

Eisg Brachaidh Project Description

Eisg Brachaidh Estate in Wester Ross has biodiversity conservation as its primary objective. A feature of the estate is a series of significantly declining native and ancient woodlands. It is a designated site: part of Inverpolly SSSI and SAC with regard to important open ground and wooded habitats.

After many years of considering alternative options, it is proposed to fence the 2000ha estate to enable the effective control of deer numbers within and allow habitat restoration at a landscape scale including woodlands, heath and bog. The aim is to re-establish the richness, diversity and connectivity of healthy self-sustaining native species and communities. A major aim is to allow the protection and natural expansion of native woodlands (which have been in a process of steep decline over many decades), together with their associated flora and fauna thereby kickstarting a fully functioning woodland ecosystem once more.

It is important to note that this is not a total deer exclusion project. A small number of animals are to be retained at low density to augment the seasonal cattle grazing and allow woodland development in a natural manner. Cattle grazing is maintained at levels governed by the SSSI management agreements with NatureScot.

At 2,000 ha Eisg Brachaidh has oligotrophic lochs, rivers and streams amongst low-lying hills, an estuary, extensive coastline and nearshore islands. It was previously part of the Inverpolly National Nature Reserve (1961-2004); it remains an important part of the Inverpolly SSSI and SAC, the Inverpolly, Loch Urigill & Nearby Lochs SPA, the Assynt –Coigach National Scenic Area (NSA) and is classed as a wild area. The surviving woodland is a Plantlife Important Plant Area for oceanic bryophytes and lichens in addition to its SAC status and is a focus area for the Saving Scotland's Rainforest Project.

Some of the important features on Eisg Brachaidh include fragmentary western acidic oak woodland, wet heath, dry heaths, blanket bog, upland assemblage and upland birch woodland, otter, black throated diver, red throated diver, breeding heron and fresh water pearl mussel. Effectively reducing and mitigating the effects of excessive grazing and trampling by deer is the most important factor for biodiversity conservation and habitat restoration on Eisg Brachaidh. After many years of trying to find a solution to the deer grazing levels all other avenues have been exhausted and it is concluded that the only way to protect this valuable habitat against further loss is to fence the estate boundary and reduce the deer numbers within the estate to 1-2 deer per square kilometre.

This reduction will improve the habitat quality of the area for important species (otter, black and red throated divers) and hopefully lead to the re-establishment of other woodland species like black grouse.

It is proposed to enrich the habitat by planting 8000 trees in small groups within existing native woodland remnant areas, using species that would naturally have been present, but are now only found in very low numbers. The long-term aim is to bolster seed sources for the re-establishment of a naturally structured woodland.

These species include aspen, oak, holly, alder, wych elm, bird cherry, guelder rose, juniper and willows (grey, goat and eared).

Trees will be sourced from seed as close as possible to Eisg Brachaidh; it is planned to get them from a local tree nursery just outside Lochinver. This nursery also grows local understorey species such as primrose, roses and honeysuckle, which the project will also plant out in the existing woodlands to boost the natural understorey. The reduction in deer grazing will allow existing regeneration to come away and boost woodland cover and diversify age structure making it more resilient in the future. Existing woodland (depending on how you define it) covers approximately 10% of the area and it is anticipated that most of the resulting regeneration will occur as infills within existing woodland and around its fringes to allow woodland fragments to join up.

Over the last few decades, the owners have sought to find a solution, particularly in respect of the SAC, 'Scotland's Rainforest' woodland areas. The solution of fencing the estate's landward boundary and reducing internal deer numbers will not impact on the grazing tenancy which covers most of the estate, as only a small number of cattle are allowed to graze the area (under an NatureScot agreement); that grazing will have a positive effect on the regenerating areas; and it will be closely monitored both by NatureScot, and through this project, to ensure that the desired results are attained. Fencing the estate will minimise any negative impact on surrounding owner's deer stalking activity. Public access will not be inhibited by this proposal. The project is in line with Scottish Government objectives regarding the restoration of valuable habitats.

Training days for native woodland management will be held as well as volunteer days for the enrichment planting with trees and understorey species. Training on Habitat Impact Assessment for woodland and non-woodland habitats will be offered and opportunities for paid ongoing assessment will then be available.

Sharon Phipps

From: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Sent: 14 May 2021 17:53
To: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: EIA required for Eisg Brachaidh proposal

Just to keep you informed, Scottish Forestry have requested Woodland Trust Scotland undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment regarding the Eisg Brachaidh woodland restoration proposal.


A key step on this process is holding a scoping meeting, the details of which will be announced in the coming weeks.

Meantime, any questions regarding the Eisg Brachaidh project should be sent to scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk

Thanks

Eisg Brachaidh project team

Woodland Trust, South Inch Business Centre, Perth, Perthshire, PH2 8BW
01738 635 544
www.woodlandtrust.org.uk



[Stand up for trees](#)

The information contained in this e-mail along with any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended for the named individual(s) or entity who is/are the only authorised recipient(s). If this message has reached you in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without review.

Anything in this email which does not relate to the Woodland Trust's official business is neither given nor endorsed by the Woodland Trust. Email is not secure and may contain viruses. We make every effort to ensure email is sent without viruses, but cannot guarantee this and recommend recipients take appropriate precautions. We may monitor email traffic data and content in accordance with our policies and English law. Thank you.

The Woodland Trust is a charity registered in England (No. 294344) and in Scotland (No. SC038885). A non-profit making company limited by guarantee.

Registered in England No. 1982873.

Registered Office: Kempton Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LL.

<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk>

Sharon Phipps

From: [REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk>
Sent: 02 June 2021 18:33
To: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot; Tamara Lawton; Sinclair Coghill;
[REDACTED]@highland.gov.uk; [REDACTED];
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED];
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED];
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]@ramblers.org.uk;
info@mountaineering.scot; [REDACTED]@canoescotland.org;
[REDACTED]@rspb.org.uk; NHNI@sepa.org.uk; HMenquiries@hes.scot;
[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot
Cc: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Meeting Documents link

Dear All,

As per my email below, please find link to all the Scoping Meeting Documents.

There are a lot of documents, Folder 1 has the description and Rationale for the project proposal, Folder 8 has the proposal maps in and Folder 10 has the Issues Log. The rest of the folders have more details in on specific areas and are clearly named. Folder 7 – Bird and Mammal survey, is empty and will be discussed at the scoping meeting. If there are any queries at all or problems opening the files please let me know.

There is a communication summary in folder 9, but individual queries/issues raised will be detailed in the scoping report, carried forward from previous communication/consultation.

<https://thewoodlandtrust.sharefile.eu/d-sa467b6634cbc4368a004fbb4bc57f059>

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Woodland Manager - Coigach & Assynt Living Landscapes Partnership (CALLP)

Telephone: 01571844638

Email: [REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk

Woodland Trust, South Inch Business Centre, Shore Road, Perth, PH2 8BW

0173 863 5544

www.woodlandtrust.org.uk



WOODLAND
TRUST SCOTLAND

Stand Up For Trees

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 May 2021 14:22
To: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot; tamara.lawton@nature.scot; sinclair.coghill@nature.scot;
[REDACTED]@highland.gov.uk; [REDACTED];
[REDACTED];
[REDACTED]@scottishwildlifetrust.org.uk>; [REDACTED];
[REDACTED]@ramblers.org.uk; info@mountaineering.scot; [REDACTED]@canoescotland.org;
[REDACTED]@rspb.org.uk
Cc: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Meeting Doodle Poll invite

Dear Sir/Madam,

Woodland Trust Scotland submitted a screening opinion request to Scottish Forestry for the Eisg Brachaidh Woodland Restoration Proposal and under the EIA regulations, Scottish Forestry have confirmed that EIA consent is needed.

The first step in this process is to hold a [scoping meeting](#) to help decide the issues that must be covered in the EIA Report.

Please find a link below to a doodle poll with a range of potential meeting dates and times. A three hour slot is being allowed, the meeting maybe shorter or run longer as needed, a comfort break will be programmed in. **We request you complete this poll by noon on Friday 4th June**, after which a final date for the scoping meeting will be confirmed.

[REDACTED]

Details of the proposal to be discussed at the scoping meeting will be available from Wednesday 2nd June when an email with a link to the files will be circulated.

All points previously raised with Woodland Trust re the Eisg Brachaidh Woodland Restoration Proposal will be carried forward into the scoping report and anything else raised at the scoping meeting will also be added.

A copy of the scoping report will be circulated after the meeting to anyone who requests it.

Kind Regards,

The information contained in this e-mail along with any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended for the named individual(s) or entity who is/are the only authorised recipient(s). If this message has reached you in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without review.

Anything in this email which does not relate to the Woodland Trust's official business is neither given nor endorsed by the Woodland Trust. Email is not secure and may contain viruses. We make every effort to ensure email is sent without viruses, but cannot guarantee this and recommend recipients take appropriate precautions. We may monitor email traffic data and content in accordance with our policies and English law. Thank you.

The Woodland Trust is a charity registered in England (No. 294344) and in Scotland (No. SC038885).

A non-profit making company limited by guarantee.

Registered in England No. 1982873.

Registered Office: Kempton Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LL.

<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk>

Sharon Phipps

From: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Sent: 21 June 2021 18:14
To: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Meeting Agenda for Thursday 24th June, 09:00-12:00
Attachments: EB Scoping Agenda - Final.docx

Good afternoon,

Please find attached the agenda for the Eish Brachaidh Scoping meeting on Thursday.

The meeting will be Chaired by [REDACTED] of Scottish Forestry.

Please note:

The WT will be using the Zoom meeting platform for this meeting.

This allows all participants the chance to share their screen, turn on their video & audio and see and hear all other attendees.

The WT will be recording the meeting solely for the purposes of accurate minute taking and production of the EIA Scoping Report. The recording is for internal use only and will be held on a secure WT server until the Eish Brachaidh EIA process is complete, at which time it will be deleted.

The WT seeks your permission to record your image for the above purpose only.

You will be prompted at the start of the meeting to give your permission to be recorded. Should you not wish your image to be recorded, please turn your camera off but join with and keep your audio on.

To access the meeting simply click the link below:

Join Zoom Meeting



A reminder you can view / download scoping documents for this proposal [here](#).

If you intend to use a mobile to access the meeting, please download zoom app in advance. [Download in Apple App Store](#) / [Download in Google Play](#)

For those unfamiliar with zoom, here's a reminder of Zoom meeting etiquette:

- **Join the Zoom call early** – around five minutes before the meeting starts.
- Unless you do not wish to be seen, please **turn on your camera**
- Make sure that when you're using your camera that it is not too low or too high.
- **Put yourself on mute** if you're not talking as background noises can be really distracting.
- Use **raise hand** if you wish to speak (click 'reactions')
- The Chair reserves the right to mute participants who do not observe the meeting etiquette

We would also request that you:

- Change your on-screen name to your **full name and the organisation** you represent e.g. [REDACTED], Woodland Trust Scotland. (To do this click on 'Participants', hover your mouse over yourself, click 'More', then 'Rename' and type in your name and organisation)
- Please be considerate and treat all other participants with respect.

- Remember that whilst some of those taking part will have experience of using Zoom, others may be novices.

As well as raising a hand, you can also indicate in the Chat if you wish to make a comment or ask a question.

We politely request that all points to be noted in the minutes be made in person (and not in Chat as we do not wish to detract from the meeting.)

We appreciate some of you may not be able to join us at the Eisd Brachaidh Scoping Meeting on Thursday 24th June, but this is just for your information.

Thank you.

Kind regards,
Eisd Brachaidh project team

The information contained in this e-mail along with any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended for the named individual(s) or entity who is/are the only authorised recipient(s). If this message has reached you in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without review.

Anything in this email which does not relate to the Woodland Trust's official business is neither given nor endorsed by the Woodland Trust. Email is not secure and may contain viruses. We make every effort to ensure email is sent without viruses, but cannot guarantee this and recommend recipients take appropriate precautions. We may monitor email traffic data and content in accordance with our policies and English law. Thank you.

The Woodland Trust is a charity registered in England (No. 294344) and in Scotland (No. SC038885).

A non-profit making company limited by guarantee.

Registered in England No. 1982873.

Registered Office: Kempton Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LL.

<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk>



Eisg Brachaidh Proposal - Scoping Meeting

24th June 2021, 9am – noon

Agenda

The meeting will be chaired by [REDACTED], Senior Operations Manager, Scottish Forestry

	Agenda Item	Who
1.	Introduction and apologies	Chair (Scottish Forestry)
2.	Overview - Summary of the EIA process, scoping stage and next steps - Purpose of today - identify issues to be addressed at EIA - Meeting and Zoom etiquette	Chair
3.	Opening statement - project proposal objectives, issues, mitigations and surveys	Woodland Trust
4.	Points of clarification	All participants
	<i>Flexible comfort break</i>	
5.	Correspondence in absentia	Woodland Trust
6.	Points of clarification	All participants
7.	Raising relevant issues by each participant	Chair
8.	Summary and close - Preliminary listing of issues for Scoping Report - Next steps and timescales	Chair

Sharon Phipps

From: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Sent: 24 June 2021 16:44
To: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Meeting follow-up

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for attending today's meeting. A few people had wifi issues and we would like to invite those to submit a maximum one-page submission detailing their issues raised about the Eisg Brachaidh project proposal to ensure that we have captured everyone's points. Please can you do this by 5pm on Monday 28th June.

Kind Regards,

Eisg Brachaidh project team

The information contained in this e-mail along with any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended for the named individual(s) or entity who is/are the only authorised recipient(s). If this message has reached you in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without review.

Anything in this email which does not relate to the Woodland Trust's official business is neither given nor endorsed by the Woodland Trust. Email is not secure and may contain viruses. We make every effort to ensure email is sent without viruses, but cannot guarantee this and recommend recipients take appropriate precautions. We may monitor email traffic data and content in accordance with our policies and English law. Thank you.

The Woodland Trust is a charity registered in England (No. 294344) and in Scotland (No. SC038885).
A non-profit making company limited by guarantee.

Registered in England No. 1982873.

Registered Office: Kempton Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LL.

<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk>

Sharon Phipps

From: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Sent: 09 July 2021 16:51
To: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Report
Attachments: 20210709 Scoping Report Minutes & Appendices.docx; Appendix 8 - 0210708 EIA Issues Log for scoping report FINAL.pdf

Dear all,

Thank you for attending the scoping meeting held by Zoom on 24 June 2021 or, if you were unable to attend, for submitting correspondence prior to or since that Scoping meeting.

We have collated all the issues raised into the attached Scoping Report. It contains a minute of the 24 June meeting, along with appendices of the 'in absentia' correspondence that were referred to at the meeting. The other attachment is Appendix 8 (the Issues Log).

We would ask you to confirm that the minute of the meeting as shown in the Scoping Report is an accurate record of the meeting, and that the issues you raised are recorded properly in the minute and in the corresponding Issues Log, also attached.

Please confirm the above by **12pm on 23 July**.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

The Eisg Brachaidh project team.

The information contained in this e-mail along with any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended for the named individual(s) or entity who is/are the only authorised recipient(s). If this message has reached you in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without review.

Anything in this email which does not relate to the Woodland Trust's official business is neither given nor endorsed by the Woodland Trust. Email is not secure and may contain viruses. We make every effort to ensure email is sent without viruses, but cannot guarantee this and recommend recipients take appropriate precautions. We may monitor email traffic data and content in accordance with our policies and English law. Thank you.

The Woodland Trust is a charity registered in England (No. 294344) and in Scotland (No. SC038885).

A non-profit making company limited by guarantee.

Registered in England No. 1982873.

Registered Office: Kempton Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LL.

<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk>

Eisg Brachaidh – Scoping Report

Introduction

Woodland Trust Scotland (WTS) submitted an application for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion for 250ha of afforestation on 30th August 2020. A letter for more information from Scottish Forestry (SF) was received on 17th September, 2020. This information was submitted on 19th March 2021 and SF issued an EIA determination on 26 April 2021 which stated that the project would require an EIA.

SF supplied a statement of reasons, included as appendix 1 to this report. A scoping meeting was held on 24 June 2021. The report that follows is the summary of that meeting, the issues raised, and ultimately WTS recommendations for the focus of the EIA.

Scoping Meeting

The scoping meeting took place online, via Zoom on 24 June 2021. A list of attendees and apologies is shown in table 1 below.

Scopee	Organisation
Attended	
████████████████████	Assynt Community Council
██████████	Assynt Foundation
██████████	Coigach Community Council
██████████	Eisg Brachaidh Estate
██████████████	Inver & Kirkaig Fishings Estate
██████████	Inverpolly Estate & agricultural tenant for Eisg Brachaidh
██████████	Inverpolly Estate Woodland Advisor
Graeme Taylor	NatureScot
Sinclair Coghill	NatureScot
Tamara Lawton	NatureScot
██████████████	RSPB Scotland
██████████	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
██████████	Scottish Forestry - Chair of EIA Scoping Meeting
██████████████	Scottish Forestry
██████████	Scottish Forestry
██████████████	Scottish Forestry
██████████████	Scottish Wildlife Trust
██████████████	Woodland Trust Scotland / CALLP
██████████	Woodland Trust Scotland
Apologies	
██████████	Scottish Wildlife Trust
██████████	Woodland Trust Scotland

Table 1. List of attendees and apologies

Correspondence in absentia

The following scopees submitted correspondence in lieu of attending the meeting. See Appendices 2- 6 for copies of correspondence submitted.

Scopee	Organisation	Issue	Appendix ref
██████	Historic Environment Scotland	None	Appendix 2
██████	Highland Council	Visual impact Deer vehicle collisions	Appendix 3
██████	Mountaineering Scotland	Access and visual impact	Appendix 4
██████	Canoe Scotland	Access	Appendix 5

Table 2: List of correspondence in absentia

Minutes

Table 3. below contains the minutes from the scoping meeting.

The final column shows a reference to the issues log (Appendix 8). There is a reference in this column if an issue is raised or if the information in the minute is relevant to the issue. As appropriate, multiple minutes covering the same points have been assigned to single issues.

Some of the issues arising from the scoping meeting were brought up in the EIA determination issued by SF on 26 April 2021. Some duplication occurs in the issues log, this is to ensure the concerns of all scopees can be captured as clearly as possible.

Issues are coded by topic as follows:

EIA – Arising from the EIA Screening Opinion letter (Appendix 1)

Arc – Issues concerning archaeology

Ac – Issues concerning access

Ag – issues around agricultural impacts

Bi – Issues concerning birds

Dm – Issues concerning deer management

FWPM – Issues concerning freshwater pearl mussel

Hi – Issues concerning habitat impact (from deer, of fencing works)

Ma – Issues concerning mammals (otter, badger & water vole)

Ps – Issues concerned with public safety

Vi – Issues concerning visual impact on landscape

Wa – Issues concerning water

Wc – Issues concerning woodland creation / natural regeneration

Scopee / Heading	Minute	Issues Log ref (if added)
Introduction		
██████████ - SF	Welcome and introductions. Explanation of EIA and scoping process. WTS to write scoping report detailing issues raised including by those not attending today.	n/a
██████████ - EB	██████████ presented the reasons why this proposal is needed. The ██████████ family has multi-generational commitment to conservation. Range of site designations (some in unfavourable decline); loss of wildlife; EB is important to Scotland's biodiversity. Deer browsing and trampling are primary causes of decline of woodland and more will be lost without effective protection. For decades we have tried a workable way to restore woodland. Fence is only viable option to uphold tenant grazing rights and access payment schemes, enable sustainable deer densities and habitat recovery.	n/a
██████████ - WTS	██████████ presented slides with more detail on what the proposal is and how the WTS intends to deliver it.	n/a
Points of Clarification		
██████████ - SEPA	No significant issues but because it's a designated site we need to make sure NatureScot are happy with proposals. Will follow up on minor comments by email to ██████████ and WTS – see Appendix 6.	none
██████████	Increased tracking along northern boundary fence will result in more excreta entering the River Kirkaig, not less – so there will not be nitrogen pollution benefits as suggested by ██████████; river water quality will not improve. Enquired on SEPA's perspective of this. ██████████ noted it and to get back to ██████████.	Wa1
Correspondence in absentia		
██████████	See appendices for copies of the correspondence.	none

	<p>Historic Environment Scotland – no heritage assets within their remit included in proposal.</p> <p>Highland Council – recognises woodland restoration benefit to the designated woodland; Highland Council’s Forestry and Woodland Strategy classifies the area having ‘potential with sensitivities’; Landscape lies entirely within NSA with prominent viewpoints from falls of Kirkaig and the top of Suilven. Advises to be aware of fencing at prominent view-points; Alignment of fence will need to minimise risk of deer vehicle collisions. Recognises Public access has been discussed with the local area access officer.</p> <p>Mountaineering Scotland – response submitted last Sept. Ensure sufficient access points along route of fence-line; could add signs to fence-line to let users know where nearest gates are; would like to see LVIA - keen to see what analysis of potential impact and special qualities of the NSA. He expressed the opinion that culling over deer range would have more cohesive impact than segregation of extensive sections of land by fences which illustrate a failure of management to control impacts of deer on vegetation. A Strava link was shared which showed that there was a concentration of activity on the road for cycling and routes through lochs Sionascaig and Veyatie for kayaking.</p> <p>West Sutherland DMG (late submission in writing 28/06) – There needs to be more info on deer movement and how it will be impacted by the fence. Particularly evaluation is needed of potential for deer to be pushed into bottlenecks, and deer welfare. The proposal aims to reduce deer numbers to 1/100ha over two years but there is not enough information to show how many deer will need to be culled to achieve this.</p>	<p>Vi1</p> <p>Ps1</p> <p>Vi2</p> <p>Ac1</p> <p>Dm1</p> <p>AC1</p> <p>Dm15</p> <p>Dm16</p> <p>Dm17</p>
Issues		
<p>██████████ - AF</p>	<p>AF fully supports whole project; bigger fence better than lots of little fences to recover biodiversity losses; restoration of woodland is paramount as 95% of the woods are gone and we’re already missing important species (red squirrel, blackcock, etc.); happy to have open dialogue with any landowners to make it a success.</p>	<p>none</p>

<p>██████████ ██████████ - ACC</p>	<p>No-one can speak out against natural regeneration of woodland, but question is how, what public funds would be used, is a fence of this nature really necessary? Some might suggest it's an obscene amount of public money.</p> <p>Had detailed concerns, some no longer relevant particularly about deer movement, although yet to bottom that out.</p> <p>Landscape assessment was flawed.</p> <p>Does not approve of enrichment planting.</p> <p>What is the 'original state' that the project is trying to restore the woodland to e.g. the 1900s, 5000 years ago? He added that in 1750, the area was populous, settled and under cultivation. He urged the need for clarity on history, what it means to restore or bring back to an 'original state', which is not defined in the proposal, and the fact that the area has changed over time where in the past it has been under agriculture, settlements and woodland, so what should it be now? Not saying it couldn't or shouldn't be woodland.</p> <p>Birchwoods die, they are dynamic – why are we trying to intervene in this natural process?</p> <p>At Leorchirkaig birch have died, revealing lazy beds indicating arable land some 200 years ago. Should they be restored?</p> <p>Need to better understand the cost / benefit.</p> <p>Will consider documents and respond fully in due course.</p>	<p>Dm2</p> <p>Wc1</p> <p>Arc1</p> <p>Wc2</p>
<p>██████████ - SWT</p>	<p>SWT supports the proposal and would like to see habitats move out of unfavourable condition. Would prefer if this could be achieved with no fencing but it would appear that a fence is necessary in this case.</p> <p>Would like to see a maintenance commitment beyond 20 years so that old fencing can be removed. Hard to plan long term, but Scottish countryside littered with dilapidated fences, a hazard to people and wildlife.</p>	<p>none</p>

	Welcomed the point about what period to restore to but added we need to accept there is uncertainty when restoring habitats.	
██████████	<p>Four points, all referenced in EIA determination letter.</p> <p>1. Deer management in this area is characterised by movement; this is a significant project; it needs a Deer Management Plan at the Coigach and South Assynt level (not at single estate level) to establish the impact of the fence on neighbours and this hasn't been done; need to include deer numbers in a plan, and neighbour obligations; if we get it wrong we will have deer welfare issues. A deer plan covering one property won't make much impact.</p> <p>2. Question whether a fence is needed at all. Majority of habitats are in recovering or favourable condition, except woodland. There are pockets of regeneration throughout Inverpolly and around Lochinver so focussed deer control could work. The 2011 EB fire was devastating for regeneration. But for that fire, woodland regeneration in the area would be better.</p> <p>To manage deer effectively with no fence...this is possible and preferable. There are some examples of how to do this [get birch regeneration] in the deer group to the North, along the coast.</p> <p>If there had been stronger representation on this in 2018, we would have tried to incorporate this in the 2018 deer plan. There was no strong focus on the woodlands at that time.</p> <p>Section 7 in place on Inverpolly for last 10 years generally held to be a success with the majority of habitats in unfavourable recovering or favourable condition, except for the woodlands and dry heath. Woodland hard to evaluate. Lots of fragments over large area. Some enclosed, some naturally regenerating now, some moribund, no question about that. If not for the 2011 fire, we'd be more optimistic about the woodlands than not.</p> <p>A lot of the Inverpolly woodland regen is linked to cattle grazing/trampling. Can't get away from the fact that deer are a problem. Secret will be to get more cattle trampling to encourage birch, especially on EB. We do need to focus on this area. Conservation history is good on Inverpolly Estate. Cattle grazing/trampling has encouraged birch</p>	<p>Dm3</p> <p>Dm4</p> <p>Wc3</p> <p>Dm5</p> <p>Hi1</p> <p>Wc3</p>

	<p>seedling establishment in places. How will the young trees on more fertile areas marked for enrichment planting be protected from cattle? Conclusion on deer is a larger area deer plan is needed and is preferable. He had submitted alternative ideas in Nov 2020 but he believes there had been no real consideration of that. SF's letter confirms alternatives need to be looked at.</p> <p>3. There is a high % of fences close to lochs in Assynt. This is a threat to birds and the riparian environment. Deer will trample up against fence-lines impacting the riparian environment. Is bird strike an issue? We need to know what birds are there and the importance of riparian zones for them. I don't think it's possible to mitigate, but it needs a breeding bird survey first. Do fences have to be marked, in which case they become more visible and impact landscape?</p> <p>4. It's not a designation but it is part of Wild Land area #32 – Inverpolly and Glencanisp, which refers to the existing deer fences as diminishing the perceived naturalness of the area. More fences will be a greater threat. Can Scottish Forestry look at this? The beauty of the landscape is that you can walk through it unencumbered and unaware of manmade objects of any sort; a fence would destroy that and people wouldn't want to walk there.</p>	<p>Bi1</p> <p>Vi3</p> <p>Vi4</p>
<p>Tamara Lawton - NS</p>	<p>There is a role for NS to assess any proposal that may affect a protected area; we know WTS and the █████ family have done a lot of work to try and address protected areas and features; we'd like to see that all of that work feature in the EIA report; including impacts and benefits on the designated features and more commentary on monitoring and how it will be managed long term.</p> <p>The Visual Assessment goes a long way to suggest mitigations; NS has guidance for how applicants can assess proposals in Wild Land Areas published in 2020.</p>	<p>Hi2</p> <p>Vi5</p>
<p>██████ - IKF</p>	<p>Concerned that the fence-line will cause trampling close to the Kirkaig river and therefore erosion, silting and a high level of nitrites.</p> <p>There is already a high density of trees on either side of the river Kirkaig providing shade for Atlantic salmon which spawn on gravel beds that could be silted up if there was increased trampling and erosion.</p>	<p>Wa2</p> <p>Wa3</p>

	<p>Indicated that more trees would not benefit Fresh Water Pearl Mussels or salmon.</p> <p>As Wild Land, we sell it as an unspoilt wilderness and an adventurous fishing experience. Having a fence-line running down it will detract from its appeal for our clients.</p> <p>This fence will put additional deer grazing pressure on the Kirkaig grazings and potentially more pressure on deer ingress into Lochinver, already a locally contentious issue.</p>	<p>FWPM1</p> <p>Vi6</p> <p>Dm6</p>
Graeme Taylor - NS	<p>NS interested in a nature-rich future. Acknowledges significant contribution of [REDACTED] family to deal with designated site features and the significant potential positive impact on local biodiversity. NS is responding on natural habitat role but also taking account of deer legislation and balancing duties. Significant potential biodiversity gain needs to be balanced and the deer legislation is meant to be flexible.</p> <p>NS recognise there are potential significant habitat impacts within and out-with the fenced area which need to be evaluated; NS looking for a more accurate breakdown of deer control actions likely to be taken pre-, during and post-fencing, recognising potential significant habitat impacts within the fenced area and other distribution of habitats impacts outside the fenced area after fencing.</p> <p>Evaluate/consider deer vehicle collisions risk;</p> <p>Consider any agricultural damage;</p> <p>Consider potential changes to deer movement in and around residential areas and the deer management strategy needs to take this into account. The proposal needs flexibility and mitigations before, during and after fencing; if the DMG was willing to engage in planning that would help; may be that we can involve only those willing to be involved.</p>	<p>Hi3</p> <p>Hi4</p> <p>Ps2</p> <p>Ag1</p> <p>Dm7</p>
[REDACTED]	<p>Many concerns, all reflected in December email sent to [REDACTED] of Scottish Forestry</p> <p>1. Agricultural damage – we are tenants on EB and owners of Inverpolly so run the two as one unit. Our cattle are used to running over the hill. They will track the fence and start</p>	<p>Ag2</p>

	<p>to do damage if forced around lochs; risky for calves swimming with adults. We will need to spend time and money on rescuing cattle.</p> <p>2. Potential economic damage – stalking parties stay in the lodge and bring in ██████ per week for 3 weeks of the year; our deer model (produced by ██████) indicates we will lose 2 weeks letting with a fence, resulting in financial hardship; plus there’s the knock-on impact of fewer guests spending money in the community.</p> <p>NS haven’t told us we can’t graze more sheep or cattle on EB; fearful that NS money for this project might mean limited grazing for us in future. Concern over the levels of post Brexit agri subsidies.</p> <p>3. Visual damage – EB is heavily designated and unspoilt by human intervention – a fence will be a gross intrusion for walkers, fishermen and kayakers. It will no longer be a wild experience. The fence to Poll Loisgan seems to have been forgotten, there’s been no attempt to hide the line or take into account vehicle access routes across the landscape needed for fence construction.</p> <p>4. Access damage – no paths doesn’t mean no walkers. The coastal path is not defined on the ground so people take a variety of routes. How will they find out where gates are? A fence will spoil the adventure - will fisherman be able to walk around the lochs freely? Will the hundreds of walkers and kayakers be able to pass through?</p> <p>5. Environmental damage – there will be increased impacts from deer and cattle; mitigation is never 100% effective and the burden will fall to neighbours. The fence will zig zag through existing woods – how much will be cut down for that? Could FWPM be affected by fencing treatments / chemical leaching? The fenceline is on average 15m from the loch – not wide enough to let deer pass around without damaging ground they are walking on.</p> <p>6. Deer – EB is the only low ground not heavily settled that is available to deer; there’s enough conflict in village without pushing them closer; deer welfare will be a problem to the east along Loch Sionascaig where deer will be trapped between the loch and the fence – the gap will need to be wide enough to allow deer to travel through comfortably; seems ridiculous to pay for a fence and leave a giant hole in it [at Loch Buine Moire], it’s a deer trap; will</p>	<p>Dm8</p> <p>Ag3</p> <p>Vi7</p> <p>Ac2</p> <p>Hi5</p> <p>FWPM2</p> <p>Hi6</p> <p>Dm9</p> <p>Dm10</p> <p>Dm11</p>
--	---	---

	<p>the cull be in season only or will you shoot stags out of season? The EB DMP alone is fairly meaningless - a revised DMP is the only way to predict what it means for other estates.</p> <p>7. Fire in 2011 is the reason for lack of regeneration on EB; prior to that EB had great regeneration, it will come again. Fencing will make it worse next time; it is a waste of public money. Various other options could be pursued; we have extensive woodland enclosures at Inverpolly.</p> <p>8. Birds - lack of up to date information from RSPB – need to know where waders nest and feed so fence-line doesn't get in between them; mergansers could be nesting on Loch a Ghillie and may fly low to Fionnloch and Loch Sionascaig causing issues of bird strike; the local golden eagle pair will no longer have gralloch without the deer (provided by the current stalker when doing his culls).</p>	<p>Dm12</p> <p>Dm13</p> <p>Bi2</p> <p>Bi3</p>
<p>██████████ - CCC</p>	<p>Concerns on displacement of deer and impact on motorists; loss of wild feeling; access for walkers and canoeists; visual impact. Glad to be part of this EIA discussion.</p>	<p>Dm14</p> <p>Ps3</p> <p>Ac3</p> <p>Vi8</p>
<p>██████████ - RSPB</p>	<p>We think the scheme, because of its scale, will have considerable benefits for climate and biodiversity. This includes widespread benefits for ground flora, woodland, invertebrates and a wide range of species. Woodland bird assemblages are smaller than they might be – this proposal will help increase numbers and diversity.</p> <p>Carbon capture will benefit significantly from a reduction in deer grazing; this is hugely welcome and some cattle grazing can have some benefits for the natural regeneration of woodland.</p> <p>Potentially some issues with the fence – but we can look to mitigate fence strike around lochs, on the open hill and through woods using micro-siting to benefit divers, mergansers and waders.</p> <p>There have been very few surveys in this area so don't have lot of data but we know there are mergansers, divers, waders, common sandpipers and green shank present.</p> <p>Suggest a bird survey, using specific vantage points to understand flight lines for divers and where waders are</p>	<p>Bi4</p> <p>Bi5</p> <p>Bi6</p>

	<p>breeding, rather than a broad breeding bird survey across the entire area.</p> <p>Overall the long-term impacts are significantly positive for wildlife and ecosystem services, hydrology, water quality, soils and species.</p>	
<p>██████ - SF</p>	<p>Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations stipulates the information that must be included in an EIA Report; we will provide further detail of this in our Scoping Opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Non-technical summary · Site description – relevant aspects of the current state of the environment · Description of the forestry project · Site selection and alternatives · Prediction of impacts – forecasting methods or evidence used to id/assess · Description of likely significant effects associated with the project · Mitigation · References <p>The main reasons for the project requiring consent were identified in our screening opinion of 26 April 2021. We considered the size and design of the project could have complex, long-term, or irreversible impacts on the environmental sensitivity of the area, with particular regard to its biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>Although we appreciate the valuable contribution that the visual appraisal makes to our understanding of how the proposed deer fence may be seen in the landscape, we are of the opinion that because of the sensitivities of the Assynt-Coigach landscape, a more in-depth LVIA is required.</p> <p>Considering that Eisg Brachaidh estate is within a National Scenic Area and in part within and adjacent to a Wild Land Area, the potential effects of the deer fence proposals on the landscape should also be assessed. Specifically, such a landscape assessment should refer to the Special Qualities of the Assynt – Coigach NSA, the Landscape Character Type 334: Cnocan – Ross & Cromarty Key Characteristics and Description, and the Description of the Inverpolly – Glencanisp Wild Land Area.</p>	<p>EIA1</p> <p>EIA2</p>

	<p>These references would contribute towards the identification and assessment of the potential landscape effects from the deer fence proposals, especially the potential consequences of constructing a physical barrier which is intended over time to promote the recovery and regeneration of the vegetation pattern within the enclosure. In contrast, out with the fence the pressures on the vegetation could be potentially more considerable as a consequence of excluding deer from a considerable area of land. These differences could potentially have effects on the key characteristics of the wider landscape so should be considered.</p> <p>The LVIA should include an assessment of any infrastructure that may be required to both construct, maintain and – in future – dismantle and remove the enclosure, and any short-, medium- and long-term visual effects of those stages of construction and dismantling.</p> <p>Considering the potential landscape and visual effects on the Wild Land Area from the proposals, we would also request that the applicant carry out an assessment of the proposals to the NatureScot Assessing impacts on Wild Land Areas – Technical Guidance September 2020.</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>The EIA should quantify and evaluate the potential significant effects of the proposals on the SSSI and SAC features, both within and out with the proposed enclosure. Proposal maps provide a broad indication of where the anticipated 250ha of woodland regeneration is expected to occur, but it should be clear how each area has been assessed as being suitable for woodland creation and consider what impact the anticipated regeneration may have on non-woodland habitats. Consideration should also be given to areas of deep peat in relation to project design.</p> <p>Bird and Mammal surveys should be completed and any likely significant effects on the current environmental baseline discussed.</p> <p>Under the Habitats Regulations, before undertaking or giving any form of permission, consent or other authorisation to a plan or project, we must check whether the plan or project would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site.</p> <p>The EIA Report must provide such information as we may reasonably require for the purposes of the appraisal as our conclusions must be made on the basis of there being no reasonable scientific doubt as to the absence of adverse</p>	<p>EIA3</p> <p>EIA4</p> <p>EIA5</p> <p>EIA6</p> <p>EIA7</p> <p>EIA8</p> <p>EIA9</p>
--	---	---

	<p>effects. There is a need to ascertain the proposal will not adversely affect site integrity of the SAC.</p> <p>Deer There remains uncertainty over the likely impacts on deer welfare and behaviour over time and therefore the efficacy of the mitigation strategy in minimising impacts to an acceptable level, both within the enclosure and over the whole range.</p> <p>The capacity to disperse is an essential part of the lifecycle of wild deer, identifying the likely significant effects and subsequent mitigation on deer is reliant on a predictive approach that requires detailed knowledge of likely deer movement patterns.</p> <p>The scoping documents provide a desired density, however the EIA Report should be clear on how the number of deer to be culled can be achieved both safely and humanely. The EIA Report should also consider and discuss how deer within the proposed enclosure may react to captivity, or what if any welfare implications may arise on becoming a captive herd e.g. stress, wildfire or inbreeding depression. There can be no uncertainty around any likely effect on deer welfare.</p> <p>Appendix 9 of the scoping documents suggests “We can’t be certain how the deer will react to the fence, but with local knowledge we have tried to mitigate this to reduce any potential impact as much as possible.” The EIA Report should clearly describe the adverse impact each measure is intended to avoid, mitigate or compensate when implemented. It should also describe the effectiveness of such measures, their reliability and certainty, as well as the commitment to ensuring the practical implementation and monitoring of the results.</p> <p>It may not be possible to mitigate all significant effects but the EIA Report must ensure that it identifies any residual impacts (those remaining after mitigation) and their significance.</p> <p>EIA Report should also discuss Public Access The EIA should fully understand the nature and extent of the current use of the site and assess the potential impacts that the proposals may have on this use.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the proposal.</p>	<p>EIA10</p> <p>EIA11</p> <p>EIA12</p> <p>EIA13</p> <p>EIA14</p>
--	--	--

	<p>There remains uncertainty as to whether the project can successfully achieve its objective of woodland regeneration in the presence of livestock and wild deer. This should include clarification of current grazing cattle and sheep and how this will be impacted.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts Potential cumulative impacts with other existing, consented or planned (known) deer fencing that may be relevant to this proposal.</p> <p>Alternatives A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the applicant, which are relevant to the proposed forestry project and its specific characteristics; and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects.</p> <p>Other issues Maps should accurately reflect what is in the application for EIA consent and be at an appropriate scale to show a reasonable level of detail.</p>	<p>EIA15</p> <p>EIA16</p> <p>EIA17</p>
██████████	<p>Assynt Foundation doesn't recognise the term 'Wild land', it is subjective as the land is not wild, it has been managed for hundreds of years. 'Restore' terminology not appropriate either, we are trying to 'expand' the woodland.</p>	n/a
██████████ ██████████	<p>Regardless of terminology there needs to be an assessment of the impacts on wild land.</p>	n/a
██████████	<p>Summary of meeting Main issues are impact of fence on designated features / on deer (need DMP to look at that and impact on Lochinver village); recreation access for walkers / fishing / canoeists; enrichment planting and economic impact. Benefits – carbon capture, woodland expansion and biodiversity.</p> <p>Next steps: Scoping report drawn up by applicant and circulated around everyone to ensure it is accurate; SF then has 35 days to assess and give its scoping opinion detailing what significant effects should be addressed in the EIA report.</p> <p>Applicant then writes and consults on the EIA report. Then the public will have an opportunity to comment.</p>	n/a

██████████	Checks that it is ok for scopees to submit a 1-page report to SF (given wifi issues at today's meeting). Chair says yes	n/a
██████████	Asks if the general public will get a chance to respond to the proposal – ██████████ confirms the public will get a 30-day period to respond to the EIA report. Will previous public letters of response be included in the report? Chair advises yes.	
██████████	Thanks everyone for attending and presenting	

Due to the problems with some of the internet connections we accepted a further written response from anybody who was affected. WTS received further clarification letters from ██████████, RSPB and SEPA. These were checked over and the only fresh issue that didn't appear in the meeting recording was a point from ██████████ which has been recorded as point Ac4 and added into the issues log table. WSDMG also submitted a written response as they couldn't attend the meeting – the issues raised have been added to the Issues Log.

Issues Log

Each point from the EIA determination letter has been included in the issues log. Issues raised in the minutes have been grouped, where appropriate, and added to the issues log which has been broken down into more detail.

WTS has proposed mitigation measures next to each issue and given an indication of significance following mitigation in the next column. Some issues are simply relevant information, requests for clarification, inclusion from the SF scoping letter or relevant to matters outside the scope of an EIA and so have not been given a rating.

Recommendations for the EIA Report

WTS' assessment of significance in the issues log show that deer management issues predominate as the most significant in terms of potential impact following mitigation measures. The remainder of the issues can be minimised through implementation of the planned mitigations or balanced against the many significant positive impacts acknowledged by attendees as noted in the minutes above, including AF, CALL, NS, RSPB, SWT and SF too.

The proposed project area is designated SSSI/SAC, within a national scenic area and forms part of wildland area number 32. It is important therefore that the positive and negative effects on designated habitats and species need to be considered. Further visual impact assessment has also been requested in addition to the studies which have already taken place.

We therefore recommend that the EIA should focus on deer management issues, the impact on designated habitats and species, and landscape. It should identify and develop further mitigation to reduce the significance of the likely impacts raised.

The EIA should describe and discuss the alternatives to fencing the entire estate and include a non-technical summary of why this is the preferred option.

It should clearly outline how deer monitoring in conjunction with deer management will safeguard the designated site woodland features and the sustainable management of wild deer together with associated welfare concerns.

It should outline the significant positive effects of the proposals on designated habitats and species and how mitigation can minimise any potential short term negative effects.

The Bird Survey will be focused and agreed with RSPB as the recognised expert body for this issue and an ongoing dialogue with RSPB will be maintained.

A full LVIA of the potential effects on the landscape will be included.

The EIA will include an updated issues log showing how each issue has been mitigated and where possible reduced to acceptable levels.

Appendices

Appendix 1. SF issued EIA determination letter

Appendix 2. HES letter confirming 'no records of interest in project area'

Appendix 3. Highland Council () response

Appendix 4. Mountaineering Scotland () response

Appendix 5. Canoe Scotland () response

Appendix 6. SEPA () response

Appendix 7. WSDMG () response 28/06/21

Appendix 8. Issues Log - separate document

Eisg Brachaidh Project Team

Woodland Trust Scotland

9th July, 2021

Appendix 1. FCS EIA determination and statement of reasons.



Highland & Islands Conservancy
'Woodlands', Fodderty Way
Dingwall, Ross-Shire, IV15 9XB
Tel: 0300 067 6950
highland.cons@forestry.gov.scot
Conservator: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Woodland Manager
Coigach-Assynt Living Landscape Project

By email - [REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk

Our Reference - 030902379

26 April 2021

Dear [REDACTED]

The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

I refer to your application at Eisd Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool for, 250 hectares of afforestation.

We are required to provide a Screening Opinion under the above Regulations as to whether the work you are proposing is an EIA project and will require EIA consent.

I can confirm that the work you propose will require EIA consent.

Description of Forestry Project and Location

Although the maps provide a broad indication of where natural-regeneration is anticipated, it is not clear from these or from the supporting information how each area relates to non-woodland protected habitats and how they have been assessed as being suitable for woodland creation.

The supporting information does not clearly demonstrate the requirement to enclose the entire Eisd Brachaidh Estate, non-woodland habitats have been assessed as being in favourable maintained or unfavourable recovering condition.

The role of the Section 7 agreement and Coigach - South Assynt sub area Deer Management Plan in delivering designated features into favourable condition is not discussed. Consequently it is not clear the extent to which these management agreements are being successful or failing to meet their objectives.

The description of relevant aspects of the current state of the environment are incomplete. The mammal survey is an 'interim report' largely based on earlier surveys and by its own declaration fieldwork is "by no means complete". A recent bird survey has not been undertaken, instead the supporting information includes a summary based on personal accounts that are not supported by data.

The screening request concludes "Fencing the estate will avoid any negative impact on surrounding owner's deer stalking activity", though the evidence to support this statement has not been provided. To set this proposal in context we would expect an assessment of how the proposal relates to the management objectives of all neighbouring landholdings.

Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for forestry policy, support and regulation

S e Coilltearachd na h-Alba a' bhuidheann-ghnìomha aig Riaghaltas na h-Alba a tha an urra ri poileasaidh, taic agus riaghladh do choilltearachd



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

There remains uncertainty as to whether the project can successfully achieve its objective of woodland regeneration in the presence of livestock and wild deer, as no method to control their abundance or distribution in areas identified for natural regeneration is proposed.

The screening request does not consider the potential cumulative impacts with other existing, consented or planned deer fencing that may be relevant to this proposal.

Description and Mitigation of Likely Significant Effects

The supporting information does not provide the level of detail required to determine the significance of impacts on SSSI and SAC features, both within and out with the proposed enclosure. Appendix 2 provides brief notes of an expected outcome within the enclosure, though it is unclear what methodology was used to arrive at these conclusions.

There remains uncertainty over the likely impacts on deer welfare and behaviour over time and therefore the efficacy of the mitigation strategy in minimising impacts to an acceptable level, both within the enclosure and over the whole range. Appendix 3 confirms "Deer movements in the area are difficult to predict with any certainty. The area may be one of the through routes for deer into and through Inverpoll Estate." The capacity to disperse is an essential part of the lifecycle of wild deer, identifying the likely significant effects and subsequent mitigation on deer is reliant on a predictive approach that requires detailed knowledge of likely deer movement patterns.

The screening request concludes the proposal will not inhibit public access, but does not provide the rationale for this assumption. Favoured routes have not been identified on the access map and local and other relevant stakeholders views have yet to be invited on the location of access gates.

Although a competent piece of work, the visual appraisal does not include mention or assessment of any infrastructure that may be required to both construct, maintain and in future dismantle and remove the enclosure, and any short, medium and long term visual effects of those stages of construction and dismantling. Additionally, the potential visual effects created as a consequence of the vegetation within the enclosure having the grazing pressures removed has not been considered. From the more elevated and distant viewpoints, this differential vegetation pattern may become visible in the wider landscape, despite the actual enclosure being too far distant or screened from view.

Consultation

The outcome of discussions held with NatureScot, including comments and advice with regards to deer and protected sites are not captured within the screening request. Neither are the opinions and issues raised by those who do not support the proposal.

Changes to deer management on one landholding can have significant effects on others. The extent of these effects are unclear, as the views of the tenant farmer, Deer Management Group, all neighbouring properties and local community regarding this project are not fully captured within the screening request and supporting information.

Conclusion

In reaching our decision we have taken into account the information you have provided with the request for a screening opinion and other existing environmental information for the area.

We considered the size and design of the forestry project could have complex, long-term, or irreversible impacts on the environmental sensitivity of the area, with particular regard to its biodiversity and landscape. We have therefore concluded that expert and detailed analysis of those impacts would be relevant to whether or not the proposal should be allowed.

Although the visual appraisal makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of how the proposed deer fence may be seen in the landscape, as Eisd Brachaidh estate is within a National Scenic Area and in part within and adjacent to a Wild Land Area, we are of the opinion the potential effects of the deer fence proposals on the landscape should also be assessed and a more in-depth [Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment](#) is required.

Although a useful tool in managing wild deer, fencing is rarely appropriate as a long-term fix particularly on a landscape scale. We need to be certain that this project is an effective means of deer management that both safeguards the designated site woodland features and the sustainable management of wild deer. The screening request and supporting information does not clearly demonstrate this.

The screening request considered alternative solutions were shown to be unviable, but did not provide detail on alternate designs or explain why they were shown to be unworkable. The EIA process will provide further opportunity for an analysis of all reasonable alternatives taking into account the environmental effects.

Next Steps

It is recommended that you now contact us to request a Scoping Opinion, which will provide the information that is to be included in your EIA Report.

We must consult statutory consultees during the scoping process, so we recommend you arrange an online Scoping Meeting and invite Scottish Forestry and all of the necessary organisations and individuals that can contribute information or that may be affected by your EIA forestry project.

We advise this includes:

- NatureScot
- Highland Council
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Historic Environment Scotland
- West Sutherland Deer Management Group
- Assynt Foundation
- Inver and Kirkaig Fishings estate
- Inverpolly estate
- Scottish Wildlife Trust
- Assynt Community Council
- Coigach Community Council
- Ramblers Scotland
- Mountaineering Scotland
- Scottish Canoe Association
- RSPB Scotland

If you do not hold a Scoping Meeting we will still require the following information to consult independently:

- A description of the location of your forestry project
- A map identifying the land
- A description of the nature and purpose of your forestry project and its likely effects on the environment
- Any other information that you wish to provide, e.g. any avoidance, off-setting or mitigation measures.

Guidance on EIA for forestry projects can be found at:

<https://forestry.gov.scot/support-regulations/environmental-impact-assessment>

Yours sincerely

██████████

For Conservator

Appendix 2 - HES letter confirming 'no records of interest in project area'



By email to:

██████████@woodlandtrust.org.uk

██████████
Woodland Manager - Coigach & Assynt Living
Landscapes Partnership (CALLP)
Woodland Trust Scotland

Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

██████████@hes.scot
T: 0131 668 8575

Our case ID: 300051733

04 June 2021

Dear ██████████

Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017
Eisg Brachaidh Estate - Woodland Restoration
EIA Scoping Meeting

Thank you for contacting us regarding the scope of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to be undertaken for the proposed woodland restoration scheme on the Eisg Brachaidh Estate in the Scottish Highlands. 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).

The Highland Council's 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.

Proposed Development

We understand that it is proposed to fence the 2000 ha Eisg Brachaidh estate to enable the effective control of deer numbers within and to allow habitat restoration at a landscape scale including woodlands, heath and bog.

Scope of Assessment

We can confirm that there are no heritage assets within our remit located within the proposed woodland restoration scheme area or its vicinity. We are therefore content for heritage assets within our remit to be scoped-out of any Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken for the scheme. Consequently, we confirm that we will not require to attend the proposed scoping meeting to be undertaken for the scheme.

Further information

A new Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS, 2019) was adopted on the 1st May 2019, which replaces the Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS,

Historic Environment Scotland – Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH

Scottish Charity No. SC045925

VAT No. GB 221 8680 15

2016). The new Historic Environment Policy for Scotland is a strategic policy document for the whole of the historic environment and is underpinned by detailed policy and guidance. This includes our Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance Notes. All of these documents are available online at www.historicenvironment.scot/heps.

Practical guidance and information about the EIA process can also be found in the EIA Handbook (2018). This is available online at <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=6ed33b65-9df1-4a2f-acbb-a8e800a592c0>

We hope this is helpful. Please contact us if you have any questions about this response. The officer managing this case is [REDACTED] and they can be contacted by phone on 0131 668 8575 or by email on [REDACTED]@hes.scot.

Yours sincerely

Historic Environment Scotland

Appendix 3 – Highland Council ([REDACTED]) response

From: [REDACTED] (Planning and Environment) <[REDACTED]@highland.gov.uk>
Sent on: Thursday, June 17, 2021 3:19:01 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk>
Subject: RE: Eisd Brachaidh Scoping Meeting Documents link

Dear [REDACTED],

Good to catch up earlier and thanks for explaining your proposals at Eisd Brachaidh in more detail.

I will not be able to attend the meeting next week and so briefly outline some of the key points that we discussed:

Highland Forest & Woodland Strategy

This area is classified as 'Potential with Sensitivities' which recognises that sensitive woodland creation or restoration may benefit many of the designated features found within the site (SPA, SAC & SSSI). NatureScot will be best placed to comment on this aspect, but there would appear to be core areas of ancient woodland remnants (AW1 1a & 2a) which would benefit from a reduction in deer pressure, along with other non-woodland habitats.

Landscape

The entire site lies within the wider Assynt-Colgach NSA. There are prominent viewpoints, particularly along the Core Path route to the Falls of Kirkaig and from the top of Sulven. I appreciate that you have certain constraints which dictate how far the perimeter fence can stray from the ownership boundary. I mentioned a couple of areas where I thought this may cause issues, such as along the shore of Fionn Loch, but I understand that the local topography provides the opportunity to minimise this visual impact.

Public Access

I understand that you have been in discussion with the Council's Access Officer about any requirements.

Roads

The alignment of new deer fences will need to minimise any risk of deer vehicle collisions. I understand that Galbraiths will be submitting a planning application for a deer grid to the south (in addition to the existing grid to the north).

I hope you have a productive meeting next week. I would be grateful if you could forward a copy of the scoping report, when available.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Forestry Officer, North Highland | Infrastructure & Environment | Highland Council

All Highland Council planning staff are currently working from home and have limited access to non-digital / paper records. Please note that I do not work on Fridays.

Appendix 4 – Mountaineering Scotland ([REDACTED]) response

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@mountaineering.scot>
Sent: 24 September 2020 11:08
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@coigach-assynt.org>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot>
Subject: RE: FAO Davie Black

Hello [REDACTED]

Thank you for getting in touch about the deer fence at Eisg Brachaidh. Our interest in this proposal lies with the recreational access arrangements and the assessment of impact on landscape and visual amenity.

Online searches about the proposal led me to the conclusion that information is rather limited on the landscape and visual impact of this proposed deer fence in the Assynt-Coigach National Scenic Area and Wild Land Area 32, Inverpolly-Glencanisp. I had got in touch with the Woodland Officer at Scottish Forestry as I was interested in finding out more about this extensive deer fencing scheme, and expected that as regulatory body they would hold more data on this.

It turns out that they don't as it is not funded by a forestry grant and there was not the usual public consultation that goes along with the use of public funds, with the associated environmental documents.

For access I understand that the route to Suilven from Inverkirkaig lies along the north bank of the river and should not be affected by this proposed fenceline. However it is an extensive barrier to recreational access generally and would like assurance that there will be sufficient crossing points for those wishing to pass through the fence. We would expect to see crossings at regular intervals so that people do not have to make unnecessary detours. This is important in the wet, lochan-speckled landscape here. In addition, the think that crossings should be clearly visible to the public, with arrows indicating the direction to the nearest crossing point to make it easier for people to find them if visibility is restricted.

On landscape and visual impact we would like to see what analysis was done for the potential impact on the special qualities of the NSA and if it would have an effect on the qualities of the Wild Land Area, especially as seen from visual receptors such as Gasteal Lieth on Suilven and around the summits of Cul Mor and Stac Polly. This is not just the visibility of the physical fenceline, but the ongoing landscape changes over time through the effect of the fence on vegetation, inside and outside of the fence.

It is our opinion that in a landscape like this that culling over the deer range should have a more cohesive landscape impact than segregation of extensive sections of land by fences, which in many cases can illustrate a failure of management to control Red Deer impacts on vegetation.

I look forward to receiving your analysis.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]
Access & Conservation Officer

[REDACTED]
Mountaineering Scotland
The Granary, West Mill Street
Perth, PH1 5QP



Love Scotland's mountains?
Walk climb ski. Join us.

www.mountaineering.scot

Appendix 5 – Canoe Scotland ([REDACTED]) response:

From:	[REDACTED]@canoescotland.org>
Sent on:	Friday, August 28, 2020 8:08:01 PM
To:	[REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk>
CC:	[REDACTED]@coigach-assynt.org>; Info <info@coigach-assynt.org>
Subject:	Re: Canoe Trail
Attachments:	Inverpolly Lochs Trail.jpg (2.79 MB)

Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html;

[REDACTED], thank you again for the assistance in forwarding my email.

[REDACTED], many thanks for your initial response and for searching out the trail on the Go Paddle website. There is however another section of trail which is included in the 'Scottish Canoe Classics' guidebook and is a popular loop, or traverse from Elphin to the West Coast. I attach a plan showing the two sections to the north and east of Loch Sionasgaig connecting through to Fionn Loch and Loch Veyatie. Hopefully these routes are also out with the area to be fenced, but if they do conflict, I'd appreciate being able to discuss potential access solutions.

Many thanks, and I hope you both have (had?) a good weekend.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | SCA Access Committee

[REDACTED]

Scottish Canoe Association

Caledonia House, 1 Redheughs Rigg, South Gyle, Edinburgh, EH12 9DQ

t: 0131 317 7314

w: www.canoescotland.org

Follow us on Twitter @ScottishCanoe

Find us on Facebook www.facebook.com/ScottishCanoeAssociation

The Scottish Canoe Association is a Company Limited By Guarantee registered in Scotland. Company number SC 207488. The contents of this email remain confidential for the intended recipient only. If we have sent this to you in error, please do not keep/copy or disclose it without our permission and please send it back to us. We virus scan and monitor our e-mails but do not accept any responsibility for any damage that is caused by a virus or alteration by a third party after it has been sent.

On Fri, 28 Aug 2020 at 09:13, [REDACTED] <[HYPERLINK](#)
"mailto:[REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk" [REDACTED]@woodlandtrust.org.uk"> wrote:

Morning [REDACTED] nice to hear from you again, I left a phone message to say I had found the portage route on the GoPaddle website that runs from Loch Buine Mhor (who's boundary isn't to be fenced) across the narrow bit of ground to Boat Bay. This appears to be well outside the fenced enclosure but if you could send me your map that would be useful to just double check.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Access further resolved via phone calls to make two gates at the east end kayak friendly if the short cut to Fionnloch from Gull Bay is chosen. Awaiting spec for the 2 kayak friendly gates. Confirmed other route is outside the fence.

Appendix 6 – SEPA (redacted) response

Fw: 1702 - Eisg Brachaidh Scoping - SEPA Response



scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk

To

(redacted)

Reply Reply All Forward ...

Thu 24/06/2021 16:55

If there are problems with how this message is displayed, click here to view it in a web browser.

OFFICIAL – BUSINESS

Dear (redacted) and Woodland Team

Thank you for your invite to the EIA scoping meeting – it was useful to attend and I apologise I was not able to stay for the whole event due to other commitments.

The information provided within the submission suggests that issues such as avoiding inappropriate planting on deep peat or wetlands are already being considered – and the proposals will improve wet woodland (which is itself a type of wetland habitat) and other peatland habitats will be improved due to other associated actions. We also note the confirmation provided at the meeting that there is no need for new tracks, or other similar infrastructure. As a result of above, and based on the other information currently supplied then SEPA has no specific significant issues to highlight for consideration in the EIA process. However as all of the area is a designated site it is important to ensure that NatureScot is content with the proposals.

Consideration may also need to be given to protecting any local private water supplies and we draw the applicants attention to the relatively new Cultivation of Upland Woodland Creation sites – Applicants Guide (which hopefully you have a link for (redacted) as I cannot find one). In addition if the trees are to be protected by tree guards then there should be a tree guard removal plan after the trees are established (leaving the plastic-based guards lying on the landscape would constitute improper waste disposal).

Should you wish to discuss any site specific issues further I can be contacted via planning.north@sepa.org.uk.

Kind regards

(redacted)
Senior Planning Officer
SEPA Planning Service

Appendix 7 – WSDMG response 28/06/21

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Eisg Brachaidh proposal. Given the time constraints please accept comments from WSDMG in bullet points below.

1. There is not enough information provided about the movement of deer and how this will be impacted by the fence
2. The fence alignment could lead to deer being pushed in to bottlenecks no evaluation of this.
3. The proposal aims to reduce deer numbers to 1/100ha over two years but there is not enough information to show how many deer will need to be culled to achieve this.
4. We are concerned that not enough work has been done to evaluate whether deer welfare is going to be adversely impacted by this proposal.

We look forward to receiving your response to the concerns raised.

[REDACTED]

Chair WSDMG East Sub Group/Vice Chair WSDMG

[REDACTED]

Estate Manager

Sallachy Estate

Lairg

IV27 4EF

/Web. www.sallachyestate.co.uk

Appendix 8 Issues Log – Please see separate attachment

Eisg Brachaidh - Scoping Report Issues Log

Ref or issue code	Raised by	Date	Issue (incl date & raised by)	Applicants (WTS) response / proposed mitigation	WT suggested significance following mitigation	SF comments	Agreed mitigation	Status (Open / Closed)	Significance of impact (High, medium, Low)
Wa1	█	24/06/2021	Increased tracking along northern boundary fence will result in more excreta entering the River Kirkaig, not less – so there will not be nitrogen pollution benefits as suggested by █; river water quality will not improve.	The deer use outwith the fence will be monitored and control implemented as necessary to keep numbers to a minimum. There will also be a regular deer disturbance regime to prevent a build up of deer numbers along the River. Improving woodland condition will have a positive effect on the watercourses.	Low				
Wa2	█ - I & K Estate	24/06/2021	Concerned that the fence-line will cause trampling close to the river and therefore erosion, silting and a high level of nitrites.	as per Wa1	Low				
Wa3	█ - I & K Estate	24/06/2021	There is already a high density of trees on either side of the river Kirkaig providing shade for Atlantic salmon which spawn on gravel beds that could be silted up if there was increased trampling and erosion.	as per Wa1	Low				
FWPM1	█ - I & K Estate	24/06/2021	Indicated that more trees would not benefit Fresh Water Pearl Mussels or salmon.	The improvement to aquatic habitats will be seen across the whole of the estate and not isolated to the Kirkaig River. Regarding the Kirkaig, more woodland structure and ground vegetation (due to reduced grazing) minimises the amount of run off during wet conditions and hence silt run off.	Low				
FWPM2	█	24/06/2021	Could FWPM be affected by fencing treatments / chemical leaching?	Full investigation has been carried out by NatureScot and it is not deemed to be an issue	N/A				
Hi1	█	24/06/2021	No talk of an EB fence when I wrote deer plan in 2018. Section 7 agreement 'generally held to be quite effective' – except for woodland, everything else doing ok; difficult as there is a full spectrum of woodland across the whole area – some fenced, some moribund, some regenerating.	<p>The Section 7 agreement is failing to preserve SAC designated habitats. Although through the course of the Section 7, non-woodland habitats have been improving they started from a low set point and apart from wet heath, they are still assessed as unfavourable, no change or unfavourable recovering.</p> <p>This will be looked at in more detail in the EIA report. But critically, the woodland element (unfavourable declining) especially on EB has been in steady decline since the agreement came into place. Woodland condition is about more than birch regeneration and recent HIA surveys in 2021 show almost all woods on EB to have very high herbivore impacts.</p> <p>The unfavourable and declining condition of the woodlands has been widely known for decades as has Eisg Brachaidh's priority and intent to improve the condition of habitats and biodiversity on the Estate.</p> <p>The Coigach-South Assynt Sub Group Deer Management Plan 2018-2023 Background Information, states,</p> <p>Page 5 "... Eisg Brachaidh. The primary objectives for the property are conservation related, in particular to see restoration of native woodland habitats as well as other designated features including heath and blanket bog. The estate therefore wishes to manage deer in a way that achieves these objectives. ...'</p> <p>Page 33 "...Action points...PI 2.4 The Assynt Foundation, Inverpolly & Eisg Brachaidh Estates will look to forward planned woodland exclosures during the period of this plan....'</p>	Low				
Hi2	TL - NS	24/06/2021	There is a role for NS to assess any proposal that may affect a protected area; we know WTS and the █ family have done lot of work to try and address protected areas and features; we'd like to see that all of that work feature in the EIA report; including impacts and benefits on the designated features and more commentary on monitoring and how it will be managed long term.	To be addressed in EIA report	Low				
Hi3	GT - NS	24/06/2021	NS interested in a nature-rich future. Acknowledges significant contribution of █ family to deal with designated site features and the significant potential positive impact on local biodiversity. NS is responding on natural habitat role but also taking account of deer legislation and balancing duties. Significant potential biodiversity gain needs to be balanced: the deer legislation is meant to be flexible.	To be addressed in EIA report	Low				

Hi4	GT - NS	24/06/2021	We recognise there are potential significant habitat impacts within and out-with the fenced area which need evaluated; NS looking for more accurate breakdown of deer control actions likely to be taken pre, during and post fencing, recognising potential significant habitat impacts within the fenced area and other distribution of habitats impacts outwith the fenced area after fencing.	To be addressed in EIA report	Low					
Hi5		24/06/2021	Environmental damage – there will be increased impacts from deer and cattle; mitigation is never 100% effective and the burden will fall to neighbours. The fence will zig zag through existing woods – how much will be cut down for that?	If current level of cattle grazing remains then there will be no increased impact. Deer will be reduced over the Estate so the impact will be reduced. There will be added impact on some of the unfenced margin area, like the deer pass around Loch Scionasaig. This is on firmer ground and where the existing Gull Bay fence comes back more than a couple of metres from the lochside it shows there is minimal impact. There maybe a few limbs needing to be cut off trees and maybe some small trees removed - but this will be kept to a minimum.	Low					
Hi6		24/06/2021	The fenceline is on average 15m from the loch – not wide enough to let deer pass around without damaging ground they are walking on.	There is currently a deer fence enclosure at Gull Bay, Loch Scionasaig. At the northern point by the loch, the space between the loch and fence is narrow and the ground is well trampled. Quickly it moves away from the lochside by roughly 10-20m in places and the trampling reduces to very light impact. The new fenceline will be monitored regularly. If current proposed mitigation is put in place with an increased cull on adjacent AF land, then tracking shouldn't have a negative effect on the habitat - this will be monitored and deer management adjusted accordingly.	Low					
Bi1		24/06/2021	There is a high % of fences close to lochs in Assynt. This is a threat to birds and the riparian environment. Deer will trample up against fence-lines impacting the riparian environment. Is bird strike an issue? We need to know what birds are there and the importance of riparian zones for them? I don't think it's possible to mitigate, but it needs a breeding bird survey first.	A survey of breeding birds along the fence route is being carried out by a recognised ornithological consultant, including Vantage Point surveys to understand the flight lines of the divers. WT will be guided by RSPB expertise and recommendations.	Low					
Bi2		24/06/2021	Birds - lack of up to date information from RSPB – need to know where waders nest and feed so fence-line doesn't get in between them; mergansers could be nesting on Loch a Ghillie and may fly low to Fionnloch and Loch Sionasaig causing issues of bird strike	Bird survey currently underway and looking at flight lines. Considerate fenceline siting e.g., at Scionasaig back from the loch on rising ground and Fionnloch at the bottom of a bank should alleviate most of the risk. Existing fences in the area have not had problems (e.g. Gull Bay, South L. Veyatie (put up by SNH), and others. None have had known issues with bird strike.	Low					
Bi3		24/06/2021	The local golden eagle pair will no longer have gralloch without the deer (provided by the current stalker when doing his culls).	Carrion can be simply provided as required and built into the deer management plan.	Low					
Bi4	- RSPB	24/06/2021	Potentially some issues with the fence – we can look to mitigate fence strike around lochs, on the open hill and through woods using micro-siting.	The bird survey is looking closely at flightlines and if micro-siting and/or fence marking need be deployed in areas identified by vantage point and flightline surveys (and by the ecological clerk of works ahead of the fence construction). Ongoing monitoring will assess future bird strike incidents and inform further marking needs.	Low					
Bi5	- RSPB	24/06/2021	There have been very few surveys in this area so don't have lot of data but we know there are mergansers, divers, waders, common sandpipers and green shank present.	A focused bird survey is currently underway as agreed with RSPB and results are being shared with RSPB regularly. WTS will discuss with RSPB any further recommendations as needed.	Low					
Bi6	- RSPB	24/06/2021	Suggest a bird survey, using specific vantage points to understand flight lines for divers and where waders are breeding, rather than a broad breeding bird survey across the entire area.	as per Bi4 and Bi5	Low					
Ag1	GT - NS	24/06/2021	Consider the risk of agricultural damage	We are not sure what this is in reference too, no additional information was provided. Under this proposal all rights under the existing grazing lease are maintained and therefore access to current income sources will remain.	Low					
Ag2		24/06/2021	Agricultural damage – we are tenants on EB and owners of Inverpolly so run the two as one unit. Our cattle are used to running over the hill. They will track the fence and start to do damage if forced around lochs; risky for calves swimming with adults. We will need to spend time and money on rescuing cattle.	The cattle are only on the ground in summer. The cattle will become familiar with the new fence in the first year. It is unknown what circumstances might 'force' cattle to go into the lochs.	Low					
Ag3		24/06/2021	NS haven't told us we can't graze more sheep or cattle on EB; fearful that NS money for this project might mean limited grazing for us in future. Concern over the levels of post Brexit agri subsidies	A matter between the tenant and NatureScot	N/A					
Dm1	- MS	24/09/2021	culling over deer range would have more cohesive impact than segregation of extensive sections of land by fences which illustrate a failure of management to control impacts of deer on vegetation.	To be addressed in EIA report	Medium					
Dm2	- ACC	24/06/2021	Has concerns about deer movement (not 'bottomed it out') and landscape impact.	To be addressed in the EIA report	Medium					
Dm3		24/06/2021	Deer management in this area is characterised by movement; this is a significant project; it needs a Deer Management Plan (DMP) at the Coigach and South Assynt level (not at single estate level) to establish the impact of the fence on neighbours and this hasn't been done; need to include deer numbers in a plan, and neighbour obligations; if we get it wrong we will have deer welfare issues.	Deer numbers and movements will be considered as part of the EIA process as will the impact on immediate neighbours and deer welfare. It was agreed at the detailed sub-group meetings in 2020 that Eisd Brachaidh would pay to revise the Sub-group plan should the proposal go ahead. The workings for the EIA report will provide some of the information to feed into this. Whilst a DMP is helpful on a wider basis, it is a requirement of Scottish Forestry and NatureScot that a DMP for Eisd Brachaidh is produced going forward.	Medium					

Dm4		24/06/2021	A deer plan covering one property won't make much impact.	See DM3	Medium				
Dm5		24/06/2021	There are some examples of how to do this (get birch regeneration) in deer group to the North, along the coast.	It would be useful to see the information on this.	Medium				
Dm6	I & K Estate	24/06/2021	This fence will put additional deer grazing pressure on the Kirkaig grazings and potentially more pressure on deer ingress into Lochinver, already a locally contentious issue.	<p>Inverkirkaig Common Grazings have replied to say that they have 'no comment' to make on the proposals.</p> <p>If the mitigation that we would like to implement is actioned then it should result in no or negligible changes in deer numbers in and around Lochinver.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation is for the deer that would normally migrate onto Eisd Brachaidh in winter, to be culled on Eisd Brachaidh before the fence is fully enclosed. As an additional measure, Assynt Foundation will assist in reducing deer numbers close to Eisd Brachaidh prior to, during and after the completion of the fence to ensure there are no extra deer numbers outwith the fence. There should therefore be no displaced deer that remain outwith the fence. Regular monitoring of the deer and habitat on neighbouring estates will be used to ensure that this remains the case. Additional control will be undertaken in collaboration with neighbouring estates if required. This collaborative approach may be needed for the first 3-4 years, lessening as the deer get used to the fence.</p> <p>There is a fear locally that any displaced deer will end up in Lochinver village, but the deer that are used to going onto EB (to be culled) are not used to human interaction. The deer in the village do not appear to be scared of humans and are often fed.</p> <p>The CALLP project is working with ACC to help towards a solution to this issue in Lochinver. Consideration of a deer fence around the village is currently under discussion. But the mitigation proposed for the EB deer management, if actioned effectively, will help prevent any displaced deer moving towards and into the village.</p>	Low				
Dm7	GT-NS	24/06/2021	Potential changes to deer movement in and around residential areas and the deer management strategy needs to take this into account. The proposal needs flexibility and mitigations before, during and after fencing	Understood and built into the revised DMP for EB and will be built into the wider sub-group plan.	Low				
Dm8		24/06/2021	Potential economic damage – stalking parties stay in the lodge and bring in per week for 3 weeks of the year; our deer model indicates we will lose 2 weeks letting with a fence, resulting in financial hardship; plus there's the knock-on impact of fewer guests spending money in the community.	The model used for these calculations will be looked at closely and discussed as part of the wider sub-group deer plan.	Low				
Dm9		24/06/2021	Deer – EB is the only low ground not heavily settled that is available to deer; there's enough conflict in village without pushing them closer;	This is why the project has been proposed this way to take in the hefted deer and winter population, cull, and then carry out deer management where needed outside the fence.	Low				
Dm10		24/06/2021	Deer welfare will be a problem to the east along Loch Sionascaig where deer will be trapped between the loch and the fence – the gap will need to be wide enough to allow deer to travel through comfortably; seems ridiculous to pay for a fence and leave a giant hole in it [at Loch Buine Moire], it's a deer trap	<p>By moving the fence back from both loch sides (Fionn and Scionascaig) as requested at deer sub-group discussions last Autumn/Winter, deer will be able to move around these lochs.</p> <p>Deer moving from higher ground and higher densities around Cul Mor to lower ground toward the coast will not be trapped. They will be able to travel west around Loch Sionascaig onto Inverpolly estate. Regarding the fence at Loch Buine Moire, the strategy is to not run the fence along the shoreline, thereby minimising the visual impact of the views from the nearby road. Instead, using the lie of the land the fence will run into the loch and maintain the direction of travel by deer away from the fence and Eisd Brachaidh estate, thereby reducing the pressure or incentive for deer to swim around the fence ends.</p> <p>The potential for a deer trap hasn't been evidenced, but the process of starting to revise the sub-group deer plan may help eliminate this fear.</p>	Low				
Dm11		24/06/2021	Will the cull be in season only or will you shoot stags out of season?	Deer numbers and movements will be considered as part of the EIA process as well as the impact on immediate neighbours and deer welfare. It was agreed at the detailed sub-group meetings in 2020 that EB would pay to revise the Sub-group plan should the project proceed.	Low				
Dm12		24/06/2021	The EB DMP alone is fairly meaningless - a revised DMP is the only way to predict what it means for other estates.	See Dm3	Low				

Dm13	█	24/06/2021	Fire in 2011 is the reason for lack of regeneration on EB; prior to that EB had great regeneration, it will come again. Fencing will make it worse next time; it is a waste of public money. Various other options could be pursued; we have extensive woodland enclosures at Inverpolly.	Designated habitats on Eisg Brachaidh, such as the woodlands, were in unfavourable and declining condition prior to the 2011 fire. The fire in 2011 did damage some regeneration and young trees, but following the fire there was a lot of regeneration on the ground that has not had chance to get above heather height due to deer browsing. This proposal is about improving the health of the woodlands and other designated habitats on EB Estate. WTS will not analyse and does not dispute what has been carried out on Inverpolly.						
Dm14	█ - CCC	24/06/2021	Concerns on displacement of deer	See DM6/9/10 but effects unlikely to affect Achiltibuie area	Low					
Dm15	█ WSDMG	28/06/2021	There needs to be more info on deer movement and how it will be impacted by the fence.	See DM6/9/10	Medium					
Dm16	█ WSDMG	28/06/2021	Evaluation is needed of potential for deer to be pushed in to bottlenecks and deer welfare.	See DM6/9/10	Medium					
Dm17	█ - WSDMG	28/06/2021	The proposal aims to reduce deer numbers to 1/100ha over two years but there is not enough information to show how many deer will need to be culled to achieve this.	this will be shown in the EIA report.	Low					
Wc1	█ - ACC	24/06/2021	Does not approve of enrichment planting.	The aim of the project is to improve the diversity of the woodland, including species which are currently in very low numbers, including woodland understorey species. These have been browsed out as they are more palatable. Seed is collected locally and grown on at the local tree nursery, where we would source the trees for the enrichment planting, therefore safeguarding appropriate genetic material. Species would include Oak, Hazel, Juniper, Holly, Elm, Rose and honeysuckle.	Low					
Wc2	█ - ACC	24/06/2021	Birchwoods die, they are dynamic – why are we trying to intervene in this natural process? At Leorchircaig birch have died revealing lazy beds indicating arable land from some 200 years ago. Should they be restored?	Agreed that "restored" is not the right word to be using. Although history is important for providing context about distribution, the purpose of this project is to look forward and establish a dynamic, mature and functioning native woodland ecosystem, including other broadleaved species. One that works in balance with open ground habitats and evolves naturally.	Low					
Wc3	█	24/06/2021	Question whether fence is needed at all. Majority of habitats are in recovering or favourable condition, except woodland. There are pockets of regeneration throughout Inverpolly and around Lochinver so focussed deer control could work. The 2011 EB fire was devastating for regeneration. But for the fire, woodland regeneration in the area would be better. We do need to focus on this area. Conservation history is good on Inverpolly Estate. Cattle grazing/trampling has encouraged birch seedling establishment in places. How will the more fertile areas marked for enrichment planting be protected from cattle? Alternatives to fencing are possible and preferable. There needs to be an evaluation of these.	see Hi 1 comment on designated habitats. There are pockets of regeneration in places near to EB Estate, but these are mainly, not exclusively, in areas of high public use i.e. by footpaths where people walk with dogs regularly. The fire was devastating and took out saplings and younger trees, but following the fire there was (as is usual and expected) a blanket of mainly birch regeneration. As a pioneer species this is expected, but due to high deer grazing this has been unable to get away. Much of the regeneration that is visible now at heather/ground vegetation height probably dates from just after the fire, as when you look at the base of these trees they are clearly not young trees and are many years old but suppressed by grazing pressure. We have not surveyed the success of the conservation history on Inverpolly as this is not in the remit of this project, but understand that the estate has undertaken a number of different woodland projects, presumably with the objective of improving the woodland condition on Inverpolly, as we seek to do here on EB. Although it will take some time, ultimately it will result in increased woodland health and cover which will improve the grazing for the tenant and wild deer in years to come. Alternatives will be analysed as part of the EIA report.	Low					
Ps1	█ - Highland Council	24/06/2021	seek to minimise risk of deer vehicle collisions.	The fence doesn't run parallel to the road, but runs away from the road at a right angle. The road through EB Estate is a single track slow road, deer vehicle collisions will be monitored if there are any, but the risk of these is considered low.	Low					
Ps2	GT - NS	24/06/2021	Consider the risk of deer/ vehicle collisions;	See Ps1	Low					
Ps3	█ - CCC	24/06/2021	Concerns about deer/car collisions	See Ps1	Low					
Ac1	Mountaineering Scotland	24/06/2021	ensure sufficient access points along route of fence-line; could add signs to fence-line to let users know where nearest gates are;	Access points have been and will continue to be consulted on prior to fencing and monitored after fencing. Signage will also be consulted on and used where effective and reasonable	Low					

Ac2	█	24/06/2021	Access damage – no paths doesn't mean no walkers. The coastal path is not defined on the ground so people take a variety of routes. How will they find out where gates are? A fence will spoil the adventure - will fishermen be able to walk around the lochs freely? Will the hundreds of walkers and kayakers be able to pass through?	It is known that walkers use the area, but not big numbers and they rarely head out to the East of EB. This can be monitored. Consider waymarking the coastal path to assist walkers to find the path and therefore the gate. There are limited places for fishers to park, so signage could be used to inform them of where access gates are. The fence being set back off the loch sides will allow access around the lochs for deer, walkers and fisher people. Deer movements will be in the closed season for fish so there will be no clash or disturbance of movement. WTS understands that fishing on Scionasaig is mainly from a boat, so the fence shouldn't hinder this.	Low					
Ac3	█ - CCC	24/06/2021	Access for walkers and canoeists	Discussions have been had with Mountaineering Scotland and Ramblers Scotland to ensure they feel appropriate provision for these user groups are made.	Low					
Ac4	█	25/06/2021	A fenceline will also potentially threaten the riparian zone, which will be disproportionately important to a number of species, potentially causing tracking, or funnelling predators in to this area. It will also increase the chances of people being forced to walk in the riparian area when they might otherwise stay further away from the water. Disturbance may then become an issue.	To be addressed by habitat impact section of the EIA. The comments overlap with many Hi section points	Low					
Arc1	█ - ACC	24/06/2021	What is the 'original state' that the project is trying to restore the woodland to e.g., the 1900s, 5000 years ago, etc.? Need to be more explicit.	We are not seeking to restore the woodland to a point in history, we are looking forward to secure a healthy future for the currently declining woodland - see point Wc 2. The project is about more than just the woodlands An archaeological walkover survey of the proposed fenceline has been carried out and HES have no locations of interest within the proposal area.	Low					
Vi1	█ - Highland Council	24/06/2021	advises to be aware of fencing at prominent view-points;	Understood. Visual Appraisal has done this and this will be developed in the LVIA.	Low					
Vi2	Mountaineering Scotland	24/06/2021	would like to see LVIA.	Understood, it is currently underway.	Low					
Vi3	█	24/06/2021	Do fences have to be marked, in which case they become more visible and impact landscape?	Bird surveys currently underway and will inform this.	Low					
Vi4	█	24/06/2021	It's not a designation but Wild Land area # 32 – Inverpolly and Glenanisp, refers to the existing deer fences as diminishing the perceived naturalness of the area. More fences will impact that. Can Scottish Forestry look at this? The beauty of the landscape is that you can walk through it unencumbered and unaware of manmade objects; a fence would destroy that and people wouldn't want to walk there.	Wildland is a devious subject particularly amongst those living within it, but it is a designation which will be looked at as part of the LVIA assessment currently underway.	Low					
Vi5	TL - NS	24/06/2021	The Visual Assessment goes a long way to suggest mitigations; NS has guidance for how applicants can assess proposals in Wild Land Areas. ...published in 2020	see Vi4	Low					
Vi6	█ - I & K Estate	24/06/2021	As Wild Land, we sell it as an unspoilt wilderness and an adventurous fishing experience. Having a fence-line running down it (assuming the kirkaig) will detract from its appeal for our clients.	█ walked the line with █ and fencing contractors in Aug 2020, we kept away from the river, partly due to the nature of the ground and finding a good fenceline and partly to keep it within the woodland so that the experience wouldn't be spoilt. The fenceline along much of the Kirkaig is within woodland which will be in full leaf during the fishing season, so shouldn't detract from the special experience that this river offers. There are a number of fences already on the north of the Kirkaig and one enclosure on the south of the Kirkaig.	Low					
Vi7	█	24/06/2021	Visual damage – EB is heavily designated and unspoilt by human intervention – a fence will be a gross intrusion for walkers, fishermen and kayakers. It will no longer be a wild experience. The fence to Poll Loisan seems to have been forgotten, there's been no attempt to hide the line or take into account vehicle access routes across the landscape needed for fence construction.	To be covered in the LVIA assessment.	Low					
Vi8	█ - CCC	24/06/2021	Loss of wild feeling / visual impact.	A LVIA is being drawn up which will hopefully address CCC's concerns	Low					
EIA1	█ - SF	24/06/2021	Although we appreciate the valuable contribution that the visual appraisal makes to our understanding of how the proposed deer fence may be seen in the landscape, we are of the opinion that because of the sensitivities of the Assynt-Coigach landscape, a more in-depth LVIA is required.	A LVIA is currently being drawn up.	n/a					
EIA2	█ - SF	24/06/2021	Considering that Eisg Brachaidh estate is within a National Scenic Area and in part within and adjacent to a Wild Land Area, the potential effects of the deer fence proposals on the landscape should also be assessed. Specifically, such a landscape assessment should refer to the Special Qualities of the Assynt – Coigach NSA, the Landscape Character Type 334: Cnocan – Ross & Cromarty Key Characteristics and Description, and the Description of the Inverpolly – Glenanisp Wild Land Area.	A LVIA and Wildland assessment being carried out as per the guidance.	n/a					

EIA3	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	These references (from EIA 2) would contribute towards the identification and assessment of the potential landscape effects from the deer fence proposals, especially the potential consequences of constructing a physical barrier which is intended over time to promote the recovery and regeneration of the vegetation pattern within the enclosure. In contrast, outwith the fence the pressures on the vegetation could be potentially more considerable as a consequence of excluding deer from a considerable area of land. These differences could potentially have effects on the key characteristics of the wider landscape so should be considered.	This will be considered as part of the EIA report. The mitigation proposed for deer management, if implemented, well should mean that there will be little change outwith the fence to the current situation, but see a marked improvement within the fence.	Low negative impact, High positive impact					
EIA4	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	The LVIA should include an assessment of any infrastructure that may be required to both construct, maintain and – in future – dismantle and remove the enclosure, and any short, medium and long term visual effects of those stages of construction and dismantling.	Understood and passed on to the LVIA consultant	n/a					
EIA5	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	Considering the potential landscape and visual effects on the Wild Land Area from the proposals, we would also request that the applicant carry out an assessment of the proposals to the NatureScot Assessing impacts on Wild Land Areas – Technical Guidance September 2020	Understood and passed on as above	n/a					
EIA6	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	The EIA should quantify and evaluate the potential significant effects of the proposals on the SSSI and SAC features, both within and out with the proposed enclosure.	Understood and see Hi1-6.	n/a					
EIA7	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	Proposal maps provide a broad indication of where the anticipated 250ha of woodland regeneration is expected to occur, but it should be clear how each area has been assessed as being suitable for woodland creation and consider what impact the anticipated regeneration may have on non-woodland habitats. Consideration should also be given to areas of deep peat in relation to project design.	Understood	n/a					
EIA8	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	Bird and Mammal surveys should be completed and any likely significant effects on the current environmental baseline discussed.	Understood and are part of ongoing survey work.	n/a					
EIA9	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	Under the Habitats Regulations, before undertaking or giving any form of permission, consent or other authorisation to a plan or project, we must check whether the plan or project would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site. The EIA Report must provide such information as we may reasonably require for the purposes of the appraisal as our conclusions must be made on the basis of there being no reasonable scientific doubt as to the absence of adverse effects. There is a need to ascertain the proposal will not adversely affect site integrity of the SAC.	Understood and will be included in EIA report	n/a					
EIA10	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	There remains uncertainty over the likely impacts on deer welfare and behaviour over time and therefore the efficacy of the mitigation strategy in minimising impacts to an acceptable level, both within the enclosure and over the whole range The capacity to disperse is an essential part of the lifecycle of wild deer, identifying the likely significant effects and subsequent mitigation on deer is reliant on a predictive approach that requires detailed knowledge of likely deer movement patterns.	Understood - see points DM 1-17. Will be discussed in detail in EIA report.	n/a					
EIA11	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	The scoping documents provide a desired density, however the EIA Report should be clear on how the number of deer to be culled can be achieved both safely and humanely. The EIA Report should also consider and discuss how deer within the proposed enclosure may react to captivity, or what if any, welfare implications may arise on becoming a captive herd e.g. stress, wildfire or inbreeding depression. There can be no uncertainty around any likely effect on deer welfare.	See EIA10	n/a					
EIA12	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	Appendix 9 of the scoping documents suggests “We can’t be certain how the deer will react to the fence, but with local knowledge we have tried to mitigate this to reduce any potential impact as much as possible.” The EIA Report should clearly describe the adverse impact each measure is intended to avoid, mitigate or compensate when implemented. It should also describe the effectiveness of such measures, their reliability and certainty, as well as the commitment to ensuring the practical implementation and monitoring of the results. It may not be possible to mitigate all significant effects but the EIA Report must ensure that it identifies any residual impacts (those remaining after mitigation) and their significance.	See EIA10	n/a					
EIA13	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	The EIA should fully understand the nature and extent of the current access use of the site and assess the potential impacts that the proposals may have on this use.	See Ac 1-3	n/a					
EIA14	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	There remains uncertainty as to whether the project can successfully achieve its objective of woodland regeneration in the presence of livestock and wild deer. This should include clarification of current grazing cattle and sheep and how this will be impacted.	The grazing regime is agreed by the tenant and NatureScot and is subject to SSSI consent. For more details see appendix 4 of the scoping documents circulated prior to the scoping meeting.	low					
EIA15	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	Potential cumulative impacts with other existing, consented or planned (known) deer fencing that may be relevant to this proposal.	Understood, will be shown in EIA report.	low					
EIA16	■■■ - SF	24/06/2021	A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the applicant, which are relevant to the proposed forestry project and its specific characteristics; and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects.	Understood, will be shown in EIA report.	n/a					

EIA17	████ - SF	24/06/2021	Maps should accurately reflect what is in the application for EIA consent and be at an appropriate scale to show a reasonable level of detail.	Understood.	n/a					
EIA18	██████████ (lett	26/04/2021	The supporting information does not clearly demonstrate the requirement to enclose the entire EIS Brachaidh Estate, non-woodland habitats have been assessed as being in favourable maintained or unfavourable recovering condition.	See Hi 1 -6. More detailed analysis of current habitat condition will be covered in EIA report.	n/a					
EIA19	██████████ (lett	26/04/2021	The screening request concludes "Fencing the estate will avoid any negative impact on surrounding owner's deer stalking activity", though the evidence to support this statement has not been provided. To set this proposal in context we would expect an assessment of how the proposal relates to the management objectives of all neighbouring landholdings.	Understood.	n/a					
EIA20	██████████ (lett	26/04/2021	There remains uncertainty as to whether the project can successfully achieve its objective of woodland regeneration in the presence of livestock and wild deer, as no method to control their abundance or distribution in areas identified for natural regeneration is proposed.	Understood, will be shown in EIA report.	n/a					
EIA21	██████████ (lett	26/04/2021	The outcome of discussions held with NatureScot, including comments and advice with regards to deer and protected sites are not captured within the screening request. Neither are the opinions and issues raised by those who do not support the proposal.	Understood, will be shown in this scoping report and EIA report.	n/a					

- EIA – Arising from the EIA Screening Opinion letter (Appendix 1)
- Arc – Issues concerning archaeology
- Ac – Issues concerning access
- Ag – issues around agricultural impacts
- Bi – Issues concerning birds
- Dm – Issues concerning deer management
- FWPM – Issues concerning freshwater pearl mussel
- Hi – Issues concerning habitat impact (from deer, of fencing works)
- Ma – Issues concerning mammals (otter, badger & water vole)
- Ps – Issues concerned with public safety
- Vi – Issues concerning visual impact on landscape

Sharon Phipps

From: Tamara Lawton
Sent: 22 July 2021 11:45
To: 'scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk'
Subject: RE: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Report

Hi there, just to confirm that I am content that the issues I raised in the meeting are recorded properly in the minute and the issues log.

Kind regards,
Tamara

Tamara Lawton | Area Officer, South Highland

NatureScot | 17 Pulteney Street , Ullapool, Wester Ross IV262UP | 01463 701605

17 Sràid Pholtanaidh, Ulapul, Ros an Iar, IV26 2UP

nature.scot | [@nature_scot](https://twitter.com/nature_scot) | *Scotland's Nature Agency* | *Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba*

From: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk <scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk>
Sent: 09 July 2021 16:51
To: scotland@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Scoping Report

Dear all,

Thank you for attending the scoping meeting held by Zoom on 24 June 2021 or, if you were unable to attend, for submitting correspondence prior to or since that Scoping meeting.

We have collated all the issues raised into the attached Scoping Report. It contains a minute of the 24 June meeting, along with appendices of the 'in absentia' correspondence that were referred to at the meeting. The other attachment is Appendix 8 (the Issues Log).

We would ask you to confirm that the minute of the meeting as shown in the Scoping Report is an accurate record of the meeting, and that the issues you raised are recorded properly in the minute and in the corresponding Issues Log, also attached.

Please confirm the above by **12pm on 23 July**.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

The Eisg Brachaidh project team.

The information contained in this e-mail along with any attachments may be confidential, legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. It is intended for the named individual(s) or entity who is/are the only authorised recipient(s). If this message has reached you in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it without review.

Anything in this email which does not relate to the Woodland Trust's official business is neither given nor

endorsed by the Woodland Trust. Email is not secure and may contain viruses. We make every effort to ensure email is sent without viruses, but cannot guarantee this and recommend recipients take appropriate precautions. We may monitor email traffic data and content in accordance with our policies and English law. Thank you.

The Woodland Trust is a charity registered in England (No. 294344) and in Scotland (No. SC038885).

A non-profit making company limited by guarantee.

Registered in England No. 1982873.

Registered Office: Kempton Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LL.

<http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk>

Sharon Phipps

From: Graeme Taylor
Sent: 30 July 2021 15:11
To: Tamara Lawton
Subject: FW: EIA Forestry Project: Eisg Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

Tamara,

I think this may be best considered by you. At least we are making some progress, was it your understanding SF were to do the assessment?

Regards,

Graeme

From: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot <[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot>
Sent: 30 July 2021 14:51
To: Graeme Taylor <Graeme.Taylor@nature.scot>
Cc: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot
Subject: EIA Forestry Project: Eisg Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

Dear Graeme

The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

EIA Forestry Project: Eisg Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

As a consultation body under the above Regulations I am writing on behalf of Conservator [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to request NatureScot's formal advice on the environmental features likely to be significantly affected by the above forestry project, which you consider should be included in the EIA Report.

As the proposed project is also located within an SAC and adjacent to an SPA and is not directly connected with or necessary to site management for conservation, in our view, this proposal is likely to have a significant effect on a European site and we will be required to carry out an appropriate assessment in view of the site's conservation objectives for its qualifying interests.

In order to ensure both EIA and HRA are co-ordinated we would also appreciate at this time any advice you can provide on the scope of the HRA.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Woodland Creation and Case Support Manager
Scottish Forestry

Silvan House | 231 Corstorphine Road | Edinburgh | EH12 7AT

Tel: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot

Website: forestry.gov.scot

Twitter: [@scotforestry](https://twitter.com/scotforestry)

Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for forestry policy, support and regulation.

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) may contain confidential or privileged information and is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government and Scottish Forestry may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Forestry.

Sharon Phipps

From: [REDACTED]@heritagefund.org.uk>
Sent: 06 August 2021 11:36
To: Tamara Lawton
Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project

Hi Tamara

I hope you're well.

[REDACTED] from the Coigach and Assynt Living Landscape Partnership passed on your contact details. I work for the National Lottery Heritage Fund and we are currently considering the inclusion of the Eisg Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project in the CALLP Scheme we are funding. I'm keen to get a better understanding of the local context and was wondering if you would be free for a quick call at some point?

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Senior Investment Manager
The National Lottery Heritage Fund

Phone: 0131 376 9945

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]@heritagefund.org.uk

Follow us on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [Instagram](#)
#NationalLotteryHeritageFund

If you require an urgent response please call our main switchboard on 0131 376 0033.



Sharon Phipps

From: [REDACTED]@coigach-assynt.org>
Sent: 06 August 2021 13:13
To: Tamara Lawton
Subject: RE: Eisd Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project

Hi Tamara,

I can confirm that [REDACTED] is the representative for the National Lottery Heritage Fund. When NLHF asked for the WT contacts for the Eisd Brachaidh Project, [REDACTED] identified you as the NatureScot representative for the local office and SSI/SAC management and [REDACTED] in terms of the Biodiversity Challenge Fund.

The NLHF are presently reviewing the request to fund AP02 Eisd Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project (the CALLP name of the Eisd Brachaidh Project). Although the original request was made in 2019, confirmation of NLHF funding is still outstanding.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Scheme Manager
Coigach & Assynt Living Landscape Partnership



T: 01571 844638 M: [REDACTED] W: coigach-assynt.org

From: Tamara Lawton <Tamara.Lawton@nature.scot>
Sent: 06 August 2021 13:00
To: [REDACTED]@coigach-assynt.org>
Subject: FW: Eisd Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside The Scottish Wildlife Trust. Do not click links nor open attachments unless you know the source to be genuine (please check with the sender independently if required).

Hi [REDACTED] hope all is well with you.

Just got this email from [REDACTED] – can you confirm this is bona fide? If so, it would be good to understand the context.

Cheers,
Tamara

Tamara Lawton | Area Officer, South Highland

NatureScot | 17 Pulteney Street , Ullapool, Wester Ross IV262UP | 01463 701605

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@heritagefund.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@heritagefund.org.uk)>

Sent: 06 August 2021 11:36

To: Tamara Lawton <Tamara.Lawton@nature.scot>

Subject: Eisg Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project

Hi Tamara

I hope you're well.

[REDACTED] from the Coigach and Assynt Living Landscape Partnership passed on your contact details. I work for the National Lottery Heritage Fund and we are currently considering the inclusion of the Eisg Brachaidh Habitat Restoration Project in the CALLP Scheme we are funding. I'm keen to get a better understanding of the local context and was wondering if you would be free for a quick call at some point?

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Senior Investment Manager
The National Lottery Heritage Fund

Phone: 0131 376 9945

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@heritagefund.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@heritagefund.org.uk)>

Follow us on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [Instagram](#)
#NationalLotteryHeritageFund

If you require an urgent response please call our main switchboard on 0131 376 0033.



**A' Mhaoin-
Dualchais**

**Heritage
Fund**

--

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager or the sender.

Please note that for business purposes, outgoing and incoming emails from and to NatureScot may be monitored.

Tha am post-dealain seo agus fiosrachadh sam bith na chois dìomhair agus airson an neach no buidheann ainmichte a-mhàin. Mas e gun d' fhuair sibh am post-dealain seo le mearachd, cuiribh fios dhan manaidshear-siostaim no neach-sgrìobhaidh.

Thoiribh an aire airson adhbharan gnothaich, 's dòcha gun tèid sùil a chumail air puist-dealain a' tighinn a-steach agus a' dol a-mach bho NatureScot.

Sharon Phipps

From: Chris Donald
Sent: 19 August 2021 14:28
To: Tamara Lawton
Subject: FW: EIA Forestry Project at Eisg Brachaidh Estate
Attachments: EIA Forestry Project: Eisg Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

Importance: High

Hi Tamara,
Have there been discussions about this on our response?

Chris
Chris Donald | Area Manager, South Highland

NatureScot | Achantoul, Grampian Road, Aviemore, PH22 1QD | DD: 01463 725270; M: [REDACTED]

nature.scot | @nature_scot | *Scotland's Nature Agency* | *Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba*

From: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot <[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot>
Sent: 19 August 2021 14:18
To: Chris Donald <Chris.Donald@nature.scot>
Cc: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot; [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot
Subject: FW: EIA Forestry Project at Eisg Brachaidh Estate

Dear Chris

I'm forwarding this to you as Graeme's out of office message doesn't say when he'll be back from leave and we would appreciate an early response if possible.

Many thanks and regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Woodland Officer
Highland & Islands Conservancy
Scottish Forestry

Tel: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot
Twitter: @scotforestry

Website: forestry.gov.scot



BRAVE values are the roots that underpin Scottish Forestry, to create a workplace where our staff, and the people we work with, feel valued, supported and respected.

Be professional, Respect others, Act with honesty and integrity, Value teamwork and collaboration and Encourage innovation and creativity.

Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for forestry policy, support and regulation.

From: [REDACTED] SF)
Sent: 19 August 2021 14:08
To: 'Graeme.Taylor@nature.scot' <Graeme.Taylor@nature.scot>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)>
Subject: EIA Forestry Project at Eisd Brachaidh Estate

Dear Graeme

The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

EIA Forestry Project: Eisd Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

Please see attached a copy of [REDACTED] email to you of 30th July requesting NatureScot's formal advice on the environmental features likely to be significantly affected by the above forestry project, for inclusion in the EIA Report.

I would be grateful if you could respond at your earliest convenience along with any advice you can provide on the scope of the HRA.

Thanks and regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Woodland Officer
Highland & Islands Conservancy
Scottish Forestry

Tel: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)>
Twitter: @scotforestry

Website: forestry.gov.scot



BRAVE values are the roots that underpin Scottish Forestry, to create a workplace where our staff, and the people we work with, feel valued, supported and respected.

Be professional, Respect others, Act with honesty and integrity, Value teamwork and collaboration and Encourage innovation and creativity.

Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for forestry policy, support and regulation.

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) may contain confidential or privileged information and is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government and Scottish Forestry may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Forestry.

Sharon Phipps

From: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot
Sent: 30 July 2021 14:51
To: Graeme Taylor
Cc: [REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot
Subject: EIA Forestry Project: Eisg Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

Dear Graeme

The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

EIA Forestry Project: Eisg Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

As a consultation body under the above Regulations I am writing on behalf of Conservator [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to request NatureScot's formal advice on the environmental features likely to be significantly affected by the above forestry project, which you consider should be included in the EIA Report.

As the proposed project is also located within an SAC and adjacent to an SPA and is not directly connected with or necessary to site management for conservation, in our view, this proposal is likely to have a significant effect on a European site and we will be required to carry out an appropriate assessment in view of the site's conservation objectives for its qualifying interests.

In order to ensure both EIA and HRA are co-ordinated we would also appreciate at this time any advice you can provide on the scope of the HRA.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Woodland Creation and Case Support Manager
Scottish Forestry


Silvan House | 231 Corstorphine Road | Edinburgh | EH12 7AT

Tel: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot

Website: forestry.gov.scot

Twitter: [@scotforestry](https://twitter.com/scotforestry)



Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for forestry policy, support and regulation.

Sharon Phipps

From: Chris Donald
Sent: 20 August 2021 08:44
To: Tamara Lawton
Subject: RE: EIA Forestry Project at Eisg Brachaidh Estate

Thank you.

Chris Donald | Area Manager, South Highland

NatureScot | Achantoul, Grampian Road, Aviemore, PH22 1QD | DD: 01463 725270; M: [REDACTED]

nature.scot | @nature_scot | *Scotland's Nature Agency* | *Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba*

From: Tamara Lawton <Tamara.Lawton@nature.scot>
Sent: 19 August 2021 17:20
To: Chris Donald <Chris.Donald@nature.scot>
Subject: RE: EIA Forestry Project at Eisg Brachaidh Estate

Hi Chris, I need to discuss with Graeme before we send our response.
Will have a chat with him tomorrow and give Donald a timescale. At the moment I have 1st September as my deadline on CMS.

Cheers,
Tamara

From: Chris Donald <Chris.Donald@nature.scot>
Sent: 19 August 2021 14:28
To: Tamara Lawton <Tamara.Lawton@nature.scot>
Subject: FW: EIA Forestry Project at Eisg Brachaidh Estate
Importance: High

Hi Tamara,
Have there been discussions about this on our response?

Chris
Chris Donald | Area Manager, South Highland

NatureScot | Achantoul, Grampian Road, Aviemore, PH22 1QD | DD: 01463 725270; M: [REDACTED]

nature.scot | @nature_scot | *Scotland's Nature Agency* | *Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba*

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)> <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)>
Sent: 19 August 2021 14:18
To: Chris Donald <Chris.Donald@nature.scot>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@forestry.gov.scot](mailto:[REDACTED]@forestry.gov.scot)>
Subject: FW: EIA Forestry Project at Eisg Brachaidh Estate

Dear Chris

I'm forwarding this to you as Graeme's out of office message doesn't say when he'll be back from leave and we would appreciate an early response if possible.

Many thanks and regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
Woodland Officer
Highland & Islands Conservancy
Scottish Forestry


Tel: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]@forestry.gov.scot
Twitter: @scotforestry

Website: forestry.gov.scot



BRAVE values are the roots that underpin Scottish Forestry, to create a workplace where our staff, and the people we work with, feel valued, supported and respected.

Be professional, **R**espect others, **A**ct with honesty and integrity, **V**alue teamwork and collaboration and **E**ncourage innovation and creativity.



Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for forestry policy, support and regulation.

From: [Redacted] (SF)
Sent: 19 August 2021 14:08
To: 'Graeme.Taylor@nature.scot' <Graeme.Taylor@nature.scot>
Cc: [Redacted]@forestry.gov.scot; [Redacted]@forestry.gov.scot
Subject: EIA Forestry Project at Eisd Brachaidh Estate

Dear Graeme

The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

EIA Forestry Project: Eisd Brachaidh Estate, by Ullapool.

Please see attached a copy of [Redacted] email to you of 30th July requesting NatureScot's formal advice on the environmental features likely to be significantly affected by the above forestry project, for inclusion in the EIA Report.

I would be grateful if you could respond at your earliest convenience along with any advice you can provide on the scope of the HRA.

Thanks and regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]