

Technical Appendix 6.7: Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan



Technical Appendix 6.7 Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan

Ravengill Energy Park

Ravengill Energy Park Limited

Prepared by:

SLR Consulting Limited

93 South Woodside Road, Glasgow, G20 6NT

SLR Project No.: 413.V01686.00XM2

25 May 2026

Revision: 3.0

Revision Record

Revision	Date	Prepared By	Checked By	Authorised By
1.0	20 April 2026	F. Veitch	B. Henry	B. Henry
2.0	7 May 2026	B. Henry	B. Henry	B. Henry
3.0	25 May 2026	B. Henry	B. Henry	B. Henry
	Click to enter a date.			
	Click to enter a date.			

Basis of Report

This document has been prepared by SLR Consulting Limited (SLR) with reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the timescales and resources devoted to it by agreement with Ravengill Energy Park Limited (the Applicant) as part or all of the services it has been appointed by the Client to carry out. It is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

SLR shall not be liable for the use of or reliance on any information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document for any purpose by any person other than the Client. Reliance may be granted to a third party only in the event that SLR and the third party have executed a reliance agreement or collateral warranty.

Information reported herein may be based on the interpretation of public domain data collected by SLR, and/or information supplied by the Client and/or its other advisors and associates. These data have been accepted in good faith as being accurate and valid.

The copyright and intellectual property in all drawings, reports, specifications, bills of quantities, calculations and other information set out in this report remain vested in SLR unless the terms of appointment state otherwise.

This document may contain information of a specialised and/or highly technical nature and the Client is advised to seek clarification on any elements which may be unclear to it.

Information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document should only be relied upon in the context of the whole document and any documents referenced explicitly herein and should then only be used within the context of the appointment.



Table of Contents

Basis of Report	i
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Target Habitats and Species.....	1
1.2 Biodiversity Enhancement Area	2
1.3 Finalisation of the BEMP and Reporting	2
2.0 Existing Conditions & Summary of Ecological & Ornithological Impact Assessments	2
2.1 Ecology (Non-Avian)	3
2.2 Ornithology	4
3.0 Biodiversity Enhancement Area (BEA)	4
3.1 Overview	4
3.2 HMU A – Restore & Enhance Peatland Habitat and Improve Bog Condition	5
3.3 HMU B – Native Broadleaf Woodland & Scrub / Riparian Corridor Creation / Enhancement	8
3.4 HMU C – Bracken Management	10
3.5 HMU D – Ground Nesting Raptor Habitat Enhancement.....	10
3.6 HMU E – Long-Term Retention of Agri-Environment Climate Schemes (AECS).....	11
4.0 Aims, Objectives and Management Prescriptions	12
4.1 Aim 1: Restore & Enhance Peatland Habitat and Improve Bog Condition (HMU A)....	12
4.2 Aim 2: Native Broadleaf Woodland & Scrub / Riparian Corridor Creation / Enhancement (HMU B)	14
4.3 Aim 3: Bracken Management (HMU C).....	15
4.4 Aim 4: Ground Nesting Raptor Habitat Enhancement (HMU D)	15
4.5 Aim 5: Long-term Retention of AECS (HMU E)	16
5.0 Monitoring.....	17
5.1 Aim 1: Restore & Enhance Peatland Habitat and Improve Bog Condition (HMU A)....	17
5.2 Aim 2: Native Broadleaf Woodland & Scrub / Riparian Corridor Creation / Enhancement (HMU B)	18
5.3 Aim 3: Bracken Management (HMU C).....	18
5.4 Aim 4: Ground Nesting Raptor Habitat Enhancement (HMU D)	19
5.5 Aim 5: Long-term Retention of AECS (HMU E)	19
6.0 Reporting and BEMP Review	20
7.0 Annex A Management and Monitoring Indicative Timetable	21



Tables in Text

Table 6.7.1: Breakdown of Habitat Type Within HMU A	6
Table 6.7.2: Breakdown of Habitat Type Within HMU D	10

Figures

Figure 6.14	Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan
Confidential Figure C6.14	Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan



1.0 Introduction

This Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (OBEMP) has been prepared to accompany the Proposed Development's Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

The OBEMP describes the habitat restoration/enhancement and species conservation management measures that are proposed as part of the Proposed Development, to restore degraded habitats, create new habitats of biodiversity value, and strengthen nature networks.

The measures detailed within this OBEMP would aim to achieve significant biodiversity enhancement as a direct result of the Proposed Development over its operational lifetime, in line with objectives outlined in National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) Policy 3¹.

This OBEMP is set out in the following sections:

- Existing Conditions & Summary of the Ecological and Ornithological Impact Assessments;
- Biodiversity Enhancement Area;
- Aims, Objectives and Management Prescriptions;
- Monitoring;
- Reporting and BEMP Review; and
- Management and Monitoring Timetable.

The OBEMP should be read with reference to **Figure 6.14 (EIAR Volume 3a)**. Note, there is a confidential and non-confidential version of **Figure 6.14**; the confidential version (i.e. **Figure C6.14**) shows the location of an area to be managed for sensitive species protected by Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and as such will only be made available to relevant employees of Ramboll, the Applicant, NatureScot, the Energy Consents Unit, South Lanarkshire Council (SLC), and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).

1.1 Target Habitats and Species

The management recommendations within this OBEMP are informed by the findings of baseline ecological and ornithological studies and the conclusions of assessment upon Important Ecological Features (IEFs) and Important Ornithological Features (IOFs), set out within **Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2)** and **Chapter 7: Ornithology (EIAR Volume 2)**.

The key habitats considered in this OBEMP, and for which habitat restoration, enhancement and creation measures are proposed, include priority peatland blanket bog/wet modified bog, broadleaved/riparian woodland and scrub, and bracken management primarily for the benefit of grassland/heathland. These habitat restoration and enhancement measures proposed would also have secondary beneficial effects for the bird assemblage identified locally, including ground-nesting waders, raptors and black grouse.

The key ornithological species considered, and for which additional specific management would be undertaken as proposed within this OBEMP, are hen harrier and breeding waders.

1.2 Biodiversity Enhancement Area

This OBEMP is based on a series of specific identified land parcels, hereafter termed 'Habitat Management Units' (HMU) (refer to **Figure 6.14 (EIAR Volume 3a)**), which would encompass the habitat management measures proposed.

These HMUs have been identified through discussions with the Applicant, landowner and respective agents, and relevant technical specialists. These HMUs may however be refined and finalised post-consent into the overarching Biodiversity Enhancement Area (BEA) for the Proposed Development, following any further specialist surveys, feedback from relevant consultees, and further discussions with the landowner and associated agents.

The Applicant would remain committed to delivering significant biodiversity enhancement as part of the Proposed Development, over its operational lifetime.

1.3 Finalisation of the BEMP and Reporting

Following receipt of planning consent for the Proposed Development, the OBEMP would be refined and developed into a final BEMP. The final BEMP would confirm the overarching BEA encompassing all habitat management proposals, and any finalised management units therein (i.e. the refined HMUs for specific habitat management proposals), where the aims, objectives and management prescriptions of the BEMP would apply.

The final BEMP would be agreed with SLC in consultation with NatureScot and any other relevant stakeholders (as deemed necessary) prior to the commencement of construction of the Proposed Development.

A Biodiversity Management Group (BMG) would oversee and monitor the implementation of the agreed BEMP. The BMG should include representatives from SLC, NatureScot, the landowner, and the Applicant.

A BEMP report (initially for operational Years 1, 3 and 5) would be submitted by the Applicant to the BMG detailing the tasks (management and monitoring) completed over the last year(s) and those planned for the year(s) ahead. This review process would ensure that local biodiversity within the BEA is enhanced over the lifetime of the Proposed Development to a demonstrably better state than without intervention.

The implementation and funding of the agreed BEMP will be the responsibility of the Applicant.

2.0 Existing Conditions & Summary of Ecological & Ornithological Impact Assessments

The following section provides a high-level summary of baseline ecological and ornithological conditions established at the Site, and the assessment of effects presented in detail in **Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2)** and **Chapter 7: Ornithology (EIAR Volume 2)**, which have informed the identification of aims and objectives of this OBEMP.

¹ National Planning Framework 4, available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-4/>



2.1 Ecology (Non-Avian)

The Site is mainly open upland moorland; the most common and widespread habitat types present and which make up the bulk of the landscape are dry and wet heath, acid grassland, marshy grassland and blanket bog/wet modified bog. Breaking up the expanses of these habitat types are patches and pockets of several other habitat types. See **Technical Appendix 6.2 (EIAR Volume 4)** and **Figure 6.3 (EIAR Volume 3a)** for further detail of baseline habitat composition and character.

The blanket bog and wet modified bog within the Site are considered to be a degraded resource and for the most part of no better than 'modified' condition, with many areas also artificially drained and others subject to peat haggling/gullying and self-seeded conifer encroachment; there was no 'near-natural' peatland recorded on-site (as detailed in **Technical Appendix 6.2 (EIAR Volume 4)**). Much of the more highly degraded peatland is clustered in the drained and eroding peatland towards the southeast of the Site near Wellgrain Dod and Peat Hill (see **Figures 6.5 and 6.6 (EIAR Volume 3a)**). This is also generally where the greatest peat depths were recorded within the Site (see **Figure 8.6 (EIAR Volume 3a)**). The presence of damage features within the peatland indicates the potential for restoration, and these areas have been a particular target for restoration proposals within this OBEMP.

Evidence of otter (*Lutra lutra*), common lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*) and water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) were recorded within or in proximity to the Site (see **Technical Appendix 6.3 (EIAR Volume 4)**). The automated bat surveys recorded a total of five bat species and two genus classification within the Site; soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*), common pipistrelle (*P. pipistrellus*), *Nyctalus* spp., Daubenton's (*Myotis daubentonii*), *Myotis* spp., Natterer's (*M. nattereri*) and brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*) (see **Technical Appendix 6.4 (EIAR Volume 4)**).

There are multiple watercourses located within the Site, all of which are tributaries of, and form part of, the headwater catchments of the River Clyde (see **Figure 8.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**). The majority of these watercourses contain populations of resident brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) (see **Technical Appendix 6.5 (EIAR Volume 4)**). These watercourses are all generally treeless and lack riparian cover, making them and the species which inhabit or use them more at risk from future climate change effects.

Within **Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2)**, IEFs scoped-in to the ecological impact assessment (EclA) comprised blanket bog/wet modified bog; no significant adverse effects are predicted on habitats.

It is predicted that the Proposed Development could potentially directly impact up to 16.75 hectares (ha) of blanket bog/wet modified bog; i.e. 7.79 ha for permanent infrastructure (comprising 3.66 ha of blanket bog and 4.13 ha of wet modified bog) and 8.96 ha for temporary works areas, borrow pit search areas and earthworks cut and fill areas (comprising 3.72 ha of blanket bog and 5.24 ha of wet modified bog). It is also precautionarily estimated that the Proposed Development could potentially indirectly affect up to 6.69 ha of blanket bog and 8.03 ha of wet modified bog, i.e. a total of 14.72 ha, when using indirect drainage assumptions (see **Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2)** for full details and associated assessment).



This OBEMP proposes measures that provide a level of compensation in cognisance of NatureScot guidance² with respect to the predicted effects on blanket bog/wet modified bog habitats, as well as other proposals to provide wider ecological and biodiversity enhancement in general.

2.2 Ornithology

During baseline ornithological surveys, as detailed and presented in **Chapter 7: Ornithology (EIAR Volume 2)** and **Technical Appendix 7.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**, the Site and immediate surrounding area was found to support an assemblage of upland breeding birds, which included eight breeding wader species (i.e. common sandpiper (*Actitis hypoleucos*), curlew (*Numenius arquata*), golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*), lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*), oystercatcher (*Haematopus ostralegus*), redshank (*Tringa totanus*), ringed plover (*Charadrius hiaticula*) and snipe (*Gallinago gallinago*)) and raptors/owls (including hen harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), merlin (*Falco columbarius*), short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*) and barn owl (*Tyto alba*) (probable/potential breeding) and red kite (*Milvus milvus*) (confirmed breeding)).

No lekking activity was recorded for black grouse (*Lyrurus tetrix*); records of black grouse activity were limited to three instances of non-lekking males.

Observations of additional non-breeding species of note made over the course of surveys included golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*), osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) and peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*).

The Site was not identified to be of any regular importance for notable aggregations of wintering birds.

The design of the Proposed Development has sought to avoid the locations of sensitive breeding bird species and historical black grouse lekking locations, in so far as has been possible. No potentially significant effects upon any IOF are predicted. Extensive opportunity therefore remains, away from operational infrastructure, to improve current nesting and foraging habitats within the Site for local bird species through habitat enhancement objectives such as peatland restoration, grassland and wetland management, appropriate woodland planting and supplementary measures.

3.0 Biodiversity Enhancement Area (BEA)

3.1 Overview

This OBEMP proposes a BEA comprising five overarching HMUs; A – E inclusive, see **Figure 6.14 (EIAR Volume 3a)** for HMUs A, B, C and E; HMU D is shown on **Figure C6.14.1** only. Each HMU generally focusses on a particular habitat or feature type, within which management and monitoring works would be implemented. Details of each HMU are provided in **Sections 3.2 - 3.6** below.

The overall goal of the BEMP is to restore degraded habitats, enhance habitats, and create and conserve habitats of ecological value within these HMUs, which in turn would benefit

² NatureScot (2023). Advising on peatland, carbon-rich soils and priority peatland habitats in development management. <https://www.nature.scot/doc/advising-peatland-carbon-rich-soils-and-priority-peatland-habitats-development-management> [Accessed April 2026].



existing flora and fauna, as well as increase biodiversity in general through strengthening and building nature networks and connections.

The precise objectives and detailed management prescriptions for the finalised HMUs will depend on the current condition of the habitat and the existing factors acting upon it or contributing to the condition. To further inform the objectives and detail appropriate management prescriptions, further specific surveys and desk-based assessment may be required to develop the final BEMP.

These surveys may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- further peatland condition assessments considering NatureScot guidance² and Peatland Action guidance³;
- Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) Common Standards Monitoring (CSM) of Upland Habitats⁴ or habitat condition assessments utilising the latest Biodiversity Metric condition assessment pro-forma and methodology⁵;
- hydrology/ecology walkover to identify further opportunities for non-native conifer removal, drain blocking/reprofiling, erosion feature restoration/reprofiling, and restoration of the peatland water table;
- Herbivore Impact Assessment (HIA);
- GIS mapping exercises (e.g. additional mapping of drains/moor grips and density mapping of self-seeded non-native conifers);
- forestry surveys to further inform and refine woodland creation and planting proposals and details; and
- pre-commencement ornithology surveys and consultation with third-party recording groups to update baseline conditions and further inform targeted species measures and management prescriptions.

3.2 HMU A – Restore & Enhance Peatland Habitat and Improve Bog Condition

HMU A is 195.97 ha in area and split over four sub-units, these being in the areas around Peat Hill/Dun Moss, west of Harryburn Brae, Wellgrain Dod, and Glen Kip (see **Figure 6.14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**). HMU A targets the most drained, eroded, and degraded peatland habitat within the Site, as well as where the greatest peat depths are, generally (**Figure 8.6 (EIAR Volume 3a)**).

There is some proposed infrastructure that would be sited within HMU A, once the areas of permanent and temporary infrastructure are excluded, the size of HMU A reduces to 192.14 ha. The main community present within HMU A is M19 NVC type blanket bog; however, there are several other peatland and other communities present also. The breakdown of habitats/communities within HMU A is provided in **Table 6.7.1**.

² Scottish Government (2023). Biodiversity: draft planning guidance. Available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-government-draft-planning-guidance-biodiversity/pages/1/> [Accessed April 2026]

⁴ Available at: <https://jncc.gov.uk/our-work/common-standards-monitoring> [Accessed April 2026]

⁵ Available at: <https://publications.natureland.org.uk/publication/5048804845366720> [Accessed April 2026]



Table 6.7.1: Breakdown of Habitat Type Within HMU A

Phase 1 Code	Phase 1 Description	NVC	NVC Area (ha)	Total Area (ha)
A3.2	Scattered Coniferous Tree (on peatland)	SCT	0.53	0.53
B1.1	Unimproved Acid Grassland	U4	0.80	0.85
		U5	0.01	
		U6	0.03	
B5	Marsh/Marshy Grassland	M23	0.15	1.82
		M25	0.69	
		Je/Ja	0.98	
C1.1	Continuous Bracken	U20	0.17	0.17
D1.1	Acid Dry Dwarf Shrub Heath	H9	1.86	6.86
		H10	0.51	
		H12	0.25	
		H21	4.24	
D2	Wet Dwarf Shrub Heath	M15	8.29	8.29
E1.6.1	Blanket Bog	M3	0.30	130.69
		M17	14.07	
		M19	116.31	
E1.7	Wet Modified Bog	M15^	0.01	40.69
		M20	32.30	
		M25a^	8.37	
E2.1	Acid/Neutral Flush	M6	1.80	1.80
E4	Bare Peat	ExP	0.19	0.19
I1.4.1	Acid/Neutral Exposure	RK	<0.01	<0.01
J4	Bare Ground	BG	0.01	0.01
J5	Other Habitat (recent muirburn)	MB	0.24	0.24
TOTAL				192.14

NatureScot guidance² suggests that effects on priority peatland habitats should be compensated in the order of 1:10 (lost:restored) with a further 10% restoration of the Site baseline extent of priority peatland habitats to deliver additional enhancement. As noted in **Section 2.1**, the Proposed Development could directly impact up to 16.75 ha of blanket bog/wet modified bog and potentially indirectly affect up to 14.72 ha of blanket bog/wet modified bog. Using NatureScot guidance² the compensation requirements for priority



peatland at the Proposed Development would therefore be in the region of 314.7 ha if accounting for the full predicted and potential direct and indirect effects stated⁶.

In terms of additional enhancement, the guidance² suggests a further 10% restoration of the Site baseline extent of priority peatland habitats. However site boundaries are often arbitrary lines with no specific consideration of peatland in how they are drawn and, in the case of the Proposed Development, the Site is significantly larger than the area where proposed infrastructure would be sited; the scale of the Site for the Proposed Development allows large scale habitat management to be feasible and to be undertaken. Consequently, the 10% priority peatland enhancement value based on the Site is largely a function of the area within an application boundary line (which is open to adjustment or manipulation). It is therefore considered that a more proportionate approach related to the degree of impact on priority peatland would be a further 10% enhancement on the area of predicted/potential impact; in this case that would require restoration of an additional 3.15 ha of priority peatland for enhancement⁷. Total compensation and enhancement requirements, based on this, would therefore be 317.85 ha⁸.

However, as discussed in **Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2)**, indirect drainage effects are not certain and, if they do occur, are unlikely to be fully realised for various reasons; consequently, application of the 1:10 ratio inclusive of indirect effects calculations will likely lead to greater than 1:10 compensation. It should also be noted that current Scottish Government guidance⁹ does not specify any ratios with regards to peatland restoration and enhancement, instead taking a more holistic view regarding biodiversity and a project/site specific characteristics or circumstances. If it is considered that the 1:10 ratio should be more appropriately applied to the known direct permanent and temporary losses only, the compensation and enhancement requirements for peatland would be in the region of 169.18 ha¹⁰.

Within HMU A the aim is to restore and enhance the existing and degraded peatland habitat. The specific areas selected for HMU A appear, from a desk-based review of aerial imagery in conjunction with observations made during the baseline surveys and results of the habitat peatland condition and peat depth surveys, to be areas within the Site where suitable restoration work is possible for peatland habitats due to the presence of restorable damage features. Such features include a network of drains and moor grips along with larger gullies, peat hags, areas of bare peat, and self-seeding conifers. This restoration and enhancement aim would most likely be fulfilled through measures such as drain blocking and reprofiling, peat hagg and gully reprofiling, gully blocking and flow management, bare peat revegetation and removal of self-seeding trees. Detailed surveys would be undertaken prior to finalisation of the BEMP to inform the detailed drain damming locations, gully blocking measures, etc.

Peatland restoration and enhancement measures noted above that would be applied to priority peatland habitats in HMU A cover up to approximately 172.09 ha¹¹. Therefore, for all predicted potential losses (including permanent, temporary, and potential indirect effects), peatland restoration/enhancement proposals at the Proposed Development would be less

⁶ i.e. 1:10 ratio: (16.75 ha + 14.72 ha) x 10 = 314.7 ha.

⁷ 31.47 x 0.1 = 3.15 ha.

⁸ 314.7 + 3.15 = 317.85 ha.

⁹ Scottish Government (2023). Biodiversity: draft planning guidance. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-government-draft-planning-guidance-biodiversity/pages/1/> [Accessed April 2026].

¹⁰ i.e. (16.75 x 10) + (16.75 x 0.1) = 169.18 ha.

¹¹ This is the extent of relevant peatland habitats within HMU A as per **Table 6.7.1**, and comprises the areas associated with Phase 1 codes E1.6.1, E1.7, E4 and A3.2 (as the A3.2 scattered coniferous trees are present over the peatland).



than the 1:10 compensation ratio plus 10% enhancement value⁸ (the ratio being approximately 1:5.4). However, if only considering the certain permanent and temporary direct impacts and discounting the precautionary indirect impacts that may not transpire then restoration proposals in HMU A would slightly exceed the 1:10 compensation ratio plus 10% enhancement value¹⁰.

The following text provides further information on why achieving the higher restoration/enhancement target that includes potential indirect effects is not possible at the Site. The blanket bog areas within the Site and not covered by the restoration proposals, and not included in HMU A, at this stage, do not appear to have clear or obvious damage features that could be restored and are therefore considered by NatureScot Guidance² as unsuitable areas for peatland restoration works. These areas are subject to hill grazing by livestock, however this is currently being sustainably managed by the landowner through moorland management Agri-Environment Climate Schemes (AECS); see further information in **Section 3.6**. Consequently, such areas are currently considered not to be available for peatland impacts offsetting in line with NatureScot guidance², unless further applicable restoration measures could also be applied to these areas. In that regard, further surveys would be undertaken prior to finalising the BEMP to ascertain if peatland restoration/enhancement proposals could be expanded further. If the opportunity to increase the extent of peatland restoration within the Site is feasible following further investigation/survey, then this may be included within the final BEMP.

Peatlands are important for preventing and mitigating the effects of climate change, preserving biodiversity and minimising flood risk. The improvement of these habitats would also be of benefit to local flora and fauna, including the upland bird assemblage.

Peatland restoration is a nature-based solution, which would have multiple synergistic benefits including the expansion and preserving of carbon sinks and reduction of net carbon emissions, providing enhanced habitats locally for breeding and foraging bird species.

Whilst the primary focus in HMU A would be the restoration and enhancement of priority peatland habitat, the measures proposed would also benefit several other habitat types present within HMU A, in particular the wetland habitats such as wet dwarf shrub heath, marshy grassland and flushes (**Table 6.7.1**).

3.3 HMU B – Native Broadleaf Woodland & Scrub / Riparian Corridor Creation / Enhancement

HMU B covers a linear riparian corridor of approximately 22.05 km split across several sub-units along a number of named watercourses of varying sizes, including Snar Water, Reecleugh Burn, Glenkip Burn, Glendorch Burn, Caple Gill, Cleugh Burn & Dun Grain, Laggen Gill & Coom Burn, Kirk Gill & Windgate Burn, Glencaple Burn, Hershaw Burn, Shortcleugh Burn, Long Cleugh and Scapcleuth Burn – see **Figure 6.14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**. Some of the proposed riparian corridors include breaks to account for proposed infrastructure and avoidance of the Ravengill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), designated for its geological features.

The habitats present in these riparian corridors are primarily a mix of stands of bracken and acid grasslands, with some smaller areas of marshy grassland, and limited areas of heathland; with most of these generally considered suitable for the planting proposals herein.



The aim within HMU B would be to create areas of native broadleaved woodland and species-rich scrub in a semi-natural pattern, primarily along riparian corridors, to enhance any expand existing areas and create and connect new areas. In certain riparian zones the stands of bracken can extend a significant distance out from the watercourse and, in these areas, the woodland proposals may be extended out further from the riparian zone to create larger areas of woodland/scrub depending on advice from a professional forester and future discussions with the Applicant and landowner.

The proposals in HMU B would generally involve the low-density planting and establishment of a range of small-seeding broadleaved species in non-uniform patterns and densities within suitable habitats, with some patches of retained open ground to form openings and glades in the long term.

Planting would largely aim to reflect the canopy composition/character of NVC types W7 *Alnus glutinosa* – *Fraxinus excelsior* – *Lysimachia nemorum* woodland, W11 *Quercus petraea* – *Betula pubescens* – *Oxalis acetosella* woodland, W17 *Quercus petraea* – *Betula pubescens* – *Dicranum majus* woodland and W21 *Crataegus monogyna* – *Hedera helix* scrub depending on the character and respective soil conditions within the component parts of the HMU. The mixture of native broadleaved trees would likely primarily comprise birch (*Betula* spp.), rowan (*Sorbus aucuparia*) and willows (*Salix* spp.); however, it is proposed to increase diversity by also including smaller proportions of species such as oak (*Quercus* spp.), alder (*Alnus glutinosa*), aspen (*Populus tremula*), wild cherry (*Prunus avium*), hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), hazel (*Corylus avellana*), crab apple (*Malus sylvestris*), small-leaved lime (*Tilia cordata*), wych elm (*Ulmus glabra*) and holly (*Ilex aquifolium*). The areas of species-rich scrub would primarily be comprised of hawthorn but would be supplemented with other species to increase diversity, including species such as hazel, crab apple, holly, blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa*), elder (*Sambucus nigra*) and juniper (*Juniperus communis*).

Watercourses within the Site are generally very open and lack any shading or shelter. Riparian planting has multiple beneficial biodiversity effects, such as creating structure and new breeding, shelter and foraging habitats for a range of species, from terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates to birds, bats and fish. In the longer term, woodland creation may also benefit the local red squirrel network through increasing habitat extent, connectivity and providing corridors for this species. There are also many secondary benefits of woodland creation, such as natural flood attenuation, shade, carbon sequestration and helping to mitigate the effects of climate change.

Riparian planting would also improve the ecological quality of watercourses (e.g. through allochthonous material inputs, thermoregulation, erosion reduction), create shelter opportunities (e.g. for otter), establish improved habitat corridors (e.g. for bats), provide shading to watercourses and a source of nutrient inputs and aiding in temperature regulation and cover for fish and improve bank stability with established root systems to allow banks to tolerate higher water flows without erosion, and to prevent choking of riverine sediments/gravel with finer soil particles which in turn will benefit insect assemblages.

Black grouse were recorded during baseline surveys for the Proposed Development and there are records of historical leks in the local area (see **Chapter 7: Ornithology (EIAR Volume 2)**). The small-seeding broadleaf and scrub planting proposed would also serve to benefit local black grouse populations through the provision of foraging resources and natural shelter opportunities.

Surveys for the Proposed Development found evidence of water vole on the Snar Water and Glenkip Burn (**Figure 6.8 (EIAR Volume 3a)**). Pre-construction surveys would be carried out prior to construction of the Proposed Development and all associated works (including

habitat enhancement works) (**Technical Appendix 6.6 (EIAR Volume 4)**). Riparian planting would take into account the presence of water vole populations where relevant, for example, leaving a suitable buffer unplanted on both banks.

3.4 HMU C – Bracken Management

HMU C comprises areas predominately mapped as bracken or scattered bracken/bracken mosaics within the Site during baseline habitat surveys (i.e. areas mapped as Phase 1 codes C1.1 and C1.2 – as per **Figure 6.3 (EIAR Volume 3a)** and subsequently presented in **Figure 6.14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**). HMU C totals approximately 125.51 ha in extent, of which approximately 87.47 ha is bracken (the remainder being primarily areas of acid grassland and some patches of dry dwarf shrub heath). Dense bracken habitats are generally of negligible conservation value.

The aim within HMU C would be to manage and control the bracken as much as practicable given the terrain and prevailing conditions primarily in order to allow the local acid grassland and heathland habitats to regenerate and maintain this throughout the lifetime of the Proposed Development (if these areas do not fall within the areas proposed for HMU B proposals – as per **Section 3.3** above).

The management of bracken would extend the amount of grassland and potential future heathland present and improve the floral diversity of the area and increase wildflower cover for insects and pollinators. The replacement of tall dense bracken with open grassland and heathland habitats would also restore former habitat mosaics within the Site, enhancing nesting and foraging opportunities for black grouse and the ground nesting upland breeding bird assemblage. This will include extensive areas away from operational infrastructure (see **Figure 6.14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**).

The removal of bracken and replacement with grassland/heathland and mosaics thereof would also increase available grazing for livestock, as grasslands are preferentially grazed over less productive and sensitive habitats such as blanket/modified bog and heaths; the increase in preferential grassland resource will help further reduce livestock pressure on more sensitive habitats elsewhere.

3.5 HMU D – Ground Nesting Raptor Habitat Enhancement

HMU D is 267.80 ha in size and is centred on an area of moorland with steep cleughs to the south and centre of the Site. As HMU D concerns the presence and activity of breeding hen harrier its location is only shown on **Confidential Figure C6.14.1 (EIAR Volume 3a)**. The boundary of HMU D is delineated by a combination of existing Estate tracks and paths, watercourses and woodland boundaries.

The main habitat type present within HMU D is dry dwarf shrub heath; however, there are several other habitat types present also. The breakdown of habitats within HMU D is provided in **Table 6.7.2**.

Table 6.7.2: Breakdown of Habitat Type Within HMU D

Phase 1 Code	Phase 1 Description	Area (ha)
A1.1.1	Broad-Leaved Semi-Natural Woodland	0.03



Phase 1 Code	Phase 1 Description	Area (ha)
A4.2	Recently Felled Coniferous Woodland	0.56
B1.1	Unimproved Acid Grassland	20.69
B1.2	Semi-Improved Acid Grassland	0.06
B5	Marsh/Marshy Grassland	14.13
C1.1	Continuous Bracken	10.63
D1.1	Acid Dry Dwarf Shrub Heath	143.58
D2	Wet Dwarf Shrub Heath	18.74
E1.6.1	Blanket Bog	48.87
E1.7	Wet Modified Bog	1.65
E2.1	Acid/Neutral Flush	3.25
I1.4.1	Acid/Neutral Exposure	0.43
J4	Bare Ground	1.18
J5	Other Habitat (muirburn)	3.99
TOTAL		267.80

The area within HMU D has been subject to a pattern of muirburn, and it has been historically used by ground nesting raptors, and therefore the key aim within HMU D would be to manage the habitats present to be optimal for breeding by the relevant species and to put additional measures in place to allow the long-term occupation of the area by ground nesting raptors.

3.6 HMU E – Long-Term Retention of Agri-Environment Climate Schemes (AECS)

Much of the wider Estate in which the Site is located is managed through a suite of different AECS. These schemes typically run for five years before reapplication is required, and there is no requirement to continue the respective management practices following expiration of the AECS if not being reapplied for.

The proposals within this OBEMP that are covered within HMU E, comprise the long-term retention of certain AECS to ensure the sustainable grazing management of the Site, and the retention of AECS that benefit ground-nesting waders in the local area for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. This approach secures the continuation of the appropriate management and measures beyond five-year funding cycles, while also complementing and facilitating the future success of other proposals contained within this OBEMP.

The extent of HMU E is shown in **Figure 6.14.2 (EIAR Volume 3a)** and wherein two main AECS would continue to apply. Moorland Management (MM) which largely concerns the sustainable grazing management of the moorland with appropriate livestock stocking densities is undertaken across the majority of the Site, and beyond, within the limits of the Estate. It is the intention that several of these existing MM land parcels under existing AECS would be retained and managed as such (i.e. MM1, MM2, MM3, MM7 and MM8).



The other AECS and corresponding areas to be retained long-term concern the areas of existing Wader Grazed Grassland (WGG) at North and South Shortcleugh and a further land parcel at Glengeith as shown on **Figure 6.14.2 (EIAR Volume 3a)**. These areas are currently part of the respective AECS, with previous surveys in these AECS area by the Clyde Valley Wader Initiative (CVWI)¹² recording curlew, lapwing, snipe, oystercatcher and redshank. The retention of these WGG areas in the long-term would provide safe places for local breeding waders to nest and feed over its operational lifetime whilst also being sited away from the area of proposed infrastructure.

4.0 Aims, Objectives and Management Prescriptions

The aims define the general BEMP goals, and the related objectives further define the aims into quantifiable targets. The prescriptions (i.e. measures) detail the indicative management works to be implemented to achieve these aims and objectives. **Annex A** provides an indicative timetable for the implementation of the associated prescriptions.

As discussed in **Section 3.1**, detailed appropriate objectives and prescriptions will be further developed post-survey for the final BEMP based on additional survey findings, consultation and in accordance with best practice. However, the experience gained by SLR from providing and delivering plans for similar sites and habitats would suggest that as an outline, the aims, objectives and prescriptions would likely include or be similar to the below for the Proposed Development.

4.1 Aim 1: Restore & Enhance Peatland Habitat and Improve Bog Condition (HMU A)

- Objective 1.1 Increase the abundance and distribution of major peat forming species, particularly Sphagna.
- Objective 1.2 Enhance and improve blanket bog condition.
- Objective 1.3 Eradicate self-seeded non-native conifers from HMU A.
- Objective 1.4 The full revegetation of bare peat areas.
- Prescription 1.1 Peat dam, reprofile, or wave dam/zipper any active drains¹³ (even if vegetated) as appropriate for the location specific drain in order that the water level is raised sufficiently and to restore natural flow paths to create conditions suitable for a range of blanket bog species. This should be carried out under the supervision of a suitably qualified Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW). Methods as detailed within relevant guidance^{13,14,15}.

¹² Information provided by Hopetoun Estate.

¹³ According to methodology detailed in: Peatland Action (2024) Technical Compendium. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/doc/peatland-action-technical-compendium>.

¹⁴ NatureScot (2019). Peatland Action - Guidance for land managers - installing peat and plastic dams. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/doc/peatland-action-guidance-land-managers-installing-peat-and-plastic-dams>.

¹⁵ Thom, T., Hankin, A., Lindsay, R., Richards, J., Stoneman, R. & Brooks, S. (2019). Conserving Bogs: The Management Handbook. (2nd Edition). Available at: [New edition of 'Conserving Bogs: The Management Handbook' IUCN UK Peatland Programme](#)



- Prescription 1.2 Undertake peat hagg and gully restoration and peat surface re-profiling where appropriate with a low-pressure excavator and in line with relevant guidance^{13,15}.
- Prescription 1.3 Gully blocking and flow management with the use of timber dams (for larger drains) and stone dams (in larger gullies) as appropriate to the Site-specific conditions in line with relevant guidance¹³.
- Prescription 1.4 Use of surface bunding as appropriate on peat pans (or large wide shallow gullies) in line with relevant guidance¹³.
- Prescription 1.5 Undertake stabilisation and revegetation measures on areas of bare peat such as peat pans and bare gullies in line with relevant guidance¹³ (for example use of donor turves, geotextile applications and coir matting, potentially in association with seeding, nurse crops, or heather mulch etc.).
- Prescription 1.6 Remove invading self-seeded non-native conifer trees and any new broadleaved seedlings from HMU A annually, by hand or clearance saw, until a time that monitoring shows that regeneration is no longer an issue, or the frequency of intervention can be reduced.
- Prescription 1.7 The following activities would be prohibited within HMU A:
- clearing out of existing drains;
 - supplementary feeding of livestock¹⁶;
 - application of any insecticides, fungicides or molluscicides;
 - application of lime or any other substance to alter the soil acidity;
 - cutting or topping of blanket bog vegetation except to control injurious weed species or to improve the condition or biodiversity value of the habitat by opening up the canopy and allowing bog species to recover or re-establish;
 - burning of vegetation or other materials;
 - use of roll or chain-harrow;
 - planting trees;
 - carrying out any earth moving activities in peatland areas;
 - use of off-road vehicle activities in peatland with the exception of use of low scale agricultural vehicle movements (e.g., quad bike);
 - construction of tracks, roads, yards, hardstandings or any new structures (not associated with the Proposed Development); and
 - storage of materials or machinery.

¹⁶ The key aim of this bullet is to avoid the supplementary feeding of livestock with silage/hay either on the ground or in feeders within HMU A as it can concentrate livestock activity in these areas if used repeatedly in the same area and which can lead to excessive ground poaching/trampling and exposure of peat/soil. Such supplementary feeding effects are usually more prevalent in winter when ground conditions are likely worse and more prone to damage. The use of mineral licks may be exempt provided they are routinely and regularly moved around the hill so as to avoid potential poaching/trampling effects.



4.2 Aim 2: Native Broadleaf Woodland & Scrub / Riparian Corridor Creation / Enhancement (HMU B)

- Objective 2.1 Enhance, create, expand, and connect areas of native broadleaved riparian woodland/scrub and increase tree diversity within and around the Site through the planting and establishment of up to 22.05 km of new low-density native woodland/scrub.
- Objective 2.2 Increase and enhance faunal diversity within and around the Site by providing more habitat structure and new breeding, shelter and foraging habitats for birds, bats and other small mammals, and invertebrates.
- Prescription 2.1 Undertake new native riparian broadleaved woodland/scrub planting within HMU B with a diverse mix of native broadleaved species. Planting will be in non-uniform patterns and of variable densities and may include areas of retained open ground to avoid woodland homogeneity on advice from a professional forester. Planting will utilise low impact ground preparation techniques such as screefing or inverted mounding¹⁷. Some vegetation management or clearance may be required to facilitate successful planting/establishment (e.g. bracken control). Given the Site location, soils and prevailing baseline habitats of the HMU, and to reflect the character and structure of the existing broadleaved woodlands and scrub locally, it is anticipated that the woodland species mixes here would primarily contain birch, rowan and willows. However, it is proposed to increase diversity by also including smaller proportions of species such as oak, alder, aspen, wild cherry, hazel, hawthorn, crab apple, small-leaved lime, wych elm and holly. Scrub planting would primarily consist of species such as hawthorn, and for diversity would be supplemented with smaller proportions of species such as hazel, crab apple, holly, blackthorn, elder and juniper; additionally, a low number of scattered broadleaved tree species may be included in scrub areas to further enhance the long-term structure and diversity. Proportions of species and their exact planting locations would be determined by a forester, in agreement with a suitably qualified ecologist and the landowner, during preparation of the final BEMP. Tree planting would be initiated during construction and be completed by the end of the operational Year 1. Tree planting would be carried out between the months of November and March when trees are dormant and more likely to establish successfully. Days when the ground is frozen or when snow or excessive surface water is present are to be avoided.
- Prescription 2.2 Fencing of the planting areas will likely be required to protect new trees from deer and livestock browsing during the establishment phase. Any new fencing within 1 km of known black grouse leks would follow

¹⁷ Scottish Forestry, (2021). Cultivation for upland productive woodland creation sites: applicants' guidance. <https://forestry.gov.scot/publications/1032-cultivation-for-upland-productive-woodland-creation-sites-applicants-guidance>.



guidelines in Trout & Kortland (2012)¹⁸ to minimise collision risk for black grouse.

Trees will be planted in 1 m - 1.2 m biodegradable tree tubes to further protect from potential browsing damage.

Tree tubes will be removed after approximately 10 years or after adequate establishment of the trees.

Prescription 2.3 Maintenance as required and beating-up of failed specimens to ensure woodland/scrub establishment.

Prescription 2.4 Prohibited activities noted in Prescription 1.7 above apply (with the exception of planting trees).

4.3 Aim 3: Bracken Management (HMU C)

Objective 3.1 Remove dense bracken coverage and suppress further bracken establishment within HMU C.

Objective 3.2 Restore the open habitats within HMU C to locally comparable open habitats, primarily acid grassland and dry heath habitats (if the respective area is not being utilised as part of Aim 2 (HMU B) as per above).

Prescription 3.1 Given the location, difficult access/terrain and extensiveness of the majority of dense bracken stands the initial primary control method would be chemical (e.g. use of glyphosate), as mechanised and/or manual control is not feasible.

Prescription 3.2 Mechanised and/or manual control and management of bracken would be the preferred method in locations where this is deemed suitable and safe, and following best practice¹⁹, with ongoing and repeated control where this is necessary.

Prescription 3.3 Following treatment, should areas of bare soil be evident, consideration will be given to seeding the affected areas with a suitable seed mix in order to facilitate quicker establishment of vegetation.

Prescription 3.4 Implementation of an appropriate grazing regime for long term management and maintenance.

4.4 Aim 4: Ground Nesting Raptor Habitat Enhancement (HMU D)

Objective 4.1 Long-term maintenance and occupation of the hen harrier territory within HMU D.

Objective 4.2 Increase the productivity/fledging success of hen harrier territory within HMU D.

¹⁸ Trout, R. and Kortland, K. (2012). Fence marking to reduce grouse collisions. Forestry Commission Technical Note.

¹⁹ NatureScot. Bracken Control – A Guide to Best Practice. Available at <https://www.webarchive.org.uk/>.



Prescription 4.1 Develop a Muir Burning Plan (MBP)²⁰ within HMU D to provide optimal nesting habitat for hen harrier to ensure there is abundant suitable nesting habitat within the territory at all times. Any such muir burning within HMU D would also be restricted to be undertaken no later than 31st March in any given year in accordance with the provisions of the Wildlife Management and Muirburn (Scotland) Act 2024. Any later date of muir burning would require provision of an evidence-based rationale for its necessity in order to meet NatureScot's licensing requirements under the 2024 Act.

Prescription 4.2 HMU D to include an area within which is designated as a permanent no burn/cutting zone to allow for some rank deeper heather/vegetation cover and its long-term retention.

Prescription 4.3 Developing a protocol and ensuring a good system of communication from surveyors to Estate/Proposed Development staff to ensure that appropriate measures can be taken to avoid disturbance should an active nest be found.

Prescription 4.4 Should an active nest be recorded within HMU D additional disturbance prevention measures to be implemented during the breeding season, e.g. restrictions on use of machinery/quad bikes within HMU D and avoidance of foot traffic off designated tracks and paths.

Prescription 4.5 Enhanced predator control within area of influence of HMU D. Management of same to be reviewed in conjunction with the predator control for waders noted in prescription 5.4 for HMU E below.

4.5 Aim 5: Long-term Retention of AECS (HMU E)

Objective 5.1 Maintain responsible stocking densities and grazing levels/grazing regime at appropriate levels for upland habitats and mosaics thereof to manage and maintain the respective habitat for the benefit of local flora and fauna and to complement the other Aims and Objectives within this OBEMP (as detailed above).

Objective 5.2 Long term maintenance and enhancement (where possible) of breeding wader habitat within the Clyde Valley.

Prescription 5.1 Continued responsible grazing management of the Site in line with the relevant terms of the existing and in place AECS for Moorland Management noted below when the existing scheme cycles end and support their continuation in line with relevant AECS guidance and associated prescriptions for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. This would apply to the following current moorland management land parcel IDs which are encompassed within or overlap with the Site:

- MM1;
- MM2;

²⁰ The MBP may also necessitate provisions relating to managing wildfire risk.



- MM3;
- MM7; and
- MM8.

Prescription 5.2 Continued management of areas currently managed as AECS wader grazed grassland when the existing scheme cycle ends and support its continuation in line with relevant AECS guidance and prescriptions for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Management prescriptions will include following the prescribed AECS wader grazed grassland grazing regime as a minimum, timing of activities/restricted activities, mosaic rush cutting etc. This would apply to the current wader grazed grassland schemes at North and South Shortcleugh and the additional land parcel at Glengeith (as per **Figure 6.14 (EIAR Voume 3a)**).

Prescription 5.3 Explore opportunities to incorporate additional wader scrapes into areas under the existing AECS wader grazed grassland scheme.

Prescription 5.4 Enhanced predator control within area of influence of the wader grazed grassland and wetland management land parcels that are a component part of HMU E. Management of this to be reviewed in conjunction with the predator control noted in prescription 4.5 for HMU D above.

5.0 Monitoring

Monitoring will establish whether the proposed management prescriptions are achieving the various aims and objectives, and in turn will inform adaptive management to ensure the aims and objectives are achieved through the life of the BEMP.

The Sections below outline the likely monitoring required for the proposals detailed above, however the detailed monitoring proposals will be provided in the final BEMP to be submitted post-consent/pre-construction when the BEA, HMU's and associated proposed enhancement measures have been finalised. An indicative monitoring timetable is provided in **Annex A**.

5.1 Aim 1: Restore & Enhance Peatland Habitat and Improve Bog Condition (HMU A)

The following likely monitoring measures would be undertaken to evaluate and report on the success of this aim:

- Habitat/vegetation monitoring would evaluate the success of restoration and enhancement of peatland habitats. This would be achieved by recording changes to the structure and composition of the vegetation and species abundance, evenness and diversity, and extent of self-seeded non-native conifers with the use of permanent quadrats or line transects. Recording of impacts from deer/livestock would also be included in the monitoring programme.
- A representative sample of permanent quadrats or line transects would be established within the respective HMU to gather sufficient data to inform future management and assess the trajectory of plant species and habitats. The respective monitoring surveys would be carried out at the most appropriate times of year (e.g., flora surveys versus browsing impact surveys). Repeat surveys would be carried out



in the same month in each monitoring year (Years 1, 3, 5, 10, 15) to gather comparable data. Photographs would also be taken of each sample quadrat/line transect, as well as overview photographs of the HMU.

- Blanket bog condition assessments utilising i) the latest Biodiversity Metric⁵ condition assessment pro-forma and methodology, and/or ii) a CSM⁴ site condition survey, at representative locations within HMU A.
- Any peat hagg or surface reprofiling works, gully blocking, and any installed peat dams or drain blocking/reprofiling, would be monitored to ensure works are successful over the first three years after works are completed. Remedial measures would be undertaken if restoration works have failed.
- The presence of regenerating and encroaching self-seeded conifer trees and new broadleaved seedlings, and the success or removal measures, would be monitored.

5.2 Aim 2: Native Broadleaf Woodland & Scrub / Riparian Corridor Creation / Enhancement (HMU B)

Monitoring would be undertaken in HMU B to ensure the establishment of the broadleaved planting.

- A professional forester would monitor the planted areas annually in Years 1 to 5 following planting to ensure successful establishment, specifically looking for evidence of damage (e.g. browsing) or disease. Failed specimens would be replaced in the consecutive winter (i.e., between November and March). The forester would also advise on whether any further management or maintenance is required to ensure the establishment of the trees.
- HMU B would be monitored again by a professional forester in operational Year 10 to ensure that there are no issues with disease or invasive species and to determine if any thinning at this stage would benefit woodland establishment.
- Monitoring would be undertaken again in operational Year 20 when some thinning operations may be required in the woodland in order to encourage growth of better trees and create more open woodland, further new enhancement / enrichment planting may also be considered at this stage. This would aid regeneration of seedlings and begin the process of establishing a mixed age structure.

5.3 Aim 3: Bracken Management (HMU C)

Monitoring would be undertaken in HMU C to ensure a reduction in bracken coverage and density along with the corresponding establishment of other habitat types, primarily grassland and heathland (if the area is not being utilised as part of HMU B). Monitoring would likely include:

- Bracken monitoring, such as walkover surveys and mapping extent or drone surveys, recording change over time.
- Grassland/heathland monitoring through the establishment of a representative sample of permanent quadrats/line transects to record changes to the composition of the vegetation and species abundance, evenness and diversity. Recording of impacts from deer/livestock would also be included in the monitoring programme. The respective monitoring surveys would be carried out at the most appropriate times of year (e.g. grassland monitoring during the main flowering season). Repeat surveys



would be carried out in the same month in each monitoring year (Years 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 15) to gather comparable data. Photographs would also be taken of each sample quadrat/transect, as well as overview photographs of the HMU.

- A relevant grassland or heathland condition assessment utilising i) the latest Biodiversity Metric⁵ condition assessment pro-forma and methodology, and/or ii) a CSM⁴ grassland site condition survey, at representative locations within the HMU.

5.4 Aim 4: Ground Nesting Raptor Habitat Enhancement (HMU D)

Monitoring would be undertaken in HMU D to evaluate and report on the success of the associated aims and objectives, and may include, but not be limited to:

- Breeding raptor surveys within HMU D and a 500 m buffer off HMU D, annually for the first ten years of operation, after which the frequency of monitoring would be agreed with the BMG.
- Heather surveys to inform the MBP and ongoing heather management as part of Prescriptions 4.1 and 4.2 (see **Section 4.4**).
- A predator control diary to document the implementation and results of the additional predator management and control undertaken within and around HMU D.

5.5 Aim 5: Long-term Retention of AECS (HMU E)

Monitoring in relation to the respective AECS in HMU E would likely include:

- Maintenance of an annual diary detailing the types and numbers of livestock, and the times at which they are present/absent, and associated livestock destines, within each respective AECS management unit.
- Breeding bird surveys (BBS) of the wader grazed grassland land parcels that are a component part of HMU E, plus a 250 m buffer. The main objective of this monitoring will be to assess changes in wader activity levels by recording numbers and distribution of breeding waders. BBS will follow standard methods and guidance for upland breeding waders (Brown & Shepherd, 1993²¹). BBS surveys will, as recommended, include four survey visits between mid-April and early July (Calladine *et al.*, 2009²²; NatureScot, 2025²³). Any raptor activity will also be recorded. BBS surveys would be carried out in operational years 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 10 and 15. The frequency of monitoring thereafter will be agreed with the BMG.
- A predator control diary to document the implementation and results of the additional predator management and control undertaken within and around the wader grazed

²¹ Brown, A.F. & Shepherd, K.B. (1993). A Method for Censusing Upland Breeding Waders. *Bird Study*, 40, 189-195.

²² Calladine, J., Garner, G., Wernham, C. & Thiel, A. (2009). The influence of survey frequency on population estimates of moorland breeding birds. *Bird Study*, 56, 381-388.

²³ NatureScot (2025). Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore windfarms. Available at <https://www.nature.scot/doc/recommended-bird-survey-methods-inform-impact-assessment-onshore-windfarms> [Accessed April 2026].



grassland and wetland management land parcels that are a component part of HMU E.

6.0 Reporting and BEMP Review

A report would be submitted by the Applicant to the BMG in Years 1, 3 and 5 of operation, the frequency of reporting after Year 5 would be agreed with the BMG. This report would detail:

- management undertaken in the past year(s);
- monitoring undertaken, results and discussion of results; and
- management and monitoring proposed for the following year(s).

If considered necessary by the members of the BMG, the BMG would meet periodically to discuss the reports and management of the Site.

Where monitoring indicates any management objectives are not met, further management prescriptions or interventions would be agreed by the BMG.

The requirement for the measures, monitoring and reporting following Year 15 of the operational phase would be dependent on the results of the monitoring which would be discussed and agreed within the Year 15 review report and agreed in writing with the BMG.

The BEMP would be reviewed every five years from its commencement. The purpose of the review would be to assess the effectiveness of the proposed management prescriptions at achieving the aims and objectives of the BEMP. If necessary, such measures may be amended by the BMG.



7.0 Annex A Management and Monitoring Indicative Timetable

Work Item	Year	0 ²⁴	1 ²⁵	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15...
Management Prescriptions																	
Peatland restoration measures e.g. drain blocking/damming and/or reprofiling, peat hagg/gully blocking/reprofiling, bare peat revegetation etc. if appropriate (HMU A)		✓															
Self-seeded non-native conifer encroachment removal (HMU A)		✓															
Excluded activities as per Prescription 1.7 (HMU A) and Prescription 2.4 (HMU B)																	
Riparian planting, and livestock/deer exclusion fencing (as deemed necessary) (HMU B)	✓																
Removal of tree tubes (HMU B) ²⁸												✓					
Bracken control & management, and reseeded (if deemed necessary) (HMU C)		✓		✓	✓	✓											Throughout lifetime of BEMP, as necessary and informed by BEMP monitoring
Appropriate grazing regime following bracken control (HMU C)	✓																Throughout lifetime of BEMP, as necessary and informed by BEMP monitoring
Development and implementation of a Muir Burning Plan (HMU D)	✓																Throughout lifetime of BEMP, as necessary and informed by BEMP monitoring

²⁴ Construction Phase

²⁵ First year after final commissioning of the Proposed Development / Operational

²⁶ Fast growing species may require the removal of trees guards before Year 10, to prevent damage. This would be informed by forestry monitoring surveys.



Year	0 ²⁴	1 ²⁵	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15...
Enhanced predator control (HMU D and WGG units of HMU E)																
Continuation of MM and WGG AECS (HMU E)																
Creation of additional wader scrapo(s) (if feasible) (WGG units of HMU E)	✓	✓														
Monitoring																
Inspection of peatland restoration areas and integrity/success of hagg/gully reprofiling, drain and gully blocking/reprofiling etc. (1 HMU A)		✓	✓													
Vegetation monitoring and bog condition assessments (HMU A)		✓		✓							✓					✓
Self-seeded non-native conifer extent mapping/monitoring (HMU A)		✓		✓								As required depending on frequency of regeneration				
Riparian planting establishment/growth monitoring – (HMU B ²⁷)		✓	✓		✓							As required and informed by forestry monitoring				
Bracken extent monitoring (HMU C)		✓		✓								Throughout lifetime of BEMP, as necessary and informed by BEMP monitoring				
Vegetation monitoring and grassland/heathland condition assessments (HMU C)		✓		✓							✓					✓
Heather monitoring (HMU D)		✓	As necessary and informed by RFMP monitoring and as agreed by the BMG													
Breeding raptor surveys (HMU D + 500 m buffer)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	As agreed by the BMG

²⁷ Following initial planting, any failed specimens recorded during forestry monitoring surveys would be replaced during a 'beating up' second planting period to be determined.



Year	0 ²⁴	1 ²⁵	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15...
Breeding wader monitoring (WGG units of HMU E + 250 m buffer)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓										
Maintenance of an annual livestock/management diary (HMU E)																
Throughout lifetime of BEMP																
Reporting / Reviews																
BEMP Report		✓		✓		✓										
BMG 5-year review of BEMP						✓					✓					✓
Reporting schedule after Year 5 to be agreed with the BMG																

