

Technical Appendix 8.5

Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment

TA 8.5 Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Peat Instability	3
3	Desk Based Assessment	8
4	Site Work	12
5	Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment	15
6	Proposed Development Design and Mitigation	31
7	Conclusion	33
8	References	34

Annexes

Annex 1	Figures
Annex 2	Peat Core Results
Annex 3	Peat Slide Likelihood Data

Figures

Figure 1	Site Location
Figure 2	Proposed Infrastructure
Figure 3	Superficial Geology
Figure 4	Bedrock Geology
Figure 5	Slope
Figure 6	Geomorphological Features
Figure 7	Peat Depth
Figure 8	Peat Depth Probe Locations
Figure 9	Likelihood

This page is intentionally blank.



1 Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 SLR Consulting (Ltd) were commissioned by 3R Energy Solutions Ltd (3R Energy) to undertake a Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA) at the proposed Hagshaw Energy Cluster - Western Expansion (the Proposed Development), centred at British National Grid (BNG) NS 70740 32550 (TA8.5 Figure 1 in Annex 1).
- 1.1.2 The Proposed Development will comprise 18 turbines and associated infrastructure, as shown in Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 2).
- 1.1.3 The assessment has been undertaken in line with best practice guidance issued by the Scottish Government for investigation, assessment, and reporting for wind farms in peat areas. Where relevant, reference is also made to guidance published by, NatureScot, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and wind farm construction good practice guidance.
- 1.1.4 Although peat slides are naturally occurring, in the wake of high-profile peat slides arising during construction of Derrybrien Wind Farm in 2003 (and more recently at Meenbog in 2020) further consideration of the impact on peat instability of siting developments on peatlands is required.
- 1.1.5 Blanket bog is the most common peat habitat in the UK and is associated with thick peat deposits. Renewable energy developments, including wind farms, and transmission projects are commonly located on upland moorland terrain comprising blanket bog (though raised bogs, intermediate bogs and fens may also be impacted). Within these settings, peat instability can occur, particularly where thick peat deposits (> 1 m) are present.
- 1.1.6 Peat instability is impacted by numerous factors, including but not limited to:
- peat thickness;
 - gradient;
 - climate (and rainfall);
 - underlying geology; and
 - subsurface hydrology.
- 1.1.7 Other anthropogenic factors may also increase the likelihood of peat instability events occurring, which are explored further within this report.

1.2 Objectives

- 1.2.1 The PLHRA aims to assess the influence of peat on the Proposed Development and the potential for instability. The objectives have been achieved by completion of the following:
- geomorphological mapping of the site to identify the prevailing conditions;
 - reporting on evidence of any active, incipient or relict peat instability and the potential risk of future instability, describing the likely causes and contributory factors;
 - identification of potential mitigation and controls to be imposed on the contractors for the works to minimise the risk of peat instability occurring at the site;
 - peat Probing to full depth across the Proposed Development site;
 - recommendation for further work or specific construction methodologies to suit the ground conditions at the site to mitigate any unacceptable risk of potential peat instability.
- 1.2.2 This report summarises the findings of the desk study and peat surveys and provides an assessment of the prevailing ground conditions at the site and how they relate to peat stability issues. The results



of this assessment have been used through the iterative design process to avoid areas of increased likelihood of a peat slide and avoid areas of thicker peat.

1.3 Proposed Development

- 1.3.1 The Proposed Development site comprises a total area of c.965 hectares (ha), split into two main development areas connected by the B743. The proposed wind turbines are located in the northern development area (Dungavel Forest), and the proposed solar development and long duration battery and energy storage system (BESS) is located in the southern development area (Netherwood). These two areas of the Proposed Development site will hereafter be referred to as ‘the northern development area’ and ‘the southern development area’.
- 1.3.2 There is no peat in the southern development area, therefore this PLHRA report addresses the northern development area only.
- 1.3.3 The northern development area is located within the western part of Dungavel Forest, bounded to the north by the operational Dungavel and Kype Muir Wind Farms, to the east by the Muirkirk and North Lowther Special Protection Area (SPA), to the south by the proposed Bankend III wind farm, and to the west by the B743, within South Lanarkshire.
- 1.3.4 The northern development area extends to approximately 750 ha, comprises commercial coniferous plantation and existing forestry tracks.

Wind Development

- 1.3.5 The Proposed Development comprises 18 wind turbines as well as associated infrastructure, located within the northern development area, shown in **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 2)**.
- 1.3.6 Infrastructure associated with the wind turbine component of the Proposed Development will include:
- turbine foundations;
 - crane hardstandings;
 - on-site access tracks between turbines and from the point of access to the turbines, with watercourse crossings where needed;
 - temporary construction compounds and laydown areas, with a concrete batching plant at one of the construction compounds;
 - underground cabling between the wind turbines to the electricity substation and BESS compounds; and
 - up to three borrow pits for excavation of stone to use in the construction of the Proposed Development.
- 1.3.7 A full description of the Proposed Development is provided in **Chapter 3** of the EIA Report.



2 Peat Instability

2.1 Background Information on Peat

- 2.1.1 Peat is found in extensive areas in the upland and lowland regions of the UK and is defined as the partly decomposed plant remains that have accumulated in-situ, rather than being deposited by sedimentation. When peat forming plants die, they do not decay completely as their remains become waterlogged due to regular rainfall. The effect of waterlogging is to exclude air and hence limit the degree of decomposition. Consequently, instead of decaying to carbon dioxide and water, the partially decomposed material is incorporated into the underlying material and the peat 'grows' in-situ.
- 2.1.2 Lindsay (1995) defined two main types of peat bog, raised bog and blanket bog, which are prevalent on the west coast of Europe along the Atlantic seaboard. In Britain, the dominant peatland is blanket bog which occurs on the gentle slopes of upland plateaux, ridges and benches and is predominately supplied with water and nutrients via precipitation. Blanket peat is generally considered to be hydrologically disconnected from the underlying mineral layer.
- 2.1.3 The acrotelm is the fibrous surface to the peat bog, typically less than 0.5 m thick; which exists between the growing bog surface and the lowest position of the water table in dry summers. Below this are various stages of decomposition of the vegetation as it slowly becomes assimilated into the body of the peat.
- 2.1.4 There are two distinct layers within a peat bog, the upper acrotelm layer and the lower catotelm.
- 2.1.5 The degree of humification (decomposition) can be measured in the field via the von Post scale of humification (Von Post and Grunland, 1926) (Hobbs, 1986). The 'squeezing test' undertaken in the field provides humification values ranging from H1 (minimal decomposition) to H10 (highly decomposed).
- 2.1.6 The relative position of the water table within the peat controls the balance between accumulation and decomposition, and therefore its stability, hence artificial adjustment of the water table by drainage can have significant impacts.

2.2 Peat Shear Strength

- 2.2.1 In geotechnical terms, the shear strength of a soil is the maximum stress that a soil can sustain without experiencing failure. The physical characteristic of a soil impacts on the overall shear strength. For mineral soils such as clay or sands, such strength is variously given by an interparticle friction value and cohesion. Whether the mineral soil is predominately cohesive (clay) or non-cohesive (sand and gravels) governs which of the component strengths control the behaviour of the soil.
- 2.2.2 In the case of peat soils, where the major constituent is organic, there is likely to be little or no mineral component, the geotechnical definition of shear strength therefore does not strictly apply. At present, there is no real alternative to defining shear strength of peat, therefore the geotechnical definition is usually adopted, in the knowledge that it should be used with caution.
- 2.2.3 As noted, the acrotelm or near surface peat comprises a tangle of fresh and slightly rotted roots and plant fibres. These roots and fibres impart a significant tensile strength capacity to the material which provides it with a significant load carrying capacity. The acrotelm is in effect, a fibre reinforced soil.
- 2.2.4 In the more decomposed catotelm, the tensile shear strength is reduced as the roots and fibres become increasingly rotted. However, the loss of strength is offset to a limited degree, by a gain in strength due to the overburden pressure. In geotechnical engineering there is an established relationship for recently deposited soils, between the shear strength of a sample and thickness of overburden above it.
- 2.2.5 Consequently, it is almost impossible to predict a shear strength profile in peat and attempts to measure the shear strength using normal geotechnical methods can be misleading (Evans &



Warburton, 2007) (Gosling and Keeton, 2008 Winter *et al.*, 2005). Typical values of shear strength from hand shear vanes would be in the range 10-60 kilopascal (kPa) although values of over 100 kPa have been recorded in peat elsewhere. The higher strengths are almost certainly influenced by the roots or other non-decomposed material. It is believed that the strength of peat should be quoted as a cohesion value as there are few, if any, discrete particles to give the material a significant frictional resistance. It should be noted that any quotation of shear strength for peat should be treated with extreme caution.

2.3 Peat Failure Characteristics/Mechanisms

- 2.3.1 This section reviews the nature of peat and how current and past activities can influence stability.
- 2.3.2 The PLHRA Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments, published by the then Scottish Executive (2006, updated by the Scottish Government April 2017) determines peat landslide (instability) in two categories, 'peat slides' and 'bog bursts'. It is indicated that peat slides have a greater risk of occurrence in areas where peat depth is shallow (up to 2 m) and slope gradients are steep (5 to 15°). Bog bursts, however, are indicated to have a greater risk of occurrence in areas where peat depth is deep and slope gradients are shallow. As recorded in the Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017), bog burst events have generally only been reported in Irish and Northern Irish peat bogs. They are uncommon in Scotland and therefore are not considered to attribute significant risk in relation to this assessment. It is noted that peat instability events (including bog bursts), although extremely uncommon, may occur outside the limits mentioned above.
- 2.3.3 Further to the definition above, a number of natural factors are considered to interact and create the potential for peat instability to occur. These natural factors would typically include:
- **Slope Gradient:** As noted in the Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017), peat slides have a greater likelihood of occurrence where slope angles range from 5 to 15°. Deposits with shallower slope gradients are less susceptible to failure due to the reduced influence of gravity. Deposits with steeper slope gradients are less susceptible to failure due to the general lack of peat presence (although peaty debris slide may occur).
 - **Peat Depth:** (Boylan, Jennings and Long, 2008) describes three common types of peat, controlled to an extent by rainfall and elevation:
 - **Upland Blanket Bog:** blanket bogs are typically about 3 m thick, however, they can be up to 5 m thick, generally thinning at higher elevations.
 - **Lowland Blanket Bog:** similar to the upland version, however, they form around sea level in areas of very high rainfall.
 - **Raised Bog:** generally 3-12 m thick, averaging 7 m, with growth occurring above the water table.
- 2.3.4 Peat depth can give an indication of peat strength and the potential magnitude of a slide, where the generalisation can be made that the potential for peat instability increases with peat depth provided gradients exist to allow movement. However, when combined with other instability indicators, any depth of peat can fail. Factors that influence the potential include:
- **Peat Strength:** the shear strength of peat is an important aspect in assessing the risk of landslip in blanket peat areas, with areas of lower shear strength likely to be the cause of any peat slide. However, due to the influence of fibres within the deposits and of stratification with depth, reliable values of shear strength are difficult to near impossible to obtain, using common place in situ and laboratory soil strength tests. Where data is available, it can be used, with extreme caution, to assist in assessing likely risk.
 - **Relief:** the combination of slope gradient and variation in elevation can result in confined and unconfined zones i.e., where undulating or hummocky terrain (confined) exists, the natural



relief has the potential to mitigate the occurrence of a peat slide. However, convex sloping hillsides (unconfined) can increase the slide potential.

- **Evident and/or Potential Areas of Instability:** the presence of certain geomorphological characteristics may signify an increased risk of peat instability. However, peat instability events may occur in areas where no such geomorphological characteristics are present, if the general characteristics match those mentioned above.
- **Vegetation Cover:** the vegetation cover of an area of bog/mire gives an indication as to its hydrological setting and therefore physical characteristics, as noted in the Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017) and detailed by Hobbs (1986).
- **Peat Stratification:** the peat formation process causes peat to show natural anisotropic strength. The interface between the three distinct layers (indicating three hydrosere stages) within a peat mass is defined by hydrology. The three layers are:
 - Top Mat: living vegetation of herbaceous plants, grasses and mosses;
 - Acrotelm: decomposing peat which is saturated periodically and is of relatively high permeability; and
 - Catotelm: permanently saturated dense peat of relatively low permeability.

2.3.5 Peat stratification is linked to peat depth (Dykes, 2006), with thinner peat deposits having a thinner or no catotelm layer. A minimal or absent catotelm layer leads to peat mass having a higher shear strength, as the overlying top mat and acrotelm layers are more fibrous in nature compared to the underlying catotelm layer.

- Hydrology (Surface and Subsurface): surface (seeps and springs, wet flushes, watercourses, concentration of drainage networks etc.) and subsurface (pipe systems, underground channels etc.) drainage pathways can provide areas of peat with a water supply which may be absorbed by and potentially increase the mass of the peat. This can cause pooling/piping within the peat mass, or an increase in water at the base of the peat mass, each of which increases the susceptibility of the peat mass to failure.
- The presence of a number of the above natural factors may create the potential for peat instability to occur, however, the actual instability is generally the result of a combination of further contributing factors. These factors have been grouped into two categories within the Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017) described as preparatory and triggering factors.
- Preparatory factors, which affect the stability of peat slopes in the medium to long-term (tens to hundreds of years), are:
 - increase in mass of the peat through peat formation;
 - increase in mass of the peat through increase in water content;
 - increase in mass of the peat through afforestation;
 - reduction in shear strength from changes in the physical structure of the peat due to creep, weathering or vertical tension cracks of the material;
 - loss of surface vegetation and associated tensile strength (e.g. deforestation);
 - changes in the subsurface hydrology (water filled pools and/or pipes etc.); and
 - afforestation reducing the water held in the peat body, increasing the potential for formation of desiccation cracks which can be exploited by rainfall on forest harvesting.



- Triggering factors, which can have an immediate effect on peat stability and act on susceptible slopes, include:
 - intensive rainfall or snow melt causing development of high porewater pressures within the peat;
 - alterations to drainage patterns generating high porewater pressures within the peat;
 - peat extraction at the toe of the slope i.e. fluvial incision, cut slopes etc. reducing the support of the upslope material;
 - peat loading commonly due to stockpiling or plant during construction (or natural causes i.e. landslide) causing an increase in shear stress;
 - changes to the vegetation cover i.e. by stripping the surface cover or afforestation; and
 - earthquakes or man-made rapid ground accelerations, such as blasting or mechanical vibrations, causing an increase in shear stress.

2.3.6 Evidence of the potential for peat instability within an area may be observed through the recording of the geomorphological conditions of the area. These existing geomorphological characteristics may indicate the presence of existing or historical failures or areas of future potential instability. The characteristics of particular interest include the presence of the following:

- historical failure scars and debris;
- tension cracking and tearing;
- compression ridges/thrusts or extrusion;
- peat creep;
- subsurface drainage (pools and/or piping);
- seeps and springs;
- cracking related to drying;
- concentration of surface drainage networks; and
- the presence of organic clays at the peat and bedrock interface.

2.4 Types of Failures

2.4.1 The result of peat instability is the down-slope mass movement of the peat material. There are several definitions of peat instability which are used to characterise the type of failure, briefly mentioned above but detailed below.

Bog Bursts (or Bog Flows)

2.4.2 Particularly fluid (amorphous) failures involving rupture of the peat blanket surface or margin due to subsurface creep or swelling, with liquefied basal material expelled through surface tears followed by settlement of the overlying peat mass, in-situ (Hemingway and Sledge, 1941-46) (Bowes, 1960).

2.4.3 Accounts of bog bursts are generally associated with very wet climates or areas which have received storm rainfall events. Bog bursts can be associated with particularly wet peat landscapes; therefore, it is possible to identify broad regions of a higher susceptibility to these failures. The constraints used to identify the areas of higher susceptibility to bog burst failures are given below:

- peat thicknesses >1.5 m;



- shallow gradients, ranging from 2 - 10° (peat thicknesses associated with bog bursts are generally not observed on slopes steeper than 10°, where moisture content is reduced due to natural drainage);
- ground which is annually waterlogged to within the upper 1 m below ground level (the groundwater level may rise but rarely falls below this level (Crisp *et al.*, 1964));
- greater humification of the lower catotelm within the waterlogged ground; and
- lower surface tensile strength of the fibrous peat and vegetation.

2.4.4 The humified mass can be considered as analogous to a heavy liquid and the stability of this mass is maintained by the strength of the surface or acrotelm peat. Should the surface become weakened through erosion or desiccation or the construction of a surface drainage ditch for agricultural or forestry reasons or through turbary (peat cutting), failure is made more likely.

Peat Slides

2.4.5 Peat slides tend to be translational failures with a defined shear surface at or close to the interface with the substrate. The factors generally considered to influence susceptibility to peat slide failures are listed below:

- peat depth up to 2 m;
- slope gradients between 5 and 15°;
- natural or artificial drainage cut into the surrounding peat landscape;
- greater humification of the lower catotelm within the waterlogged ground; and
- lower surface tensile strength of the fibrous peat and vegetation.

2.4.6 It is noted that some of the factors causing instability are common to both bog bursts and peat slides. The peat – substrate interface is the primary zone of failure and is enhanced by elevated water content at this boundary and softening or weathering of the lower mineral surface. For this reason, any investigation or probing should try to distinguish the nature of the lower mineral substrate.

Bog Slides

2.4.7 A bog slide is a variation on a peat slide where part of the peat mass is subject to movement, usually on an internal layer of material, which may be more prone to movement, such as an interface between the acrotelmic and catotelmic layer.

Natural Instability

2.4.8 The stability of a peat mass is controlled by a complex interrelationship of factors. Key factors include sloping rock head, and proximity to water bodies. Rainfall often acts as a trigger after the slope has been conditioned to fail by natural processes.

2.4.9 It should also be remembered that peat bogs are growing environments and that there would come a time, on sloping ground, where the forces causing instability, the weight of the bog, can no longer be resisted by the internal strength of the peat and its interface with the underlying mineral surface. At this point, failure would occur.

2.4.10 The weight of the peat bog or any soils mantling steep hill slopes would be increased during periods of very heavy rain and it is common to see landslips occurring following extreme rain events. This may be a concern for future developments where one of the predicted effects of global warming is greater frequency of extreme weather, including intense storm events.



3 Desk Based Assessment

3.1 Baseline Conditions

3.1.1 A desk-based review of the site and its condition has been conducted by the use of the following sources of information:

- British Geological Survey (BGS) mapping and data;
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) Carbon and Peatland Map, 2016;
- Hydrogeological Map of Scotland, British Geological Survey, 1988;
- Soil Survey of Scotland Maps, James Hutton Institute;
- Habitat and botanical survey data (refer to **Chapter 7: Ecology**);
- Aerial photography;
- Ordnance Survey and topographic maps; and
- Historical mapping.

Geological Setting

Superficial Geology

3.1.2 Published geological mapping from the British Geological Survey (BGS) at 1:50,000 scale indicates the majority of the northern development area is underlain by peat, as shown in **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 3)**. Devensian till deposits are mapped in the west of the northern development area and along the Powbrone Burn and its tributaries. Alluvium and Glaciolfluvial deposits are also associated with Powbrone burn and its tributaries.

Soils

3.1.3 The National Soil Map of Scotland shows the turbine area and the north of the access area to be largely underlain by Dystrophic blanket peat, Subalpine podzols and Peaty Rankers with lithosols. The south of access area is underlain by Humus-iron podzols, Dystrophic basin peat, Peaty gleys, Subalpine podzols and Alluvial Soils.

3.1.4 Dystrophic blanket peat is an organic soil which is largely rain fed and mineral poor. Subalpine podzols have a thin peaty surface with greyish to orogeny brown subsoil. Peaty Rankers consist of a thin organic surface layer overlying a weakly developed subsoil. Both the Subalpine podzols and Peaty Rankers are derived from the Moine Series.

3.1.5 Published priority peatland mapping by NatureScot, Carbon and Peatland Map 2016, indicates that the turbine area primarily comprises Class 1 peatland which is considered to be 'nationally important carbon-rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitat'. There are small, isolated areas of Class 5 peatland, which are defined as areas with no peatland habitats recorded but may include areas of bare soil, carbon-rich soils and deep peat. A small area of Class 3 peatland, defined as dominated with vegetation that is not associated peatlands is located in the north-east of the turbine area. There are areas of mineral soil located in the south and south-west of the turbine area.

3.1.6 Phase 1 and phase 2 peat surveys were undertaken to gather site specific information of the presence and condition of peat soils and/or peat and is described further in **Section 4**.

Bedrock Geology

3.1.7 Published geology mapping identified that the northern development area is predominantly underlain by Silurian Plewland Sandstone Formation and Middlefield Conglomerate Formation of the Dungavel Group, with a small, isolated, South of Scotland Granitic Suite intrusion of the Caledonian Supersuite, as shown in **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 4)**. Logan Formation, consisting of



sandstone, siltstone and mudstone, of the Waterhead Group underlies the north-east and Swanshaw Sandstone Formation of the Lanark Group underlies the north-west of the northern development area. The northern development area is heavily faulted with 11 inferred faults mapped.

Mining and Quarrying

- 3.1.8 A review of the Mining Remediation Authority (formerly Coal Authority) map shows that the northern development area is not located within a coal mining reporting area. In their scoping response the Mining Remediation Authority (formerly Coal Authority) indicated that “records do not indicate the presence of any coal mining features at surface or shallow depth in the area identified above by the updated red line boundary.”

Hydrology and Climate

Hydrology

- 3.1.9 The site is located within the wider surface water catchments of the Glengavel Water and the Greenock Water, the watercourses of the Glengavel Water and Greenock water are classified in accordance with the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) as having ‘Poor’ and ‘High’ overall status, respectively.
- 3.1.10 The catchment of the Glengavel Water drains the northern development area. The Powbrone Burn and its tributaries traverse the east of the northern development area. The Patrick Burn and the Bught Burn flow south within the west of the northern development area. The southern development area is located within the Greenock water catchment.

Hydrogeology

- 3.1.11 Silurian rocks (undifferentiated) bedrock aquifer underlies the majority of the site. The Scottish Environment Web Map defines the Silurian rocks (undifferentiated) bedrock aquifer as a low productivity Class 2C aquifers. The aquifer is defined as having ‘virtually all flow occurs through fractures and discontinuities’.

Rainfall

- 3.1.12 Periods of intense, heavy rainfall are often seen as triggers for instability events. The nearest Met Office weather station to the Proposed Development site is Saughall (National Grid Reference NS 259882, 636430). The average annual rainfall is 1,413.12 mm, which is 9.9% less than the Scotland-wide average.

Land Use and Topography

- 3.1.13 The northern development area primarily comprises commercial forestry (**Plate 3.1**) with a series of summits which include Dungavel Hill (458 m, Above Ordnance Datum (AOD)), Auchengilloch (462 m AOD), Brown Hill (313 m AOD) and Regal Hill (428 m AOD).
- 3.1.14 The site has been characterised into slope classes based on 5 m Digital Terrain Model (DTM) and is shown in **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 5)**.



Plate 3.1 – Northern Development Area Topography



Aerial Photography and Site History

Aerial Photography Interpretation

- 3.1.15 Given the extensive commercial forestry cover in the northern development area, aerial photography interpretation was limited, however it is possible to identify breaks in forestry, stream courses, drainage ditches and roads/tracks from the photographs. The aerial photographs were used in conjunction with the site DTM data to identify the major geomorphological features, mainly as breaks of slope, significant watercourses etc. The site was further assessed during site visits when more detailed mapping was undertaken.
- 3.1.16 Interpretation of available aerial photographs was undertaken to assess and identify (where present) evidence of historic peat instability. The photographs were examined to highlight features of interest, where present, including:
- possible extension and/or compression features;
 - areas of historic failure scars and debris;
 - evidence of soil/peat creep;
 - areas with apparent poor drainage;
 - areas with concentrations of surface drainage networks; and
 - steeply incised stream cuttings within peat deposits.
- 3.1.17 The aerial photography, DTM and data gathered on site have been used in conjunction to create a geomorphological interpretation of the site, presented in **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 6)**.
- 3.1.18 There was no evidence visible in the historic photographs of any extension or compression features in the peat. It was not possible to identify evidence of any significant historic peat failures or slides from the aerial photographs in either of the site areas. There was no evidence from aerial photographs or ground survey of significant features of this nature and no slumping of peat/soil was present.

Historic Mapping

- 3.1.19 Freely available historic OS mapping has been reviewed, there was no evidence of historic instability identified.



Local Knowledge

- 3.1.20 No anecdotal background from landowners or past site users has been provided to suggest there has been a history of peat instability on the site.

3.2 Surface Water and Sensitive Receptors

- 3.2.1 The effects of peat failures are felt locally, both in the long and short term, but they can also have wider off-site implications.
- 3.2.2 A key part of the risk assessment process is to identify the potential scale of peat failure, should it occur, and identify the potential environmental effects as well as the receptors of such an event.
- 3.2.3 Peat failure associated with the Proposed Development could affect the following key receptors:
- The Proposed Development itself including associated infrastructure;
 - Property and infrastructure, for example roads or utilities;
 - Land based ecological effects (damage to habitats);
 - On-site and downstream watercourses;
 - Archaeological assets; and
 - Visual amenity (scarring of the landscape).



4 Site Work

4.1 Peat Depth Survey

- 4.1.1 Phase 1 peat depth surveys were carried out by SLR between June 2022 and May 2023. This data was used to inform the iterative design process, with phase 2 surveys initially carried out by SLR on a preferred design in December 2022 and January 2023. Following initial phase 2 survey additional probing was undertaken throughout the design iteration process (during 2024) to account for changes in infrastructure location.
- 4.1.2 A total of 8,896 probe locations were collected across the various survey stages. Due to design iterations resulting in changes to the development boundary, over 2,300 probes collected are now outside of the Proposed Development boundary.
- 4.1.3 A total of 6,537 probes were collected within the Proposed Development site boundary and have been used to undertake the peat depth analysis.

Methodology

- 4.1.4 The surveys were carried out followed best practice guidance for development on peatland (Scottish Government, 2017).
- 4.1.5 The thickness of the peat/soils was assessed using a graduated fibre glass peat probe. This was pushed vertically into the peat/soil to refusal and the depth recorded using a handheld Trimble Global Positioning System instrument (GPS), reaching an accuracy of <1.5 m.
- 4.1.6 Alongside desk-based information, the 'feel' on refusal was used to interpret the underlying substrate. The following criteria was used in the field:
- Solid and abrupt refusal – Rock
 - Solid but less abrupt refusal with grinding or crunching sound – Granular (sands, gravel, weathered rock)
 - Gentle refusal – Cohesive (Clay/Silt)

Peat Depth Analysis

- 4.1.7 A summary of the peat depths encountered during probing is detailed in **Table 4.1** below and within **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figures 7 and 8)**.

Table 4.1 - Distribution of Peat Depth Recorded at the Site

Peat Depth Interval (m)	Number of Occurrences	% of Probes
Nil	22	0.3
0.01-0.50	2,790	42.7
0.51 - 1.0	2,376	36.3
1.00-1.50	783	12.0
1.51- 2.0	493	7.5
2.01 -2.50	64	1.0
2.51- 3.0	9	0.1
> 3.0	0	0.0
Total	6,537	100



- 4.1.8 The survey results show that 43 % of probes identifying thin soils (<0.5 m), with 20.6 % of probe locations identified thick peat (>1 m), to a maximum depth of 3.0 m.
- 4.1.9 The results show that deep peat (>1 m) is present across much of the eastern part of the northern development area, on flat lying ground, towards the southern boundary. The western part of the northern development area is largely absent of peat (>0.5 m). The average probe depth in the northern development area is 0.7 m. General ground conditions of the northern development area are shown in **Plate 4.1**.

Plate 4.1 – Northern Development Area ground conditions



- 4.1.10 There are limited peat deposits in the southern development area with an average probe depth of 0.3 m.
- 4.1.11 The Proposed Development infrastructure has been through several design iterations, informed by site survey, and following consultation with SEPA. The Proposed Development infrastructure has avoided areas of deep peat so far as practicable, whilst taking into consideration other technical and environmental constraints. The existing forestry track network has been utilised where possible, and where tracks cross areas of peat in excess of 0.8 m, floated construction is proposed.

4.2 Peat Coring Survey

- 4.2.1 In order to gain additional information on the condition of the underlying peat deposits, peat cores were extracted at 6 locations (detailed on **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 8)**) onsite using a 'Russian auger'.
- 4.2.2 The peat augering locations were taken at locations across the site, considered to be a representative cross section, characteristic of peat conditions at the Site. Cores were logged in line with the Von Post scale of humification. The results are indicative of a peat profile disturbed by commercial forestry, with variable conditions near surface, and more typical humified profile developing with depth.
- 4.2.3 **Table 4.2** shows a summary of the cores taken on-site, **Annex 2** provides a detailed review of the peat cores taken including pictures with relevant humification classifications.



Table 4.2 - Distribution of Peat Depth Recorded at the Site

Peat Core ID	Location	Depth (m)	Von Post Classification
PA1	270426, 634279	0 – 0.5 0.5 – 1.0 1.0 – 1.5	H5 H3/H4 H3/H4
PA2	270187, 634417	0 – 0.5 0.5 – 1.0 1.0 – 1.5 1.5 – 2.0 2.0 – 2.5	H5 H6 H3/4 H3/4 H4/5
PA3	269547, 634298	0 – 0.5 0.5 – 1.0 1.0 – 1.5	H4 H2 H3
PA4	269293, 633901	0 – 0.5 0.5 – 1.0 1.0 – 1.5	H4/5 H3/4 H3/4
PA5	268193, 634721	0 – 0.5 0.5 – 1.0	H3 H4
PA6	267902, 634005	0 – 0.5 0.5 – 1.0 1.0 – 1.5	H4/5 H4 H3/4



5 Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment

5.1.1 The Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017) acknowledges that there is no universal agreed definition of hazard and risk that can be applied in the context of peat landslides.

5.1.2 The guidance describes the calculation of risk from the following formula:

$$\text{Risk} = \text{Likelihood of a Peat Landslide} \times \text{Adverse Consequence}$$

5.1.3 The guidance provides examples of assessment methodology to be used. SLR Consulting have reviewed the guidance and the approach of other leading experts and has undertaken the assessment using the following methodology.

5.1.4 Firstly, it is important to note that the Proposed Development layout, including siting of turbines and other infrastructure, resulted from an iterative process which took into account the findings from peat survey work. Deeper peat was avoided wherever possible, in order to minimise the requirement to disturb and/or excavate peat, and to minimise peat slide risk associated with construction across and within peat.

5.1.5 The first phase of assessment is to identify the susceptibility or likelihood of a peat landslide occurring based on existing conditions and parameters that influence peat landslide occurrence (prior to influence of construction).

5.1.6 Once areas of increased likelihood of a peat slide occurring have been identified, an assessment of adverse consequence (impact) and risk assessment would be undertaken on these areas, assessing the impact of a potential peat slide on identified receptors. For this further assessment, impact coefficient scores are determined, combined with an assessment of the vulnerability of receptors to establish a final risk score.

5.2 Likelihood Assessment

5.2.1 The susceptibility or likelihood of a peat slide occurring is controlled by a number of natural controlling and trigger factors. These are typically:

- Slope gradient;
- Peat depth;
- Peat strength;
- Nature of the substrate beneath peat deposits;
- Relief;
- Evidence of historical failures/potential instability (e.g. tension cracks, creep, compression ridges);
- Vegetation cover;
- Land use; and
- Hydrology

5.2.2 The most important of the above controlling factors are considered by the assessor to be peat depth, slope gradient, underlying substrate and evidence of potential instability (which is controlled by the former). Without peat and slope, the risk of a peat slide would be unlikely to exist.

5.2.3 Key parameters influencing peat stability have been scored and provided a coefficient value.

5.2.4 The Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017) relates the likelihood of a peat landslide to a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being negligible (very low likelihood) and 5 being almost certain (very high likelihood). This scale relates to the likelihood of instability for all the controlling factors under consideration.



- 5.2.5 It is important to note that this study only focuses on peat soils and the criteria used is specifically tailored to the key factors affecting peat stability. As such it does not account for the stability of other mineral soils or rock.
- 5.2.6 Peat strength has not been included as a factor in the likelihood scoring process. Site-specific peat strength data was not collated for the site given the difficulty in obtaining reliable values of shear strength using common place in situ and laboratory soil strength tests (as described in **Section 2.2**). The shear strength is also linked to peat depth as strength is considered to decrease with thickness. As such this parameter is considered to be factored into the risk scoring for peat depth.

Input Data

- 5.2.7 The input data sets used for the analysis were as follows:
- Slope gradient: Terrain 5 DTM with a 5 m grid size.
 - Peat depth: Site survey information for peat depth and site observations.
 - Nature of substrate: Surveyor observations of substrate “feel” at the refusal point during probing, together with BGS geological mapping and surveyor observations of exposed substrate at the site.
 - Emerging Instability: Where there is evidence of instability or factors which may increase the likelihood of a slide event occurring e.g. soil creep, slumping, possible extension/compression features, poor drainage etc.
- 5.2.8 The assessment firstly considers the likelihood of instability occurring, based on a series of input factors. These factors were attributed coefficient scores based on their influence on peat stability.
- 5.2.9 There is no guidance available on how to combine the likelihood scoring for each of the factors used in the assessment. The assessment team have used the methodology set out below.
- 5.2.10 For each of the factors noted, a score/coefficient of zero to three has been assigned. A zero score reflects no contribution to peat slide likelihood, with a score of three indicating a high peat slide likelihood associated with that particular factor.
- 5.2.11 The total likelihood ranking is the product of the four individual factor scores.

Slope Angle

- 5.2.12 The limiting factor governing the formation of thick peat deposits is topography. In the case of blanket peat, it tends to be deepest in closed depressions, and typically thin as the slope angle increases (Boylan, Jennings and Long, 2008). The Best Practice Guide (Scottish Government, 2017), details that a PLHRA is not needed for blanket bog sites with slopes less than 2° and as such, a score of zero has been assigned for slopes less than 2°. For slopes greater than 2°, scores have been assigned based on the type and nature of peat slides reported for different slope conditions.
- 5.2.13 A slope angle GIS layer was generated from the DTM at a 5 m cell resolution. The source DTM is also at a 5 m resolution. The slope angle details are illustrated in **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 5)**.
- 5.2.14 This slope, calculated in degrees, was identified at each probe location and scored as shown in **Table 5.1**.

**Table 5.1 - Coefficient for Slope**

Slope (°)	Slope Coefficient	Notes
2.0 or less	0	Failure unlikely due to flat ground.
2.1 – 5.0	2	Failure in blanket bog areas would typically occur as peat slides and peaty debris slides, due to low slope angle.
5.1 – 15.0	3	Failure in blanket bog areas would typically occur as peat slides, bog slides or peaty-debris slides. This is the key slope range for reported peat failures.
15.1 – 20.0	2	Failure would typically occur as peaty debris slides due to low thickness of peat on steeper slopes.
>20.0	1	Failure would typically occur as peaty debris slides due to low thickness of peat on steeper slopes.
2.0 or less	0	Failure unlikely due to flat ground.

Peat Depth

- 5.2.15 Peat thickness is seen as one of the key factors associated with peat stability. Typically, the deeper the peat the more humified, and therefore potentially weaker and unstable it is. Peat depth surveys have been completed on the site and these data were then interpolated using the Spline interpolation function within the Spatial Analyst Tools of ArcMap 10.3 (see **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 7)**).
- 5.2.16 The highest hazard scores have been assigned to peat depth ranges most frequently associated with peat slides on upland sites (Evans and Warburton, 2007).
- 5.2.17 The peat depth was identified at each probe location and scored as shown in **Table 5.2**.

Table 5.2 - Coefficient for Peat Depth

Peat Depth (m)	Depth Coefficient	Notes
Nil	0	No peat/organic soil therefore no potential for peat slide.
<0.5	1	Peaty/organic soil rather than peat, therefore failures would be peaty-debris slides.
0.5 – 1.5	3	Sufficient peat thickness for peaty debris or peat slide.
>1.5	2	Sufficient peat thickness for peat slide however less often recorded at this thickness, due to thicker peat generally occurring in areas of shallow gradients.

Substrate

- 5.2.18 The nature of the substrate beneath peat deposits can have a bearing on the likelihood of instability arising, with failure often occurring at the interface between the base of the peat mass and the top of the substrate.
- 5.2.19 Where granular soils (sand/gravel derived from glacial till) or weathered rock form the substrate, the effective strength of the interface can be considered to be good, with comparatively high friction values. Under these conditions, failure is likely to occur in a zone within the peat, just above the interface. Further factors are necessary to cause a failure of this nature (increased pore pressures within the peat) and occurrence of such events is rare.
- 5.2.20 Where cohesive soils (clay) form the interface, there is likely to be a significant zone of softening in the clay (due to saturation at low normal stresses, poor or non-existent vertical drainage and the effect of organic acids), resulting in either very low undrained shear strength or low effective shear



stress parameters. The result is that potential shearing could occur either in the peat, or in the interface or in the clay; all three possibilities have been documented in peat slides.

5.2.21 A rock substrate provides a high strength stratum, however, the rock surface can be smooth, with a relatively impermeable surface which can result in a 'slippery' interface, accumulation of groundwater and/or low shear strength at the interface, resulting in a higher susceptibility for the overlying peat mass to fail.

5.2.22 The nature of the substrate was inferred at each probe location, based on surveyor observations and BGS geological mapping, and scored as shown in **Table 5.3**.

Table 5.3 - Coefficient for Substrate

Substrate	Substrate Coefficient	Notes
Granular Sands/Gravels/Weathered rock	1	Peat failures sometimes associated with bedrock or granular till substrate.
Cohesive (clay)	2	Peat failures often associated with cohesive till substrate.
Rock (smooth interface)	2	Peat failures often associated with impermeable 'smooth' bedrock surface.
Not proven	3	If the overall thickness of the peat had not been proven, the risk associated with the significant thickness and the unknown substrate would be given a high rating to accommodate unknown factors.

Evidence of Existing or Emerging Instability

5.2.23 Geomorphological considerations such as peat erosion, haggling, peat pipes, pools, and evidence of existing instability, can contribute to the potential for instability to arise.

5.2.24 Where evidence of existing or emerging instability was identified by surveyor observations or through mapping and aerial photography a coefficient score has been assigned, as shown in **Table 5.4**.

Table 5.4 - Coefficient for Existing or Emerging Instability

Evidence of Existing/ Emerging Instability	Existing or Emerging Instability Coefficient	Notes
Yes	2	Failures likely to occur where evidence of emerging/ developing instability is observed (peat pipes/collapsed pipes, areas of diffuse surface drainage such as flushes and pools, tension cracks, compression ridges, bulging, quaking bog) or in areas in close proximity to previous failure events.
No	1	No impact on likelihood of peat slide.

Likelihood Rating

5.2.25 The coefficient scores assigned for each of the above factors were multiplied to give a likelihood rating. Identification of the likelihood of a peat landslide occurring is the first step of the assessment, allowing areas of potential concern to be identified. **Table 5.5** sets out the ranking system employed in this assessment.



Table 5.5 - Likelihood of a Peat Landslide Occurring

Likelihood Rating Coefficient	Likelihood of Instability	Action
1 - 5	Negligible	No mitigation required, good construction practices should be followed.
>5 - 15	Low	Further investigation to refine assessment and mitigate hazard through relocation or re-design at these locations.
>15 - 30	Medium	Should not proceed unless risk can be avoided or mitigated at these locations, without significant environmental impact, in order to reduce likelihood score to low or negligible.
>30 - 36	High	Avoid project development at these locations
>36 - 54	Very High	Area should be avoided due to very high level of risk and almost certain likelihood of a peat slide occurring.

5.2.26 The assessment of all probe locations within the site boundary is included in **Annex 3**. The results show that of the 6,537 probe locations within the extent of the DTM, the following likelihood ratings were identified:

- No likelihood at 156 locations;
- Negligible likelihood at 3,036 locations;
- Low likelihood at 3,309 locations; and
- Medium likelihood at 36 locations.
- No high or very high likelihood locations were identified.

5.2.27 **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 9)** provides the interpreted likelihood of peat stability based on the rating calculated from the above factors. A summary of the likelihood of peat instability at infrastructure locations is shown in **Table 5.6** below.

Table 5.6 - Likelihood of Peat Instability Rating at Infrastructure Locations

Infrastructure Element		Instability Rating	Average Peat Depth (m)	Average Slope (°)	Suitability of Location
Turbines and Hardstanding					
T1	Turbine	Negligible	0.76	4.59	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible	0.58	4.42	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible	0.51	4.19	Suitable
T2	Turbine	Low	0.66	5.98	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.78	6.50	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	0.83	6.27	Suitable
T3	Turbine	Negligible	0.16	12.07	Suitable



Infrastructure Element		Instability Rating	Average Peat Depth (m)	Average Slope (°)	Suitability of Location
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible	0.15	13.54	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible	0.36	10.60	Suitable
T4	Turbine	Negligible	0.35	10.71	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible	0.3	11.43	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible – Low	0.52	10.30	Suitable
T5	Turbine	Negligible	0.4	11.48	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible – Low	0.55	11.38	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible	0.37	10.86	Suitable
T6	Turbine	Low	0.91	4.17	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.87	4.25	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible – Low	0.74	4.42	Suitable
T7	Turbine	Negligible – Low	0.7	3.72	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.83	3.38	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	0.89	3.38	Suitable
T8	Turbine	Negligible	0.18	5.35	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible – Low	0.75	6.09	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	0.65	5.15	Suitable
T9	Turbine	Negligible	0.68	3.67	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible – Low	0.72	3.64	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible – Low	0.71	5.06	Suitable
T10	Turbine	Negligible	0.39	15.18	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible	0.41	14.87	Suitable
	Hardstand – Temporary	Negligible	0.35	16.27	Suitable



Infrastructure Element		Instability Rating	Average Peat Depth (m)	Average Slope (°)	Suitability of Location
T11	Turbine	Low	0.7	7.80	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.78	7.28	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	0.93	6.50	Suitable
T12	Turbine	Low	1.14	6.62	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.68	7.14	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible – Low	0.55	7.74	Suitable
T13	Turbine	Low	1.02	5.15	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	1.14	5.08	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	1	5.11	Suitable
T14	Turbine	Low	0.72	5.53	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.68	5.40	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	1.07	4.95	Suitable
T15	Turbine	Low	0.75	5.24	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible – Low	0.62	4.76	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible – Low	0.62	5.16	Suitable
T16	Turbine	Negligible	0.68	4.96	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Negligible	0.39	5.40	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Negligible – Low	0.53	6.41	Suitable
T17	Turbine	Low	1.52	5.70	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	1.1	5.49	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	1.09	5.79	Suitable
T18	Turbine	Low	1.06	5.04	Suitable
	Hardstand - Permanent	Low	0.83	4.61	Suitable
	Hardstand - Temporary	Low	0.87	4.67	Suitable



Infrastructure Element	Instability Rating	Average Peat Depth (m)	Average Slope (°)	Suitability of Location
Other Infrastructure				
SPEN Substation	Negligible – Low	0.45	8.10	Suitable
Development Substation	Negligible – Low	0.42	6.52	Suitable
SPEN Temporary Compound and BESS	Negligible – Low	0.42	5.05	Suitable
Temporary Construction Compound (Site entrance)	Negligible	0.1	8.81	Suitable
Temporary Construction Compound (west of BP)	Negligible	0.28	9.52	Suitable
Borrow Pit (adjacent to T4)	Negligible	0.18	14.69	Suitable
Borrow Pit (adjacent to T10)	Negligible	0.27	11.18	Suitable
Borrow Pit (adjacent to T11)	Low	0.65	7.94	Suitable
Access Tracks				
Track (all)	Negligible – Medium	0.67	6.86	See Section 5.3 for further discussion.
Tracks in peat (cut)	Negligible – Medium	0.74	7.22	See Section 5.3 for further discussion.
Floated tracks (peat >0.8 m)	Negligible – Low	1.39	4.82	Suitable
Turning Circle to T1	Negligible	0.6	4.65	Suitable
Turning Circle to T6	Negligible – Low	0.2	4.44	Suitable
Turning Circle to T7	Negligible – Low	0.5	4.24	Suitable
Turning Circle to T12	Negligible	0.25	8.57	Suitable
Turning Circle to T15	Negligible – Low	0.46	5.67	Suitable

5.2.28 As can be seen from **Table 5.6**, all infrastructure elements have been assigned likelihood rankings of negligible or low, excepting proposed tracks. The generally negligible and low rankings accord with Proposed Development being site outwith areas of deep peat identified on site, and with no evidence of historical failures where peat is present.

5.3 Likelihood Assessment

5.3.1 The likelihood assessment has determined that the majority of the site lies within an area of negligible to low likelihood of a peat landslide occurring (**Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 9)**), excepting the proposed tracks.



5.4 Impact Assessment

- 5.4.1 In line with best practice guidance (Scottish Government, 2017) where areas with medium or higher likelihood of instability have been identified, an impact assessment has been undertaken to identify the overall risk by considering the impact (adverse consequence) should a peat landslide occur.
- 5.4.2 The assessment follows the methodology outlined below, and considers the sensitivity of the receptor, the distance between the potential source of instability and the receptor, and the relative elevation of the source compared to the receptor. This is considered to be a more realistic and suitable analysis than considering distance alone, given that a receptor which is close to a source area but is up-gradient from it, would not be affected by run-out from the resultant failure.
- 5.4.3 The impact rating is derived by multiplying the receptor sensitivity coefficient by the receptor proximity coefficient and the relative elevation coefficient. The following sections detail the methodology for assigning coefficient scores.
- 5.4.4 For example, a highly sensitive watercourse (6) at 250 m from the source of potential peat slide (2) at a relative elevation of <10 m (1) would be scored an impact rating of 12 (low), as detailed in **Table 5.12**.

Receptor Sensitivity Ranking

- 5.4.5 Should a peat landslide occur, nearby structures or features may be impacted. Generally, only features down-gradient should be considered, therefore a review of topography and geomorphological features need to be identified prior to identifying receptors. However, it should be noted that instability occurring on steep slopes do risk the back scarp of instability migrating up-slope, affecting areas not previously considered to be at risk. The receptors detailed in **Table 5.7** have been ranked according to their size and sensitivity with corresponding coefficients assigned.

Table 5.7 - Coefficients for Receptor Sensitivity

Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity Coefficient
Minor infrastructure e.g. private roads/tracks, including Proposed Development track	1
Watercourses, and critical infrastructure (roads/ services, individual dwellings and business properties)	3
High-sensitivity watercourses (e.g. national/international designations)	6
Communities (over approximately 10 dwellings)	8

Receptor Proximity

- 5.4.6 The proximity of a receptor should be considered to assess the likely level of disruption should a peat landslide occur. Predicting the size of a failure and the distance it may travel is very difficult. The high moisture content of peat makes it especially mobile once it fails and the structure of the peat breaks down. If a peat slide enters a watercourse this can mobilise the slide further and have impacts many kilometres beyond the bounds of the site. In many instances, minor slumps are localised and have little or no impact. Other failures may travel at 100 – 200 m and those entering watercourses, many miles, as was the case of the Derrybrien failure in Co. Galway, Ireland in 2003 (Lindsay and Bragg, 2005).
- 5.4.7 The distance from the source and the relative elevation of the receptor have been assigned coefficients as detailed in **Table 5.8** and **Table 5.9**.



Table 5.8 - Coefficient for Receptor Proximity

Distance from Coefficient Feature	Distance Coefficient
More than 1 km	1
100 m to 1 km	2
10 m to 100 m	3
Less than 10 m	4

Table 5.9 Coefficient for Receptor Proximity

Relative Elevation of Receptor	Relative Elevation Coefficient
Less than 10 m	1
10 m to 50 m	2
50 m to 100 m	3
More than 100 m	4

- 5.4.8 The results of the likelihood and impact assessment have been normalised into a numerical score, detailed in **Table 5.10**. The overall risk ranking (detailed in **Table 5.11**) is determined from the product of the likelihood rating coefficient (normalised) and the Impact rating coefficient (normalised).
- 5.4.9 Where a risk ranking is greater than low, qualitative assessment would then be undertaken to determine if the ranking can be revised to an acceptable level through appropriate mitigation or re-design.

Table 5.10 - Rating Normalisation

Likelihood		Impact	
Normalised Scale	Current Scale	Normalised Scale	Normalised Scale
Negligible (≤ 5)	1	Very Low (< 10)	1
Low ($> 5 - 15$)	2	Low (11 – 20)	2
Medium ($> 15 - 30$)	3	Moderate (21 – 30)	3
High ($> 30 - 36$)	4	High (31 – 50)	4
Very High (> 36)	5	Extremely High (> 51)	5

Table 5.11 - Risk Ranking

Risk Ranking	Risk Ranking Level	Action
1-4	Negligible	No mitigation required, good construction practices should be followed.
5-10	Low	Further investigation to refine assessment and mitigate hazard through relocation or re-design at these locations.
11-16	Medium	Should not proceed unless risk can be avoided or mitigated at these locations, without significant environmental impact, in order to reduce risk score to low or negligible.
17-25	High	Avoid project development at these locations



5.5 Assessment of Increased Likelihood Locations

- 5.5.1 As noted above, where areas of increased likelihood (medium or higher) of a peat slide occurring have been identified (**Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 9)**), an assessment of the impact of the peat slide and overall risk has been undertaken.
- 5.5.2 Where the likelihood assessment identified areas of negligible and low likelihood of instability, no specific mitigation measures are considered necessary. However, best practice construction methodology should be adopted with ongoing monitoring of ground conditions.
- 5.5.3 34 locations of medium likelihood have been identified and therefore further assessment of the impact of a potential peat slide is required.
- 5.5.4 The assessment carried out in **Table 5.12** was completed as described in the sections above.
- 5.5.5 Following review of **Annex 1 (TA8.5 Figure 9)**, 11 locations of medium likelihood were identified as being within influencing distance of proposed infrastructure. Although the potential risk can be mitigated to negligible, this location should be subject to further post-consent investigation and monitoring during the construction phase.

Table 5.12 - Impact Assessment

Location	Coordinates	Relative Elevation Coefficient	Receptor Sensitivity Coefficient	Receptor Proximity Coefficient	Impact Rating
1 (Temporary Hardstanding at T4)	267064, 634729	2 (46.3 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (309 m)	Low (2)
2 (Access Track south of T6)	267896, 634947	2 (22.7m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (204 m)	Very Low (1)
3 (Temporary Hardstanding at T9)	268180, 634004	2 (19.6 m)	3 (Watercourse)	3 (93 m)	Low (2)
4 (Access Track north of T9)	268330, 633954	2 (26 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (165 m)	Low (2)
5 (Access Track between T11 and T12)	267897, 633892	2 (32 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (287 m)	Low (2)
6 (Borrow Pit southeast of T11)	267993, 634051	3 (50.1 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (434 m)	Low (2)
7 (Access track southwest of T12)	269163, 633927	2 (31.1 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (229 m)	Low (2)
8 (Access track southeast of T17)	270757, 634954	1 (3.8 m)	3 (Watercourse)	3 (58 m)	Very Low (1)
9 (Temporary Hardstanding at T17)	270750, 635016	2 (11 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (138 m)	Low (2)



Location	Coordinates	Relative Elevation Coefficient	Receptor Sensitivity Coefficient	Receptor Proximity Coefficient	Impact Rating
10 (Access Track at T18)	270871, 635021	2 (18.6 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (196m)	Low (2)
11 (Temporary Hardstanding at T16)	270256, 635404	2 (25.2 m)	3 (Watercourse)	2 (291 m)	Low (2)

Table 5.13 - Risk Assessment

Location	Likelihood Rating (normalised)	Impact Rating (normalised)	Risk Rating	Mitigation/ Comment	Revised Risk Rating
1	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	The peat depths within this risk area are <1 m with slopes ranging from 10.4 to 13.5 degrees with the underlying substrate interpreted as rock. Model influenced by underlying substrate (rock). Peat is limited and there is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area. Based on the conditions identified, it is assumed that the risk could be appropriately mitigated by micro-siting this temporary hardstand eastward to an area of negligible likelihood.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
2	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located upgradient of T6 access track. Peat depths within the risk area >1 m with a slope of 6.2 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as cohesive. Model influenced by underlying substrate, (Cohesive). The area of peat >1 m is localised. There was no evidence of instability within the surrounding area identified during site walkovers. Increased likelihood location unlikely to be impacted by access track so long as appropriate drainage is maintained.	Low, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
3	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located on temporary hardstanding at T9. Peat depths within the risk area <1 m with slopes ranging from 3.6 to 11 degrees with the underlying substrate interpreted as Cohesive.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.



Location	Likelihood Rating (normalised)	Impact Rating (normalised)	Risk Rating	Mitigation/ Comment	Revised Risk Rating
				Model influenced by underlying substrate (Cohesive) and interpolation of peat depths (<1 m). Peat is limited and there is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area identified during site walkovers. Based on the conditions identified, it is assumed that the risk could be appropriately mitigated by micro-siting this temporary hardstand northward to an area of negligible likelihood.	
4	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located downgradient of access track southeast of temporary construction compound at T8. The peat depths within this risk area range from 0.4 m to 1.3m with slopes ranging from 6.1 to 7.6 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as cohesive. The model is influenced by small isolated are of peat >1 m underlain by a cohesive substrate. Peat is limited and there is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area. Based on the conditions identified, it is assumed that the risk could be appropriately mitigated by micro-siting this access track eastward to an area of negligible likelihood.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
5	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located on access track between T11 and T12, downgradient from borrow pit. Peat depths within the risk area <1 m with a slope of 7.3 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as cohesive. Model influenced by interpretation of underlying substrate (cohesive) and interpolation of peat depths (<1 m). Peat is limited and there is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area. Increased likelihood location unlikely to be impacted by access track so long as appropriate drainage is maintained.	Low, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.



Location	Likelihood Rating (normalised)	Impact Rating (normalised)	Risk Rating	Mitigation/ Comment	Revised Risk Rating
6	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located on southeast edge of borrow pit between T11 and T12. Peat depths within the risk area <1 m with a slope of 5.5 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as rock. Model influenced by interpretation of underlying substrate (rock) and interpolation of peat depths (<1 m). The impact assessment considers the risk to be low, based on the nearest watercourse receptor being >430 m from the source. The proposed borrow pit will be subject to detailed ground investigation to determine an appropriate design, avoiding peat soils (if present). Any peat present would be excavated, removing the potential for a peat slide to occur post-construction. Excavation of the borrow pit would be monitored by a geotechnical specialist.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
7	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located on access track east of temporary construction compound between T11 and T12. Peat depths within the risk area range from 0.1 m to 1.1 m with a slope ranging from 7.6 to 9.3 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as rock. Model influenced by interpretation of moderate slopes in combination with isolated areas of peat >1 m, underlain by rock. Based on the conditions identified, it is assumed that the risk could be appropriately mitigated by micro-siting this access track northward to an area of Low likelihood.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
8	Medium (3)	Very Low (1)	Negligible (3)	Located downgradient of T17. Peat depths within the risk area range from <0.5 m to >1 m with a slope of 5.8 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as rock. There is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.



Location	Likelihood Rating (normalised)	Impact Rating (normalised)	Risk Rating	Mitigation/ Comment	Revised Risk Rating
				The impact assessment considers the risk to be negligible due to the elevation difference between source and receptor being negligible. Increased likelihood location unlikely to be impacted by turbine and associated hardstanding so long as appropriate drainage is maintained.	
9	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located on temporary hardstanding of T17. There is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area. Peat depths within the risk area <1 m with a slope of 5.8 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as rock. Model influenced by isolated peat underlain by rock. Increased likelihood location unlikely to be impacted by temporary hardstanding so long as appropriate drainage is maintained. Based on the conditions identified, it is assumed that the risk could be appropriately mitigated by micro-siting this temporary hardstanding to the northeast to an area of Low likelihood and peat depths <0.5 m.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
10	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located on access track to T18. There is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area. Peat depths within the risk area <1 m with a slope of 5.4 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as rock. Model influenced by interpretation of underlying substrate (rock) and interpolation of peat depths (<1 m). Based on the conditions identified, it is assumed that the risk could be appropriately mitigated by micro-siting this access track northward to an area of Low likelihood.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation and monitoring during construction.
11	Medium (3)	Low (2)	Low (6)	Located downgradient of T16. There is no evidence of instability within the surrounding area.	Negligible, with appropriate mitigation



Location	Likelihood Rating (normalised)	Impact Rating (normalised)	Risk Rating	Mitigation/ Comment	Revised Risk Rating
				Peat depths within the risk area <1 m with a slope of 5.5 degrees. The underlying substrate is interpreted as rock. Model influenced by interpretation underlying substrate (rock) and interpolation of peat depths (<1 m). Increased likelihood location unlikely to be impacted by turbine and associated hardstanding so long as appropriate drainage is maintained.	and monitoring during construction.



6 Proposed Development Design and Mitigation

6.1 Detailed Design and Site Investigation

6.1.1 A detailed site investigation would be required to assist detailed design, comprising intrusive ground investigations at infrastructure locations prior to construction commencing, to ascertain depth to bedrock and suitable founding conditions.

6.1.2 A detailed stability analysis can then be completed at all infrastructure locations using the increased confidence in the shear strength/peat depth data and site-specific topographical survey data, to provide added robustness to the stability assessment.

Turbines and Hardstandings

Design

6.1.3 This PLHRA has identified that all turbines and hardstandings are at low or negligible likelihood of a peat slide occurring.

Mitigation

6.1.4 The infrastructure would not be constructed on peat, rather peat would be excavated to allow founding onto a suitable stratum i.e. bedrock.

6.1.5 It is anticipated that extraction of rock will be required in at least some areas to create suitable levels for founding turbines and hardstandings.

6.1.6 Prior to construction, a specific construction method statement would be produced which would draw on the findings of intrusive investigations. The method statement would detail the exact construction methodology to be used, in line with the Peat Management Plan and taking into account:

- opportunities for micro-siting turbines and hardstandings to further minimise risk where possible;
- a geotechnical analysis for each turbine base;
- the method of excavation and the location for placing and storing excavated material to ensure that these operations do not give rise to slope or site instability;
- methodology for storing and watering surface vegetated turves, for re-sodding bare areas;
- details of how excavated spoil would be stored;
- avoidance of construction (if possible) on wet areas, flushes and easily eroded soils;
- adequate drainage design to cater for expected heavy rainfall events; and
- monitoring of ground movement and water levels.

6.1.7 The Construction Method Statement would also detail how pumped water from excavated bases would be controlled and monitored to ensure it is appropriately managed and if directed into or conveyed to existing drains/watercourses, to ensure that all have adequate treatment beforehand and capacity to deal with the volumes of water encountered.

Access Tracks

Design

6.1.8 Areas of deep peat have been largely avoided with respect to access track routing so far as practicable. Where avoidance of deep peat hasn't been possible, floated track construction has been proposed on peat >0.8 m.



Peat Storage

- 6.1.9 The principles of temporary peat storage are discussed in the Outline Peat Management Plan (**Appendix 8.4** of the EIA Report). Detailed requirements for any appropriate mitigation measures would be set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
- 6.1.10 Best practice measures for temporary and permanent peat storage during construction would be followed, in accordance with guidance including Developments on Peatland: Guidance on the Assessment of Peat Volumes, Reuse of Excavated Peat and the Minimisation of Waste (Scottish Renewables and SEPA, 2012). This includes:
- selecting suitable temporary storage areas with relatively low ecological value, and low stability risk i.e. not at the crest of a slope or in areas identified as being at higher risk of instability;
 - reuse of temporarily stored peat as soon as possible after excavation;
 - dressing and reinstating peat used for road verges and infrastructure batters (as part of site landscaping works) as soon as practicable after construction; and
 - suitably limiting the angle of reinstated slopes to reduce run-off and erosion.

Drainage Areas

- 6.1.11 Design and construction of a suitable drainage system for the proposed Development would follow Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) principles and would ensure natural drainage without significant alteration of the hydrological regime of the site area.
- 6.1.12 Any construction activity relating to, or undertaken in the vicinity of watercourses would be carried out in general accordance with relevant guidelines and legislation.

Borrow Pit

- 6.1.13 Pre-construction site investigation works would be undertaken to further assess the borrow pit search area and to identify the specific excavation locations and extents within the search area. This would be based on peat depth and distribution, with any deep peat avoided, and suitability of rock for excavation. These further investigations would also establish the method of extraction, determining whether any blasting is required. If blasting is required, further analysis of potential impacts on peat stability in the vicinity would be undertaken and appropriate mitigation stipulated.

6.2 Monitoring and Management

- 6.2.1 A line of surveyed and levelled pegs and visual monitoring is an acceptable method of monitoring movement adjacent to roads, excavations and stockpile areas.
- 6.2.2 Thus, as construction activities commence, the appearance of the area and surrounding land would be monitored visually by installing a line of levelled pegs adjacent to the activity location. Specifically, the following signs would be looked for:
- an increased rate of sinking or tilting;
 - the rising of adjacent peat/peaty soils;
 - cracking and lateral movement of the soil surface; and
 - a rise in water levels.
- 6.2.3 The Principal Contractor would ensure that suitably qualified and experienced construction staff are engaged on the project, including a senior geotechnical engineer with extensive practical knowledge and experience of similar conditions to those at the site. The senior geotechnical engineer would have responsibility for maintaining and actively monitoring a geotechnical risk register for the construction works.
- 6.2.4 Additionally, all staff would undergo a site induction and suitable training relating to construction on peatland sites. This would raise awareness of ground instability indicators, best practice



construction techniques, mitigation and emergency procedures. All staff should be responsible for observational monitoring and reporting.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1.1 The Proposed Development has been assessed for potential peat instability through consideration of the likelihood of a peat slide occurring based on existing site conditions, the potential impact on identified receptors and the overall risk associated.
- 7.1.2 The overall conclusions show that there is a **negligible to low** likelihood of peat instability over the majority of the site, with the proposed layout avoiding areas of increased likelihood.
- 7.1.3 For areas with a medium likelihood of peat instability that are within influencing distance of the Proposed Development, a hazard impact assessment was completed, which concluded that, subject to the employment of appropriate mitigation measures, all these areas can be revised to **negligible** or **low** risk.
- 7.1.4 This report highlights the complicated inter-relationship between all the aspects that have an effect on the stability of peat. Consequently, the discussion has also addressed areas of construction and drainage in order to avoid a stability problem rather than attempt to put it right after the event.



8 References

- Bowes, D.R. (1960) *A bog burst in the Isle of Lewis*. Scottish Geographical Magazine, 76, pp21-23
- Boylan, N., Jennings, P., Long, M. (2008). *Peat Slope Failure in Ireland*. Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology and Hydrogeology.
- Crisp, D.T., Dawes, M. & Welch, D. (1964), 'A Pennine Peat Slide', The Geographical Journal, Vol 130, No4, pp519-524.
- Dykes, A.P. and Kirk, K.J. (2006) *Slope Instability and Mass Movements in Peat Deposits*. In Martini, I.P., Martinez Cortizas, A. and Chesworth, W. (Eds.) *Peatlands: Evolution and Records of Environmental and Climatic Changes*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Energy Consents Unit Scottish Government., (April 2017) *Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment: Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments, Second Edition*.
- Evans, E. and Warburton, J (2007). *Geomorphology of Upland Peat: Erosion, Form and Landscape Change*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gosling, D., and Keeton, P. (2008). *Problems with Testing Peat for Stability Analysis*. Paper presented at Reinforced Water, Geological Society Conference;
- Hemingway, J.E. and Sledge, W.A. (1941-46) *A Bog Burst near Danby in Cleveland*. Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literature Society, Science 4, pp276 – 288.
- Hobbs, N.B. (1986) Mire morphology and the properties and behaviour of some British and foreign peats. Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology, London, 19, 7-80).
- Lindsay, R.A, (1995), *Bogs: The ecology, classification and conservation of ombrotrophic mires*. Scottish Natural Heritage. Perth.
- Lindsay, R.A. and Bragg, O. (2005) 'Wind Farms and Blanket Peat - The Bog Slide of 16th October 2003 at Derrybrien, Co.Galway, Ireland', University of East London, The Derrybrien Development Cooperative
- Mills, A.J. and Rushton, D. (2023) A risk-based approach to peatland restoration and peat instability. NatureScot Research Report 1259
- Scottish Government, SNH, SEPA., (2017) Peatland Survey. Guidance on Developments on Peatland, online version only.
- Scottish Renewables, SNH, SEPA, Forestry Commission Scotland, Historic Environment Scotland, Marine Scotland Science, AEECoW (2024), Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction, Fifth Edition.
- Von Post, L and Grunland, E., (1926) Sodra Sveriges torvillganger 1, Sverges Geol. Unders. Avh., C335, 1-127.
- Winter, M.G., MacGregor, F. and Shackman, L. (2005) *Scottish Road Network Landslides Study*, ISBN 0 7559 4649 9.



Annex 1: Figures



Annex 2: Peat Core Results



ID:	Photo 1	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	270426, 634279	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 1	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0 – 0.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 2	Von Post Classification:	H3
Location:	270426, 634279	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 1	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0.5-1.0	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 3	Von Post Classification:	H3/H4
Location:	270426, 634279	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 1	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	1 – 1.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 1	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	270187, 634417	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 2	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0 – 0.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 2	Von Post Classification:	H3
Location:	270187, 634417	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 2	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0.5-1.0	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 3	Von Post Classification:	H3/4
Location:	270187, 634417	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 2	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	1.0 – 1.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 4	Von Post Classification:	H3/4
Location:	270187, 634417	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 2	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	1.5 – 2.0	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 5	Von Post Classification:	H4/5
Location:	270187, 634417	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 2	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	2.0 – 2.5	Date:	24/05/2024

Annex 2: Site Photographs



ID:	Photo 1	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	269547, 634298	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 3	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0 – 0.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 2	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	269547, 634298	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 3	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0.5-1.0	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 3	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	269547, 634298	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 3	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	1 – 1.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 1	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	269293, 633901	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 4	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0 – 0.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 2	Von Post Classification:	H2/3
Location:	269293, 633901	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 4	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0.5-1.0	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 3	Von Post Classification:	H3
Location:	269293, 633901	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 4	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	1 – 1.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 1	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	268193, 634721	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 5	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0 – 0.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 2	Von Post Classification:	H2/3
Location:	268193, 634721	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 5	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0.5-1.0	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 1	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	267902, 634005	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 6	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0 – 0.5	Date:	24/05/2024



ID:	Photo 2	Von Post Classification:	H2
Location:	267902, 634005	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 6	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	0.5-1.0	Date:	24/05/2024

Annex 1: Site Photographs



ID:	Photo 3	Von Post Classification:	H2/H3
Location:	267902, 634005	Underlying Substrate:	N/A
Description:	Auger Location 6	Logged By:	BN / AD
Depth (m):	1.0 – 1.5	Date:	24/05/2024



Annex 3: Peat Slide Likelihood Data