A revised Socio-economics chapter of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 12: Socio-economics** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 12 in the EIA Report** (2025).

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
	Recreation As per AI Chapter 5, there would be no change or slight reduction in the visual effects of the Revised Proposed Development; therefore, there would be no change or slight reduction in the recreational effects of the Proposed Development, which would remain not significant. **Community Benefits** Following the removal of two turbines, there would be approximately £420,000 in community benefit per annum (compared to £490,000), equating to £21 million in community benefit funding over the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development (compared to £24.5 million). **Non-domestic Rates** Non-domestic rates would be approximately £856,127 per annum (compared to £930,383) and £42.8 million over the operational lifetime (compared to £46.5 million).	
Forestry	The purpose of this section is to review the impacts of the development AI Revised Proposed Layout on the forestry resource. The access track and construction compound for the AI Revised Layout will impact on a small area of Forestry Land Scotland woodland (approximately 0.68 ha) and minor area of ancient semi natural woodland (approximately 0.05 ha). This will result in the estimated felling of 81.4 m³ of Sitka spruce, Scots pine, lodgepole pine and birch on Forestry Land Scotland woodland land and 0.38 m³ of silver birch and juniper on the Lynemore Estate land. The potential effects of future windthrow on retained woodland following tree removal is considered of moderate risk in the Forestry Land Scotland area and insignificant on the Lynemore Eatste land. The Scottish Government's Policy on the Control of Woodland Removal will require compensatory planting equivalent to an area of woodland permanently removed. To mitigate against the impact of tree removal an area of 0.74 ha of Scots line, birch and common alder will be planted alongside the upgraded A9 trunk road.	A revised forestry section of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 13: Other Issues** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 13 in the EIA Report** (2025).

Technical Discipline	Summary of Change to Significant Effects (AI Report compared to EIA Report)	Further information:
Shadow Flicker	The Revised Proposed Development would not alter the impact assessment or conclusions presented in the EIA Report for the Proposed Development, nor would it require any additional mitigation beyond what is stated in the EIA Report	A revised shadow flicker section of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 13: Other Issues** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 13 in the EIA Report** (2025).
Climate change	The decrease from 14 turbines to 12 turbines, and peat avoidance, causes the emissions savings predicted to be delivered by the Revised Proposed Development over its 50 year operational life to decrease from 4,614,787 tCO2e in the Original EIA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Assessment to 3,735,686 tCO2e for the Revised Proposed Development against a fossil fuel mix of electricity, and from 2,481,469 tCO2e, to 1,682,692 tCO2e against a grid-mix of electricity. The offset period is predicted to change, with GHG emissions predicted to be offset from 2.8 years in the Original EIA GHG Assessment, to 3.4 years after the Revised Proposed Development becomes operational against a fossil fuel mix of electricity, and from 5.0 years, to 7.0 years against a grid-mix of electricity. The findings relating with regards to GHG emissions remain the same as those for the Original EIA GHG Assessment - the Revised Proposed Development will result in a Significant and Beneficial effect based on IEMA's Guidance to Assessing GHG Significance (2022) Framework for Assessment of Significant Effects.	A revised climate chnage section of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 13: Other Issues** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 13 in the EIA Report** (2025).
Aviation	The revised layout proposed by the Applicant does not change the predicted effects on aviation set out in the EIA Report.	A revised aviation section of the Revised Proposed Development (for 12 turbines) is reported in **Chapter 13: Other Issues** of the AI Report. It should be read in addition to the corresponding **Chapter 13 in the EIA Report** (2025).

1.6 Administrative Notices

Current Public Notice and Consultation

1.6.1 This AI is advertised in newspapers locally, The Strathspey & Badenoch Herald, Inverness Courier, and The Edinburgh Gazette, in accordance with the Electricity Act 1989, and the public notice is published on the Applicant's project website in addition to being made publicly available through the ECU.

Availability of the AI Report

1.6.2 Copies of the AI documents, including the Addendum to the Planning Statement, are available for public inspection and download, free of charge on the project website: https://lynemorewindfarm.co.uk/ or on the Scottish Government Energy Consents website at www.energyconsents.scot. Copies of the application documents, are also available for public inspection at the offices of the local planning authority, The Highland Council, at Glenurquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5NX; and at:

- The Strathdearn Hub, Tomatin, Inverness IV13 7YN.
- Farr Community Hall, Inverarnie Park, Inverness IV2 6AX

1.6.3 For additional copies, a charge of £15 will be made for a full electronic copy of this Additional Information on memory stick (USB copy). Hard copies can be made available for a £500 charge.

Representations

1.6.4 Any representation on this AI should be made directly to the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit:

Energy Consents Unit,

Scottish Government,

4th Floor 5 Atlantic Quay,

150 Broomielaw,

Glasgow G2 8LU

Email: representations@gov.scot

Web: www.energyconsents.scot/Register.aspx