

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 &amp; Eisg Brachaidh Estates will look to forward planned woodland exclosures during the period of this plan....'</p>	Low				
Hi2	█ - 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 Wayne 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	█ - NS	24/06/2021	NS interested in a nature-rich future. Acknowledges significant contribution of Wayne 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	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 Scionascaig. 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 Sionascaig 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	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	█ -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 £5,100 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 Scionasaig) 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?	<p>Deer numbers and movements will be considered as part of the EIA process as well as the impact on immediate neighbours and deer welfare.</p> <p>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.</p>	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	MBJ - 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	- 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 Glencanisp, 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	- 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.	CK walked the line with EM 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 <b>Assynt – Coigach NSA</b> , the <b>Landscape Character Type 334: Cnocan – Ross &amp; Cromarty</b> Key Characteristics and Description, and the Description of the <b>Inverpolly – Glencanisp Wild Land Area</b> .	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 <b>Assessing impacts on Wild Land Areas – Technical Guidance September 2020</b>	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 Eisd 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