

**The Town and Country Planning  
(Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland)  
Regulations 2017**

**Scoping Opinion of South Ayrshire Council  
for the proposed extension to an existing permission for  
mineral extraction and processing at Barbae Quarry,  
approximately 5km south east of Girvan, South Ayrshire**

**Scoping Opinion reference:  
Date of issue:**

**18/SCO/01  
13<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

*south*  
**AYRSHIRE**  
COUNCIL



## **Contents**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Description of the development**
- 3. Planning policy context**
- 4. Consideration of alternatives**
- 5. Landscape implications**
- 6. Cumulative effects**
- 7. Aviation**
- 8. Nature conservation designations**
- 9. Soils**
- 10. Hydrology and Hydrogeology**
- 11. Forestry**
- 12. Built and cultural heritage resources**
- 13. Tourism/Recreation and public access resources**
- 14. Access issues**
- 15. Traffic and transportation**
- 16. Noise**
- 17. Mitigation and monitoring measures**
- 18. Consultation responses**
- 19. Conclusions**

**Appendix A – Comments received by consultees**



## **1. Introduction**

South Ayrshire Council received a request on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2018 under Regulation 17(1) of *The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impacts Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017* (hereafter 'the Regulations') for a scoping opinion in respect of a proposed extension to an existing permission for mineral extraction and processing (to include the formation of a dedicated haul road) at Barbae Quarry, approximately 5km south east of Girvan, South Ayrshire and accessed via the C13 Pinmore Road from the site's east side. The purpose of this scoping opinion is to provide the applicant with details of what the planning authority considers to be the main issues upon which the EIA report should focus.

In preparing this scoping opinion the planning authority has consulted with a range of agencies (both statutory and non-statutory) providing them a copy of the applicant's submitted EIA scoping report dated August 2018. Each consultee provided a response relating to their own particular remit. The responses of the consultation authorities are set out within Appendix A. Please note the responses submitted by the consultation authorities form an integral part of the scoping opinion and should therefore be read in full.

As evidenced by the wide range of consultees there are numerous matters associated with this proposal which require to be addressed within the EIA report. This cover note summarises what the Council considers to be the issues upon which there will be likely significant effects, and therefore those upon which the EIA report should focus accordingly.

## **2. Description of the development**

The subject of this scoping opinion is the existing hard rock quarry at Barbae, an operational development whose status and workings originate from planning consent reference A/488/Q dating to December 1948. Latterly a Review of Old Minerals Permissions (ROMP) undertaken and subsequently approved on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2016 applied a modern suite of planning conditions in respect of which all current site development operations now take place. Planning permission for mineral extraction at the site presently endures to an expiry date of 31 December 2014.

The existing permitted quarry comprises approximately 6.5 hectares of ground whilst the area of mineral extraction comprises circa 2.5 hectares. The proposal at hand engenders further mineral extraction undertaken by way of existing drill and blast methods to extend the working area by a further 6ha approximately, to be achieved by pushing the existing quarry faces back in a westerly direction. Consequently the development in extended form as proposed does not qualify as Schedule 1 development under The Regulations, insofar as the relevant threshold of a 25 ha site surface (Schedule 1(19)) is not met. Whilst the developer Breedon Group acknowledges same it has itself determined its proposal to constitute EIA development with reference to consideration of the potential impacts, and elected to submit its scoping request accordingly.

Barbae Quarry is located approximately 5km south-east of the town of Girvan, South Ayrshire. Barbae Quarry is adjacent to another existing quarry at Tormitchell, with the operational Assel Valley wind farm situated to the near west – immediately north of which lies the consented Tralorg wind farm – and the operational Hadyard Hill wind farm situated to the north east. The site is accessed via the C13 Pinmore Road which runs directly to the east of the site. Barbae Quarry is contained within the Landscape Character Type referenced *17c: Foothills with Forestry and Wind Farms*, comprising an upland landscape. It occupies an area within a relatively sparse, enclosed upland valley floor and its worked area encroaches upon and necessarily alters an expanse of the hillside of Barbae Hill which is itself fairly prominent in its immediate surroundings from both northern and southern approaches. The site is bounded by agricultural land and forestry to the south and by upland grazing/farmland to the north and east.

## **3. Planning policy context**

In developing the proposal and preparing the EIA report, particular regard should be afforded to the relevant provisions of both Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) (2014) and the adopted South Ayrshire Local Development Plan (LDP) (2014); the SPP states that the planning system should minimise the impacts of extraction on local communities, the environment and the built and natural heritage. The LDP

identifies the site as lying within both its Spatial Strategy's Carrick Investment Area and the plan-designated Scenic Area. As such the following LDP policies are considered applicable:

- LDP policy: spatial strategy (cf. Carrick investment area)
- LDP policy: sustainable development
- LDP policy: protecting the landscape
- LDP policy: minerals and aggregates

There are no statutory natural or built heritage designations within or bounding quarry site, however there are numerous archaeological trigger zones adjacent to the site, particularly within wooded land to the south of Barbae Hill. It is noted the developer has already consulted West of Scotland Archaeology Service in connection with the Scoping Report's Cultural Heritage Appraisal and it is expected that a continuation of this dialogue will demonstrably inform the ensuing EIA report.

#### **4. Consideration of alternatives**

Regulation 5(2) of the 2017 Regulations requires the EIA report to include information on the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer (relevant to the development and its specific characteristics) and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment. In cognisance of this proposal forming an extension to an existing operational development it is envisaged that this would be a relatively brief exercise in this instance.

#### **5. Landscape implications**

The EIA report should assess the landscape implications of the proposed development using the most up-to-date methods and best practice and should include a detailed description of the landscape as it currently exists, explicitly inclusive of impacts on the LDP-designated scenic area within which the site wholly sits. It is noted and welcomed that the developer intends an LVIA to form part of the EIA report.

Whilst the quarry in its current extent has been operational at Barbae for a considerable amount of time, further landscape implications arising from the proposal's lateral expansion of works are inevitable. Scottish Natural Heritage have confirmed their view that a full landscape character and visual impact assessment is appropriate in this instance. They advise this should be inclusive of a fully descriptive and mapped account of baseline landscape conditions (including acknowledgement and appropriate response to the LDP-designated Scenic Area coverage) and the assessment methodology should reflect the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.* (Landscape Institute / IEMA, 2013). See the consultation response from SNH (Appendix A) for further information.

#### **6. Cumulative effects**

The EIA report should include an assessment of the cumulative effects of the proposed development. This should give focus upon and a clear account of cumulative effects as assessed to arise both broadly speaking and with particular attention to the proposal entailing lateral expansion of worked areas; the intensification of noise, vibration, dust generation and traffic as compounded by the extended workings over and above the existing site and neighbouring operations at Tormitchell; and indeed the intensified interrelationship of the operations between Barbae and Tormitchell as exemplified by the proposed haul road and the intent to process additional winnings from Barbae itself off-site at Tormitchell.

#### **7. Aviation**

There are no aviation concerns associated with this proposal.

#### **8. Nature conservation designations and biodiversity**

As noted, there are no European or National nature conservation designations within or immediately bounding the site. However, the local provisionally designated Water of Assel wildlife site lies 0.1km to the south of the application site. As the provisional designation interest in this instance is a botanical interest comprising diverse plant communities on calcareous soil (thus static rather than migratory), and

given the westward proposed expansion of workings does not increase proximity; connectivity between and impacts of the proposal upon the provisional site are considered to be limited. This should however be given account in the EIA report for completeness and the avoidance of doubt.

SNH further note the Laggan Burn SSSI sits within 2km of the site boundary, designated for its Caradoc-Ashgill Earth Science feature. Woodend Loch SSSI lies just over 2km from the boundary and is designated for its Llandovery Earth Science feature. SNH consider there is no connectivity between the development site and these designated sites, and therefore statutory designated sites can be scoped out of the assessment.

On the matter of protected species, SNH require that further surveys are carried out where suitable habitat exists, and where a survey has not been completed in the last 18 months. SNH expect to see the results of these surveys in the EIA report. Regarding bats, SNH agree the proposed survey work and likewise expect to see the results in the EIA report. All such survey work should conform to SNH best practice guidance found online. Identification of impacts on protected species will warrant a species protection plan in each instance which must form part of the EIA report.

SNH wish to see the EIA report demonstrate how habitat survey results have informed the design and layout process to avoid direct impacts to and fragmentation of habitats and, where same is unavoidable, Habitat Management Plans setting out restoration and compensation measures should be included in the EIA report.

## **9. Soils**

The application site does not contain any prime quality agricultural land. Much of the damage caused to the soil by quarrying operations has already taken place through the consenting of the development some years ago and there are no significant concerns in this regard in terms of the issues to be covered within the EIA report.

## **10. Hydrology and hydrogeology**

The EIA report should assess the baseline water environment on site, including groundwater, and identify all aspects of site work that might impact on it and in turn impact those dependent elements of the immediate and neighbouring baseline environment (eg. habitat, etc). In particular SEPA require that the EIA report features spatial analyses incorporating inter alia, a Site Management Plan identifying pollution prevention / environmental management measures, disruption to GWDTE, and groundwater abstractions. Please refer to the consultation responses from both SNH and SEPA (Appendix A) for more information in this regard.

## **11. Forestry**

The developer's Scoping Report does acknowledge the proposed haul road route will cross and thus impact on a narrow band of open broadleaf woodland habitat situated north of Tormitchell. Clarification should be made within the EIA report that consequential losses of specimens will be minimised, in conjunction with proposals advanced for compensatory and broader landscape screening proposed in respect of the haul road. It is acknowledged the tree cover to be affected falls into neither ancient woodland nor semi-natural woodland inventories.

Notwithstanding, it is noted SNH advise that If tree felling/woodland clearance is required as part of the proposed development, the developer should contact Forestry Commission Scotland at an early stage to discuss the Control of Woodland Removal Policy and the implications it may have on the development. Outcomes of this dialogue should be clarified within the EIA Report. Furthermore, where felling is proposed SEPA require the EIA report includes a map identifying boundary felling and proposals for the waste timber.

## **12. Built and cultural heritage resources**

Dinvin Motte, a scheduled monument, is the sole designated heritage asset within a 3km radius of the site, situated approximately 2.8km to the south-west. There are three listed buildings between 3-4km to the south-west and south-east of the site however due to the topography of the area in conjunction with these distances there are no significant concerns in this regard, and the EIA Report's appraisal of these subjects is expected to be a brief exercise in this instance.

Historic Environment Scotland advise the proposed development will not have significant impacts on their particular statutory interests and are therefore content for impacts on cultural heritage within their remit to be scoped out of the assessment. Their full consultation response refers (Appendix A).

With regard to archaeology WoSAS express contentment that the developer's Cultural Heritage Appraisal appendix gives an accurate account of (visible) archaeological baseline conditions. Their consultation response reiterates and elaborates mitigation requirements in respect of the historic field system removal the proposal entails. The EIA report should set out a mitigation strategy in accordance with WoSAS' advice.

## **13. Tourism/recreation and public access resources**

There are no significant concerns in this regard.

## **14. Access issues**

The EIA report should contain details of the access arrangements during the operational life of the site. This process should be used in order to identify any adverse impacts upon the surrounding environment, including the potential for congestion on the surrounding road network and diffuse impacts upon the more distant trunk road network, and any subsequent mitigation measures which could be employed in order to avoid or reduce any potentially adverse effects.

## **15. Traffic and transportation**

The EIA report should assess the impact of vehicular activity associated with the operation of the site upon the public road network in terms of the effects on traffic management, road safety /layout and road condition. The EIA report should contain details of the routes considered for the delivery and export of materials and impacts upon the road network. The EIA report should address access issues, particularly those impacting upon the trunk road network, potential stress points at junctions and approach roads.

Whilst Transport Scotland note that they do not engage at scoping stage they confirm they would respond to the planning application if formally consulted by the planning authority.

## **16. Noise**

The EIA report should explore potential impacts upon sensitive receptors in terms of noise and vibration during the proposed operational life of the site. The applicant is advised to give consideration to undertaking a noise impact assessment and vibration assessment as part of the EIA report as this information will be required in support of a consequent planning application.

## **17. Mitigation and monitoring measures**

With reference to the requirement under regulation 5(3) for the EIA report to contain a description of measures mitigating likely significant adverse effects, the planning authority strongly encourages that the EIA report is structured to include a bespoke chapter itemising all mitigation and monitoring measures – specifically relating to likely significant adverse effects – proposed in the application as submitted, in a consolidated and methodical fashion. This could be presented for example in the form of tabulated lists.



## **18. Consultation responses**

A consultation exercise has been conducted with relevant consultees. All responses received together form Appendix A to this document. The issues raised within each of these responses should be carefully considered and addressed within the EIA report. Responses from the following organisations and services were received:

- Dumfries and Galloway Council
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES)
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Scottish Water (NB. Copy only of old response to application 16/00430/ROMP)
- South Ayrshire Council – Sustainable Development (Biodiversity)
- Transport Scotland
- West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS)

## **19. Conclusions**

The content of this scoping opinion makes it clear that there are a number of issues which can be scoped out of the assessment process. The main concerns relate to potential implications for the water environment (including groundwater), landscape and visual impact and protected species / habitat impact. The consultation responses of both SEPA and SNH (Appendix A) are of particular relevance in this regard.

However as highlighted elsewhere within this document there are a number of other environmental issues also relevant to the proposal and the EIA report comprises an opportunity to address these in a proportionate manner.

**Appendix A – Comments received by consultees**

Your Ref:

Our Ref: 18/1233/CNA

Date: 27 August 2018

Ben Horwill  
South Ayrshire Council  
Burns House  
Burns Statue Square  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT

**Dumfries & Galloway Council**  
**Economy, Environment & Infrastructure**  
Development Management  
Kirkbank  
English Street  
Dumfries  
DG1 2HS

Any enquiries please contact  
**Case Officer:** Chris McTeir  
**Direct Line:** 01387 260830  
**Mobile:** 07919 300801  
**Email:** [chris.mcteir@dumgal.gov.uk](mailto:chris.mcteir@dumgal.gov.uk)  
**Website:** [www.dumgal.gov.uk/planning](http://www.dumgal.gov.uk/planning)

**Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997**  
**Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland)**  
**Regulations 2013**

**PROPOSAL: EXTENSION TO EXISTING QUARRY AND DEDICATED HAUL ROAD**  
**LOCATION: Barbae Quarry, Girvan, South Ayrshire**

Dear Mr Horwill,

I refer to your e-mail of 9 August 2018 in connection with the preparation of a Scoping response for the above noted proposal.

I can confirm that Dumfries and Galloway Council have no comments to make.

Should you require any further information please contact Chris McTeir on the above number.

Yours faithfully,

**Robert Duncan**  
Team Leader (Major Applications)



HISTORIC  
ENVIRONMENT  
SCOTLAND

ÀRAINNEACHD  
EACHDRAIDHEIL  
ALBA

**By email to: [ben.horwill@south-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:ben.horwill@south-ayrshire.gov.uk)**

Ben Horwill  
Planning Assistant South Ayrshire Council  
Burns House  
Burns Statue Square  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT

Longmore House  
Salisbury Place  
Edinburgh  
EH9 1SH  
Enquiry Line: 0131-668-8716  
HMConsultations@hes.scot  
Our ref: AMN/16/SQ  
Our case ID: 300030675  
24 August 2018

Dear Mr Horwill

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017  
Barbae Quarry Extension  
Scoping Report

Thank you for your consultation which we received on 09 August 2018 about the above scoping report. We have reviewed the details in terms of our historic environment interests. This covers world heritage sites, scheduled monuments and their settings, category A-listed buildings and their settings, inventory gardens and designed landscapes, inventory battlefields and historic marine protected areas (HMPAs). Your archaeological and cultural heritage advisors will also be able to offer advice on the scope of the cultural heritage assessment. This may include heritage assets not covered by our interests, such as unscheduled archaeology, and category B- and C-listed buildings. In this case, you should contact the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS).

**Proposed Development**

I understand that the proposed development comprises the expansion of the existing permission for mineral extraction and processing at Barbae Quarry. It is anticipated that the reserves within the current planning permission boundary will be extracted within the next 4-5 years, and that quarrying will need to be expanded in order to remain operational until December 2042 when planning permission for extraction expires.

**Scope of assessment**

The proposed development will not have significant impacts on our interests. We are therefore content for impacts on cultural heritage within our remit to be scoped out of the assessment.

**Further information**

Guidance about national policy can be found in our 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment' series available online at [www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/legislation-and-guidance/managing-change-in-the-historic-environment-guidance-notes](http://www.historicenvironment.scot/advice-and-support/planning-and-guidance/legislation-and-guidance/managing-change-in-the-historic-environment-guidance-notes). Technical advice is available on our Technical Conservation website at <http://conservation.historic-scotland.gov.uk/>.

We hope this is helpful. Please contact us if you have any questions about this response. The officer managing this case is Samuel Fox and they can be contacted by phone on 0131 668 8668 or by email at [samuel.fox@hes.scot](mailto:samuel.fox@hes.scot).

Yours sincerely **Historic Environment Scotland**

**From:** Toby Wilson [mailto:Toby.Wilson@rspb.org.uk]  
**Sent:** 27 August 2018 09:12  
**To:** Horwill, Ben  
**Subject:** RE: Consultation request under EIA Regs (2017) Regulation 17

Hi Ben

Thanks very much for the information. Having looked at the Scoping Report, I don't think this development will be of concern to us and have no comments to make.

Kind regards  
Toby

**Toby Wilson**  
Senior Conservation Officer

**South and West Scotland Regional Office** RSPB Scotland, 10 Park Quadrant, Glasgow G3 6BS  
**Tel** 0141 3319096  
**Mobile** 07813125295  
*Please note that I do not work on Fridays*

[rspb.org.uk](http://rspb.org.uk)

**Let's give nature a home** in Scotland



Our ref: PCS/160675  
Your ref:

If telephoning ask for:  
Simon Watt

Ben Horwill  
South Ayrshire Council  
Planning and Building Control  
Burns House  
Burns Statue Square  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT

28 August 2018

By email only to: [planning.development@south-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:planning.development@south-ayrshire.gov.uk)

Dear Sir

**The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017**  
**Proposed extension to an existing permission for mineral extraction and processing**  
**Barbae Quarry, Girvan, South Ayrshire**

Thank you for consulting SEPA on the scoping opinion for the above proposal by your email received on 09 August 2018.

**Advice to the planning authority**

We consider that the following key issues must be addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment process. To avoid delay and potential objection, the information outlined below and in the attached appendix must be submitted in support of the application.

- a) Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications.
- b) Map of proposed surface water drainage layout.
- c) Map of proposed water abstractions including details of the proposed operating regime.
- d) Map of proposed waste water drainage layout.
- e) Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers.
- f) Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers.
- g) Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals.
- h) Map and table detailing forest removal.
- i) Quarry Site Management Plan of pollution prevention measures.

j) Map of proposed restoration measures.

Further details on these information requirements and the form in which they must be submitted can be found in the attached appendix. We have also provided comments in the following section on the Scoping Report (dated August 2018).

## **1. Site specific comments**

1.1 We have reviewed the Scoping Report and can confirm that we are satisfied with the scope of the proposed groundwater and surface water assessment (as set out in Section 3.3). We note that checks have already been carried out for Private Water Supplies (none detected) and that a National Vegetation Classification (NVC) survey has been carried out for potential groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE). Further advice on what information we expect in relation to these issues is available in Sections 3 and 4 of the attached appendix.

1.2 We note that the report indicates that it is unlikely that groundwater be intercepted. The applicant should be aware that if groundwater is intercepted and dewatering is required this will require to be undertaken in line with General Binding Rules (GBRs) 2 and 15 of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) (CAR). Abstraction of groundwater in quantities greater than 10m<sup>3</sup>/day will require a CAR permit depending on the scope and duration of the works and provide an appropriate water features survey with an appropriate radius as set out in our regulatory method on licencing groundwater abstractions including dewatering. Details should be provided of how any dewatering will be managed, the amount of groundwater proposed to be abstracted and the anticipated timescales.

1.3 It is noted that Japanese knotweed was found on site and we recommend that a specialist contractor is employed to remove this to prevent the spread of this invasive non-native species through any operational activities at the site. Additional guidance on this matter is available within On-site management of Japanese Knotweed and associated contaminated soils and Biosecurity and management of invasive non-native species for construction sites and Controlled Activities.

1.4 We note that appropriate references have been made to waste reduction and on-site re-use within the natural resource usage and waste chapter of the report (as set out in Section 3.12). With regards to site restoration we recommend that the strategy proposed for the site be developed in line with the restoration proposals in the previous review of old mineral permissions application (16/00430/ROMP). At that time it was proposed to encourage areas of M18 and M23 habitat to develop although it wasn't clear how this vegetation was to be encouraged. If this is to remain the strategy for the extended site we request that the submission clarify whether this will be a natural process or whether the areas will be seeded/planted and how the wetland will be created.

## **Regulatory advice for the applicant**

### **2. Regulatory requirements**

2.1 Please note that any mobile plant (e.g. for crushing/screening/grading etc) used at the site will need to be suitably permitted as per the requirements of the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regulatory regime.



2.2 A Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) construction site licence will be required for management of surface water run-off from a construction site, including access tracks, which:

- is more than 4 hectares,
- is in excess of 5km, or
- includes an area of more than 1 hectare or length of more than 500m on ground with a slope in excess of 25°

See SEPA's Sector Specific Guidance: Construction Sites (WAT-SG-75) for details. Site design may be affected by pollution prevention requirements and hence we strongly encourage the applicant to engage in pre-CAR application discussions with a member of the regulatory services team in your local SEPA office.

2.3 Below these thresholds you will need to comply with CAR General Binding Rule 10 which requires, amongst other things, that all reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that the discharge does not result in pollution of the water environment. The detail of how this is achieved may be required through a planning condition.

2.4 Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice for the applicant can be found on the Regulations section of our website. If you are unable to find the advice you need for a specific regulatory matter, please contact a member of the regulatory services team in your local SEPA office at 31 Miller Road, Ayr KA7 2AX (Tel: 01292 294 000).

If you have queries relating to this letter, please contact me by telephone on 01698 839 000 or e-mail at [planning.sw@sepa.org.uk](mailto:planning.sw@sepa.org.uk).

Yours faithfully

Simon Watt  
Senior Planning Officer  
Planning Service

#### *Disclaimer*

*This advice is given without prejudice to any decision made on elements of the proposal regulated by us, as such a decision may take into account factors not considered at this time. We prefer all the technical information required for any SEPA consents to be submitted at the same time as the planning or similar application. However, we consider it to be at the applicant's commercial risk if any significant changes required during the regulatory stage necessitate a further planning application or similar application and/or neighbour notification or advertising. We have relied on the accuracy and completeness of the information supplied to us in providing the above advice and can take no responsibility for incorrect data or interpretation, or omissions, in such information. If we have not referred to a particular issue in our response, it should not be assumed that there is no impact associated with that issue. For planning applications if you did not specifically request*

*advice on flood risk, then advice will not have been provided on this issue. Further information on our consultation arrangements generally can be found on our website planning pages.*

## **Appendix 1: Detailed scoping requirements**

This appendix sets out our scoping information requirements. There may be opportunities to scope out some of the issues below depending on the site. Evidence must be provided in the submission to support why an issue is not relevant for this site in order **to avoid delay and potential objection.**

If there is a delay between scoping and the submission of the application then please refer to our website for our latest information requirements as they are regularly updated; current best practice must be followed.

We would welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft submission. As we can process files of a maximum size of only 25MB the submission must be divided into appropriately named sections of less than 25MB each.

### **1. Site layout**

1.1 All maps must be based on an adequate scale with which to assess the information. This could range from OS 1: 10,000 to a more detailed scale in more sensitive locations. Each of the maps below must detail all proposed upgraded, temporary and permanent site infrastructure. This includes all tracks, excavations, buildings, site compounds, laydown areas, storage areas and any other built elements. Existing built infrastructure must be re-used or upgraded wherever possible. The layout should be designed to minimise the extent of new works on previously undisturbed ground.

### **2. Pollution prevention and environmental management**

2.1 A Site Management Plan must be submitted and include the following information:

- a) A map showing the location, size, depths and dimensions of the quarry.
- b) A map showing all stocks of rock, overburden, soils and temporary and permanent infrastructure including tracks, buildings, oil storage, pipes and drainage, overlain with all lochs and watercourses to a distance of 250 metres. You need to demonstrate that a site specific proportionate buffer can be achieved. On this map, a site-specific buffer must be drawn around each loch or watercourse proportionate to the depth of excavations and at least 10m from access tracks. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions of the loch or watercourse, drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works.
- c) A ground investigation report giving existing seasonally highest water table including sections showing the maximum area, depth and profile of working in relation to the water table.

- d) A site map showing cut-off drains, silt management devices and settlement lagoons to manage surface water and dewatering discharge. Cut-off drains must be installed to maximise diversion of water from entering quarry works.
- e) A site map showing proposed water abstractions with details of the volumes and timings of abstractions.
- f) A site map showing the location of pollution prevention measures such as spill kits, oil interceptors, drainage associated with welfare facilities, recycling and bin storage and vehicle washing areas. The drawing notes should include a commitment to check these daily.
- g) A site map showing where soils and overburden will be stored including details of the heights and dimensions of each store, how long the material will be stored for and how soils will be kept fit for restoration purposes. Where the development will result in the disturbance of peat or other carbon rich soils then the submission must also include a detailed map of peat depths (this must be to full depth and follow the survey requirement of the Scottish Government's Guidance on Developments on Peatland - Peatland Survey (2017)) with all the built elements and excavation areas overlain so it can clearly be seen how the development minimises disturbance of peat and the consequential release of CO<sub>2</sub>.
- h) Sections and plans detailing how restoration will be progressed including the phasing, profiles, depths and types of material to be used.

2.2 In addition to the information requirements set out within SPP and PAN 50 Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings, applicants will need to consider if their proposal will include an extractive waste area or an extractive waste facility under the terms set out in the Management of Extractive Waste (Scotland) regulations 2010. The applicant should refer to Guidance for The Management of Extractive Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2010.

### **3. Disruption to Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE)**

3.1 GWDTE are protected under the Water Framework Directive and therefore the layout and design of the development must avoid impact on such areas. The following information must be included in the submission:

- a) A map demonstrating that all GWDTE are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. If micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey needs to be extended by the proposed maximum extent of micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it.
- b) If the minimum buffers above cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment will be required. We are likely to seek conditions securing appropriate mitigation for all GWDTE affected.

3.2 Please refer to Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems for further advice and the minimum information we require to be submitted.

#### **4. Existing groundwater abstractions**

4.1 Excavations and other construction works can disrupt groundwater flow and impact on existing groundwater abstractions. The submission must include:

- a) A map demonstrating that all existing groundwater abstractions are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. If micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey needs to be extended by the proposed maximum extent of micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it.
- b) If the minimum buffers above cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment will be required. We are likely to seek conditions securing appropriate mitigation for all existing groundwater abstractions affected.

4.2 Please refer to Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems for further advice on the minimum information we require to be submitted.

#### **5. Forest removal and forest waste**

5.1 If tree felling is proposed the submission must include a map with the boundaries of where felling will take place and a description of what is proposed for this timber in accordance with Use of Trees Cleared to Facilitate Development on Afforested Land – Joint Guidance from SEPA, SNH and FCS.

#### **6. Restoration**

6.1 In addition to the normal restoration and aftercare information, the submission should identify environmental enhancement opportunities that can be achieved through restoration. These could include habitat creation and management proposals.

#### **7. Flood Risk**

7.1 We have reviewed the information provided with the Scoping Report and it is noted that although the site appears to lie outwith the SEPA Flood Map it adjacent to a small watercourse and consequently the site may be at risk of flooding. Small watercourses are often poorly understood with respect to the severity of the flood hazard that can be generated on a catchment of this scale. We hold a wealth of information on past small catchment flooding in Scotland which has led to significant impacts upon people and property.

7.2 We have reviewed the existing and proposed Barbae Quarry plans (Drawing No. B10/SCO/02 and Drawing no. B10/SCO/03) and note the proposed quarry extension will be

sited at elevations significantly above that of the small watercourse. Due to the lateral distance and elevation difference, the proposal is deemed to have no impact on the functional floodplain of the small watercourse. However, it is important that appropriate surface water management measures are adopted to ensure there is no increase in runoff that could shed down towards the small watercourse.

- 7.3 The updated SEPA / Planning Authority Protocol on Planning and Flooding specifies that water quantity aspects of surface water drainage are a matter for the FRMA to consider. It is therefore for South Ayrshire Council to satisfy themselves that all surface water management aspects will be appropriate.
- 7.4 Due to the proposal being located outwith the SEPA Flood Hazard Maps, in addition to the available plans and topographic information providing evidence that there will be no groundworks within the functional floodplain of the small watercourse, we are in agreement that a formal assessment of fluvial flood risk is not required.
- 7.5 If your authority requires further comment from us, additional information would be necessary to enable us to comment upon the flood risk at the application site in line with the principles of Scottish Planning Policy (2010), SEPA-COSLA Protocol (as updated 2011) and the duties of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act (2009).
- 7.6 The advice contained in this letter is supplied to you by SEPA in terms of Section 72 (1) of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 on the basis of information held by SEPA as at the date hereof. It is intended as advice solely to South Ayrshire Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 72 (1). Our briefing note entitled: "Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009: Flood risk advice to planning authorities" outlines the transitional changes to the basis of our advice in line with the phases of this legislation and can be downloaded from <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/guidance-and-advice-notes/>.

### **Caveats & Additional Information for Applicant**

- 7.7 The SEPA Flood Maps have been produced following a consistent, nationally-applied methodology for catchment areas equal to or greater than 3km<sup>2</sup> using a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) to define river corridors and low-lying coastal land. The maps are indicative and designed to be used as a strategic tool to assess, flood risk at the community level and to support planning policy and flood risk management in Scotland. For further information please visit <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/water/flooding/flood-maps/>.
- 7.8 We refer the applicant to the document entitled: "Technical Flood Risk Guidance for Stakeholders". This document provides generic requirements for undertaking Flood Risk Assessments and can be downloaded from <http://www.sepa.org.uk/media/162602/ss-nfr-p-002-technical-flood-risk-guidance-for-stakeholders.pdf>. Please note that this document should be read in conjunction with Policy 41 (Part 2).
- 7.9 Our Flood Risk Assessment checklist should be completed and attached within the front cover of any flood risk assessments issued in support of a development proposal which may be at risk of flooding. The document will take only a few minutes to complete and will

assist our review process. It can be downloaded from  
<http://www.sepa.org.uk/media/159170/flood-risk-assessment-checklist.xls>.

- 7.10 Please note that we are reliant on the accuracy and completeness of any information supplied by the applicant in undertaking our review, and can take no responsibility for incorrect data or interpretation made by the authors.

Scottish Natural Heritage, Caspian House, Mariner Court, Clydebank Business Park, G81 2NR

Ben Horwill  
Burns House  
Burns Statue Square  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT



Date: 27 August 2018 Our ref: CNS/DC/SA/CEA151860

**The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017**  
**Request for Scoping Opinion of South Ayrshire Council regarding Barbae Quarry, Girvan, South Ayrshire**

Dear Ben,

Thank you for your consultation request dated 9 August 2018. Please find our comments below.

**Background**

Barbae Quarry has been operating under planning permission 16/00430/ROMP since October 2016. This permission for mineral extraction expires on 31 December 2024. The current permitted rate of extraction is 400,000 tonnes per year. At this rate, the existing permitted quarry area will be extracted within the next 3 to 4 years. To allow rock to be extracted until the expiration of the permission, the applicant proposes to prepare a planning application to increase the size of the quarry area. A scoping report has been submitted to South Ayrshire Council, and our comments are summarised below, with detailed comments in Annex 1.

**Summary**

The Environmental Statement (ES) must contain the information specified in Schedule 4 Part II of the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations as a minimum.

We consider that the key natural heritage issues to be considered as part of the EIA process are:

1. Ecological impacts, including direct and indirect impacts upon habitats and protected species;
2. Landscape and visual impacts;
3. Recreational impacts, including positive and negative impacts associated with the development, and;
4. The cumulative impacts of 1-3 in combination with other allocations and development proposals in the area.

Our detailed response can be found in Annex 1 below. Further guidance on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process can be found in SNH's publication '*A Handbook for Environmental Impact Assessment*' (2013). This publication, including an updated Appendix 4 on soils, can be downloaded from the SNH website at: <https://www.nature.scot/professional-advice/planning-and-development/environmental-assessment/environmental-impact-assessment>. The information provided in this response is given without prejudice to any views that we may wish to express at a later date and is based upon our understanding of the project at this time. Should you need any further information or advice, please do not hesitate to contact me at [natalie.cozzolino@nature.scot](mailto:natalie.cozzolino@nature.scot).

Yours sincerely  
Natalie Cozzolino  
Operations Officer  
Strathclyde and Ayrshire

## Annex 1

### Designated sites

There are no internationally or nationally designated sites within the proposed development boundary, however there are two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) close to the development boundary.

Laggan Burn SSSI lies within 2km of the development boundary, and is designated for its Caradoc-Ashgill Earth Science feature. Woodend Loch lies just over 2km from the boundary and is designated for its Llandoverly Earth Science feature. We consider that there is no connectivity between the development site and these designated sites, and therefore statutory designated sites can be scoped out of the assessment.

Further details of these sites can be found on the SiteLink page of the SNH website - <http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/index.jsp>.

We recommend that the applicant checks with South Ayrshire Council whether there are any locally designated sites within or close to the development site.

### Protected species

It is unclear what survey work has been undertaken so far. The ecology chapter of the scoping report states that a protected mammal survey was undertaken in 2016, however the results of this survey were not submitted with the scoping report. The scoping report also notes that a ground truthing exercise of mammal surveys was undertaken in 2017, but the results do not appear to be included in the scoping report. Additionally, any protected species surveys that were undertaken prior to February 2017 will be invalid as more than 18 months have passed since these surveys were undertaken.

With regard to bats, the scoping report states that there is the potential for bat roosts along the proposed haul route, and at the disused kennel building at the junction of the proposed haul route. The scoping report states that the potential for bats *“will be further investigated in line with Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) guidance (Collins 2016) and will be detailed in the EIA Report”*.

Our advice regarding protected species therefore is that further surveys are carried out where suitable habitat exists, and where a survey has not been completed in the last 18 months. We expect to see the results of these surveys in the ES. With regards to bats, we agree with the proposed survey work, and we expect to see the results of the bat surveys in the ES.

All survey work for protected species should be undertaken in line with the best practice guidance outlined on our website. Where survey methods or other work deviates from the published guidance, this should be agreed with us in advance to ensure that any deviations still meet our needs. A full explanation of why any deviations are considered appropriate should also be provided in the ES for the benefit of others. The results of the surveys should be used to avoid or minimise impacts, thereby informing the iterative layout and design of the development.

Where impacts on protected species are identified, a species protection plan should be produced as part of the ES and include details of how the development is likely to affect protected species and the mitigation/compensation measures that will be implemented to minimise impacts. If the implementation of the identified mitigation measures is not sufficient to avoid offences under protected species legislation, a licence will be required from SNH before the works can proceed. The need for a licence should be confirmed within the ES/species protection plan.



As mentioned above, protected species surveys should be completed no more than 18 months prior to submission of the application to ensure that the survey results are a contemporary reflection of species activity at and around the site. If significant land use, habitat or population changes have occurred during this time, advice should be sought from us prior to application submission to ensure the surveys will be adequate.

Advice for planners and developers on protected species can be found at

<https://www.snh.scot/professional-advice/safeguarding-protected-areas-and-species/licensing>.

### Habitats

The results of a Phase 1 habitat survey undertaken in 2017 are presented in figure 3.21 of the scoping report. This covers the proposed new track area. Drawing number 167296-002 provides results of a habitat survey from 2015. There are target notes on both of these maps, but the notes have not been provided. It would be useful to see the target notes submitted with the ES.

Any habitats listed on Annex 1 of the EC Habitats Directive and UKBAP Priority Habitats should be subject to NVC survey (<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-1425> provides links to the different habitat classifications and a habitats correspondence table). Results of any NVC surveys should be included in the ES.

Survey results should be used to inform the design and layout process, so that the development avoids direct impacts to, and fragmentation of, fragile and priority habitats and other sensitive areas. Where this is not possible, suitable restoration and/or compensation measures should be presented in the ES in the form of a Habitat Management Plan (HMP). HMPs should follow our guidance on 'What to consider and include in Habitat Management Plans'.

If tree felling/woodland clearance will be required as part of the proposed development, we recommend that the developer/their consultants contact Forestry Commission Scotland at an early stage to discuss the Control of Woodland Removal Policy and the implications it may have on the development (see <http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/supporting/strategy-policy-guidance/woodland-expansion/control-of-woodland-removal>).

### Landscape, Recreation and Access

Quarries can be prominent features in the landscape and a full assessment of the effects on landscape character and visual amenity is important. We suggest that a full landscape character assessment and visual impact assessment of this proposal is undertaken, and we recommend that this is undertaken by appropriately qualified personnel.

The assessment methodology should follow the approach promoted by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment ("Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment", third edition, The Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment 2013).

Full descriptive and mapped details of the baseline landscape condition from the relevant Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (<http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/lca/>) should be included, including for example, existing topography, existing site features, tree age and species size, and hedgerows. Details should be supplied in plan form at a suitably legible scale.

Additionally, the landscape and visual impact assessment should make use of other appropriate techniques for assessment and communication of findings. SNH would recommend that this includes photography, photomontage and annotated wirelines drawings of the quarry at different operational stages and from key fixed viewpoints including transport corridors, paths and areas of

informal recreational usage. Zone of Theoretical Visibility studies should be used to show the likely visibility of the quarry void from positions within a 3 kilometre radius.



12th September 2018

South Ayrshire Council  
Burns House  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT

Development Operations  
The Bridge  
Buchanan Gate Business Park  
Cumbernauld Road  
Stepps  
Glasgow  
G33 6FB

Development Operations  
Freephone Number - 0800 3890379  
E-Mail - [DevelopmentOperations@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:DevelopmentOperations@scottishwater.co.uk)  
[www.scottishwater.co.uk](http://www.scottishwater.co.uk)

Dear Sir/Madam

**SITE: KA26 Girvan C13 Assel Road Barbae Quarry**  
**PLANNING REF: 16/00430/ROMP**  
**OUR REF: 766090**  
**PROPOSAL: Review of Old Mineral Permissions**

**Please quote our reference in all future correspondence**

Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application; however, the applicant should be aware that this does not confirm that the proposed development can currently be serviced and would advise the following:

**Infrastructure within boundary**

According to our records, the development proposals impact on existing Scottish Water assets.

- **There is a Scottish Water 250mm HPPE water main within these works.**

The applicant must identify any potential conflicts with Scottish Water assets and contact our Asset Impact Team directly at [service.relocation@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:service.relocation@scottishwater.co.uk).

The applicant should be aware that any conflict with assets identified may be subject to restrictions on proximity of construction.

**Scottish Water Disclaimer**

*"It is important to note that the information on any such plan provided on Scottish Water's infrastructure, is for indicative purposes only and its accuracy cannot be relied upon. When the exact location and the nature of the infrastructure on the plan is a material requirement then you should undertake an appropriate site investigation to confirm its actual position in the ground and to determine if it is suitable for its intended purpose. By using the plan you agree that Scottish Water will not be liable for any loss, damage or costs caused by relying upon it or from carrying out any such site investigation."*

## **Drinking Water Protected Areas**

A review of our records indicates that there are no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive, in the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.

## **Surface Water**

For reasons of sustainability and to protect our customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water will not normally accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system.

There may be limited exceptional circumstances where we would allow such a connection for brownfield sites only, however this will require significant justification from the customer taking account of various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges. In order to avoid costs and delays where a surface water discharge to our combined sewer system is anticipated, the developer should contact Scottish Water at the earliest opportunity with strong evidence to support the intended drainage plan prior to making a connection request. We will assess this evidence in a robust manner and provide a decision that reflects the best option from environmental and customer perspectives.

### **General notes:**

- **Scottish Water asset plans can be obtained from our appointed asset plan**

**providers:**

**Site Investigation Services (UK) Ltd**

**Tel: 0333 123 1223**

**Email: [sw@sisplan.co.uk](mailto:sw@sisplan.co.uk)**

**[www.sisplan.co.uk](http://www.sisplan.co.uk)**

- Scottish Water's current minimum level of service for water pressure is 1.0 bar or 10m head at the customer's boundary internal outlet. Any property which cannot be adequately serviced from the available pressure may require private pumping arrangements to be installed, subject to compliance with Water Byelaws. If the developer wishes to enquire about Scottish Water's procedure for checking the water pressure in the area then they should write to the Customer Connections department at the above address.
- If the connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s) by way of a deed of servitude.
- Scottish Water may only vest new water or waste water infrastructure which is to be laid through land out with public ownership where a Deed of Servitude has been obtained in our favour by the developer.
- The developer should also be aware that Scottish Water requires land title to the area of land where a pumping station and/or SUDS proposed to vest in Scottish Water is constructed.
- **Please find all of our application forms on our website at the following link**  
**<https://www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/connections/connecting-your-property/new-development-process-and-applications-forms>**

## **Next Steps:**

- **Single Property/Less than 10 dwellings**

For developments of less than 10 domestic dwellings (or non-domestic equivalent) we will require a formal technical application to be submitted directly to Scottish Water or via the chosen Licensed Provider if non domestic, once full planning permission has been granted. Please note in some instances we will require a Pre-Development Enquiry Form to be submitted (for example rural location which are deemed to have a significant impact on our infrastructure) however we will make you aware of this if required.

- **10 or more domestic dwellings:**

For developments of 10 or more domestic dwellings (or non-domestic equivalent) we require a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form to be submitted directly to Scottish Water prior to any formal Technical Application being submitted. This will allow us to fully appraise the proposals.

Where it is confirmed through the PDE process that mitigation works are necessary to support a development, the cost of these works is to be met by the developer, which Scottish Water can contribute towards through Reasonable Cost Contribution regulations.

- **Non Domestic/Commercial Property:**

Since the introduction of the Water Services (Scotland) Act 2005 in April 2008 the water industry in Scotland has opened up to market competition for non-domestic customers. All Non-domestic Household customers now require a Licensed Provider to act on their behalf for new water and waste water connections. Further details can be obtained at [www.scotlandontap.gov.uk](http://www.scotlandontap.gov.uk)

- **Trade Effluent Discharge from Non Dom Property:**

Certain discharges from non-domestic premises may constitute a trade effluent in terms of the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968. Trade effluent arises from activities including; manufacturing, production and engineering; vehicle, plant and equipment washing, waste and leachate management. It covers both large and small premises, including activities such as car washing and launderettes. Activities not covered include hotels, caravan sites or restaurants.

If you are in any doubt as to whether or not the discharge from your premises is likely to be considered to be trade effluent, please contact us on 0800 778 0778 or email [TEQ@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:TEQ@scottishwater.co.uk) using the subject "Is this Trade Effluent?". Discharges that are deemed to be trade effluent need to apply separately for permission to discharge to the sewerage system. The forms and application guidance notes can be found using the following link

<https://www.scottishwater.co.uk/business/ourservices/compliance/trade-effluent/trade-effluent-documents/trade-effluent-noticeform-h>

Trade effluent must never be discharged into surface water drainage systems as these are solely for draining rainfall run off.

For food services establishments, Scottish Water recommends a suitably sized grease trap is fitted within the food preparation areas so the development complies with Standard 3.7 a) of the Building Standards Technical Handbook and for best management and housekeeping practices to be followed which prevent food waste, fat oil and grease from being disposed into sinks and drains.

The Waste (Scotland) Regulations which require all non-rural food businesses, producing more than 50kg of food waste per week, to segregate that waste for

separate collection. The regulations also ban the use of food waste disposal units that dispose of food waste to the public sewer. Further information can be found at [www.resourceefficientscotland.com](http://www.resourceefficientscotland.com)

If the applicant requires any further assistance or information, please contact our Development Operations Central Support Team on 0800 389 0379 or at [planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk).

Yours sincerely

**Lisa Lennox**

Development Operations Analyst

[Lisa.lennox2@scottishwater.co.uk](mailto:Lisa.lennox2@scottishwater.co.uk)

**From:** Munro, Shona  
**Sent:** 07 September 2018 10:12  
**To:** Horwill, Ben  
**Subject:** Barbae Quarry

Shona Munro | Belleisle Project Officer | Neighbourhood Services | Economy, Neighbourhood and Environment | [Shona.Munro@south-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:Shona.Munro@south-ayrshire.gov.uk) | +44 1292 612802  
South Ayrshire Council | Walker Rd Depot | Walker Rd | Ayr | KA8 9LE | [www.south-ayrshire.gov.uk](http://www.south-ayrshire.gov.uk)

---

## **Request for Scoping Opinion of South Ayrshire Council re: Barbae Quarry, Girvan, South Ayrshire**

Dear Sir,  
Further to the above scoping application, I would make the following comments.

### **Designated sites**

There are no internationally or nationally designated sites within the proposed development boundary, however there are two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) close to the development boundary. Whilst it is unlikely that these should be affected, these should be taken into consideration, in particular if the construction route for the access road deviates.

The area does however fall under the Scenic Area category within the South Ayrshire Local Plan. *“Scenic Areas are notable areas of particular landscape quality .....It should however be noted that in general, potential impacts on the environment and landscape will be considered even if the area is not specifically identified as being within a designated scenic area. The acceptability of proposals located within or having an impact on scenic areas will be considered using the following criteria:*

- a) The significance of impacts and cumulative impacts on the environment, particularly landscape and visual impacts; and where relevant*
- b) The extent of any economic benefit; or*
- c) Specific, justified requirement for a rural location”.*

### **Invasive Species**

It is noted that Japanese Knotweed is present in areas of the site. We would agree with SNH that a specialist contractor is employed to remove this prior to any construction work being undertaken to prevent the spread of this invasive non-native species through operational activities at the site.

### **Environmental Enhancement**

With regard to site restoration we concur with recommendations proposed in the previous review of old mineral permissions application (16/00430/ROMP). Clarification should be provided regarding whether vegetation spread will be a natural process or whether the areas will be seeded/planted and how any wetland will be created. In addition, the submission should identify environmental

enhancement opportunities that can be achieved. These could include habitat creation as well as management proposals.

### **Access issues**

The environmental statement should contain details of the access arrangements during the operational life of the site. This process should be used to identify any adverse impacts upon the surrounding environment and its wildlife, and note any subsequent mitigation measures. This could take into account planning the various works around sensitive times, such as the breeding season.

The site should also be assessed site on the suitability of the habitats to support flora and fauna and the likelihood of species being present. For example scattered grassland mosaics may support species which use any scrub clumps for breeding and grassland may attract invertebrate species for foraging, breeding and shelter.

We concur with the inclusion of a Landscape and Visual Appraisal and preparation of a Landscaping and Restoration Plan. We agree that this appraisal also includes ecological mitigation and that and that the plan is included in the Environmental Statement (ES).

### **Protected species**

It is unclear what survey work has been undertaken so far. This should be clarified and if previously undertaken prior to Feb 2017 will require to be reworked.

With regard to bats, the scoping report states that there is the potential for bat roosts along the proposed haul route, and at the disused kennel building at the junction of the proposed haul route. The scoping report states that the potential for bats *“will be further investigated in line with Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) guidance (Collins 2016) and will be detailed in the EIA Report”*. Survey results should be made available along with any further application.



Development Management and Strategic Road Safety  
**Trunk Road and Bus Operations**  
Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow G4  
0HF  
Direct Line: 0141 272 7386, Fax: 0141 272 7350  
john.mcdonald@transport.gov.scot



Ben Horwill  
South Ayrshire Council Planning Service  
Burns House  
Burns Statue Square  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT  
planning.development@south-ayrshire.gov.uk

Your ref:

SYSTRA ref:  
TS00538

Date:  
27/08/2018

Dear Sirs,  
**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT)  
(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2017  
REQUEST FOR SCOPING OPINION OF SOUTH AYRSHIRE COUNCIL BARBAE QUARRY,  
GIRVAN, SOUTH AYRSHIRE**

With reference to your recent correspondence on the above development, I wish to inform you that from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2015, planning authorities are no longer required to consult with Scottish Ministers on EIA development.

Historic Scotland has merged with Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) to form Historic Environment Scotland (HES). HES is named as both a statutory consultee in the planning system and as a consultation body for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) purposes. Planning authorities are required to make their own arrangements for consulting HES directly on EIA development. Further information on these wider changes can be found in Historic Environment Circular 1.

In light of the above changes, the Scottish Government has taken the opportunity to streamline EIA consultation arrangements such that Transport Scotland will no longer respond to EIA consultations in a statutory capacity. Planning Authorities must, however, continue to consult Transport Scotland on applications where required by Regulation 25 and Schedule 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013. These consultations should be sent to Transport Scotland's Development Management Team.

It should be stressed that this response relates only to the EIA consultation and Transport Scotland will respond separately to the planning application for this development by means of a TRNPA2 if formally consulted.

I trust that the above is satisfactory and should you wish to discuss any issues raised in greater detail, please do not hesitate to contact myself on 0141 272 7386.

Yours faithfully  
**John McDonald**  
Transport Scotland  
**Trunk Road and Bus Operations**  
cc Alan DeVenny – SYSTRA Ltd.

Our ref: 7/3/10/Cons 37732  
Your ref:  
WoSASdoc: Barbae Cons 37732  
Date: 28 August 2018  
Contact: Martin O'Hare  
Direct dial: 0141 287 8333

WEST of SCOTLAND  
ARCHAEOLOGY  
SERVICE



231 George Street, Glasgow, G1 1RX  
Tel: 0141 287 8335  
enquiries@wosar.glasgow.gov.uk

Planning Services  
South Ayrshire Council  
Burns House  
Burns Statue Square  
Ayr  
KA7 1UT

Dear Sir or Madam,

### **Request for Scoping Opinion of South Ayrshire Council: Barbae Quarry, Girvan, South Ayrshire**

I refer to the above request for a Scoping Opinion, which was sent to the West of Scotland Archaeology Service for comment on the 9<sup>th</sup> of August. I have compared details of the proposal against the information contained in the Historic Environment Record (HER) and with available cartographic sources, and would like to make the following comments.

As you will be aware, one of the documents supplied in support of the scoping request is a cultural heritage appraisal, prepared on behalf of the applicant by Richard Conolly of CgMs. We were contacted by Mr Conolly in February of 2016 in relation to the preparation of this document, and noted in our response that the plan supplied at that time indicated that extraction would extend around 300m further to the west than the extent of the existing quarry. We also stated that the HER database contained a record relating to the presence of a field system covering most of Barbae Hill, which was identified by SLR Consulting in the Environmental Statement for the Assel Valley wind farm. The nature of opencast mining means that any features present within its boundaries are likely to be wholly destroyed. As expansion to the quarry would result in the removal of elements of this field system, we therefore advised Mr Conolly that mitigation measures would be required in relation to this element of the proposal. We recommended that this should begin with an initial walkover survey of the proposed quarry expansion, to attempt to record the position of any elements of the field system identified by SLR within the area that would be affected by extraction. This survey would allow a more accurate picture of the direct impact of quarry expansion on the historic environment to be assessed, which would in turn allow more specific proposals to be developed to attempt to mitigate this impact through further fieldwork.

The report supplied in support of the current scoping request states that an initial desk-based assessment has been conducted, and that the information gained during this process has been augmented and verified by a walkover survey, during the course of which visible features were photographed and their locations recorded using a hand-held GPS. This approach is in accordance with that suggested in the comments provided to Mr Conolly in 2016, and as a result, I am content that it should provide an accurate picture of archaeological baseline conditions, at least in terms of those features that survive in an upstanding and visible form.

The report notes that the walkover survey identified elements of the field system in the form of banks, most of which were slight. It also identifies the presence of an area of broad rig-and-furrow cultivation, occupying the south-facing slopes to the south of the proposed quarry extension, as well as a sub-square enclosure interpreted as a possible stock enclosure or hay ree. It also states that a system of stone dykes is present, and that these overlie the slight banks that form the field system. This would mean that they were constructed at a later date, though there is no indication of by how much the stone land boundaries

may post-date the earlier banks. In the report, it is speculated that the banks may be associated with preimprovement agricultural activity at Barbae, and relate to the farmstead that was shown as 'Barhe' on Blaeu's atlas of 1654 and as 'Barbeg' on Roy's map of the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century, suggesting that they could date from the post- or late medieval period. I would agree that this is a possibility, though I would say that recent fieldwork conducted on similar banks elsewhere in Ayrshire has provided earlier dates. For example, scientific dating of boundaries affected by construction of the Assel Valley wind farm in August 2016 suggested that one (and possibly both) originated between the 9<sup>th</sup> and early 13<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The effect of the proposed quarry extension on identified elements of the historic environment is set out in section 3 of the CgMs report. This acknowledges that the extension would remove part of the field system, but also notes that parts of it have already been removed as a result of forestry. It is also stated that the site of Barbae farm lies outwith the proposed quarry extension, as does the area of surviving rigand-furrow cultivation. Section 3.2 of the report suggests that the field system is likely to be of local importance, and I would agree that this is likely to be the case, assuming that it dates from the late medieval or post medieval periods; however, it is possible that it could be of greater significance if it could be demonstrated that it represents a significantly earlier pattern of land division.

In order to mitigate the impact of the proposed quarry extension on the historic environment, section 4 of the CgMs report suggests that a programme of trial trenching should be undertaken to establish the archaeological potential of the ground that would be affected. This states that trenches would be placed to investigate the enclosure and to test areas of open ground. While this would be acceptable in itself, I would suggest that trenches should also be placed across visible elements of the field system, in order to investigate its nature and to attempt to ascertain a date for its construction. The work conducted in relation to the features affected by construction of the Assel Valley wind farm made use of both radiocarbon and Optical Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) to provide a date-range for construction of the banks that formed part of the relic field system, and it may be necessary to employ similar measures in this instance.

Section 4.5 of the CgMs report states that *"Given the limited archaeological potential of the Site it would be reasonable for this programme of works to be secured by a condition attached to the consent for the proposed development. This condition would require the setting out of a detailed programme of archaeological work in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) subject to agreement with WoSAS and approval of South Ayrshire Council"*. I would agree that this is likely to be appropriate, and in order to secure this, it is likely that we would advise that the following condition should be attached to any consent that the Council may be minded to issue in relation to any subsequent planning application that may be submitted for the extension of this quarry:

*"No development shall take place within the development site as outlined in red on the approved plan until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant, agreed by the West of Scotland Archaeology Service, and approved by the Planning Authority. Thereafter the developer shall ensure that the programme of archaeological works is fully implemented and that all recording and recovery of archaeological resources within the development site is undertaken to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in agreement with the West of Scotland Archaeology Service"*.

Yours faithfully

West of Scotland Archaeology Service

The Archaeology Service of the Councils of Argyll & Bute, East Ayrshire, East Renfrewshire, Glasgow City, North Ayrshire, Renfrewshire, South Ayrshire, South Lanarkshire, West Dunbartonshire and West Lothian, and the Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park Authority.