Chapter 13
Forestry

This page is intentionally blank.

13 Forestry

Contents

13.1	Introduction	3
13.2	Legislation, Policy and Guidelines	4
13.3	Consultation	4
13.4	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	4
13.5	Baseline Conditions (Updated Forestry Baseline)	5
13.6	Scope of the Assessment	8
13.7	Assessment of Potential Effects	10
13.8	Mitigation	31
13.9	Residual Effects	37
13.10	Cumulative Assessment	38
13.11	Summary	38
13.12	References	41

Figures

Figure 13.1a Northern Development Area Baseline Phased Felling Plan – Scenario 1
Figure 13.1b Northern Development Area Baseline Phased Felling Plan – Scenario 2
Figure 13.2a Southern Development Area Baseline Species Plan – Scenario 1
Figure 13.2b Southern Development Area Baseline Species Plan – Scenario 2
Figure 13.3a Northern Development Area Proposed Phased Felling Plan (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.3b Northern Development Area Proposed Phased Felling Plan (Scenario 2)
Figure 13.4a Southern Development Area Felling Plan (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.4b Southern Development Area Felling Plan (Scenario 2)
Figure 13.5a Northern Development Area Baseline Restructuring Plan – Scenario 1
Figure 13.5b Northern Development Area Baseline Restructuring Plan – Scenario 2
Figure 13.6a Northern Development Area Proposed Restructuring Plan (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.6b Northern Development Area Proposed Restructuring Plan (Scenario 2)
Figure 13.7 **NOT USED**
Figure 13.8a Northern Development Area General Yield Class Distribution within Proposed Development Felling Area (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.8b Northern Development Area General Yield Class Distribution within Proposed Development Felling Area (Scenario 2)
Figure 13.9a Northern Development Area Compensatory Planting (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.9b Northern Development Area Compensatory Planting (Scenario 2)
Figure 13.10a Southern Development Area Compensatory Planting (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.10b Southern Development Area Compensatory Planting (Scenario 2)
Figure 13.11a Northern Development Area Proposed Development Forest Residue Management Plan (Scenario 1)
Figure 13.11b Northern Development Area Proposed Development Forest Residue Management Plan (Scenario 2)

Appendices

Appendix 13.1 Habitat Management and Enhancement Plan Compartment Four Southern Development Area Ecological Site Classification Report

Appendix 13.2 Habitat Management and Enhancement Plan Northern Development Area Ecological Site Classification Report

13 Forestry

13.1 Introduction

13.1.1 This SEI Report chapter has been prepared to update the forestry baseline and assessment presented in the EIA Report for the Proposed Development in response to NatureScot's comments in relation to the status and delivery expectations for the neighbouring Dungavel Wind Farm Habitat Management Plan (DWFHMP) and the related misalignment with the Dungavel Long Term Forest Plan (LTFP) (reference number 22FGS64845).

13.1.2 Following a request from NatureScot, the forestry baseline has been updated to incorporate the DWFHMP Harrier Enhancement Areas (hereafter referred to as the 'Core Areas') and the Potential Additional Harrier Enhancement Areas (hereafter referred to as 'Additional Areas'). These are shown on **SEI Technical Appendix 7.5 Figure 1 - Proposed Habitat Management Areas** and replicated as Core and Additional areas on **SEI Figures 13.1a** and **13.1b**.

13.1.3 These areas involve the removal of existing conifer crops to create open habitats suitable for hen harrier conservation and represent a consented change in land use to that which is presently the case in the Dungavel LTFP, approval date 12 December 2023, as shown on EIA Report Figure 13.1 and 13.2) which was considered as the forestry baseline in the EIA Report. The inclusion of these areas in the forestry baseline require consideration of two alternative scenarios as agreed with NatureScot:

- Scenario 1: assumes implementation by the Dungavel Wind Farm operator of the DWFHMP Core Area only in 2027; while
- Scenario 2: assumes implementation by the Dungavel Wind Farm operator of both the Core and Additional Areas in 2027.

13.1.4 A more detailed explanation of the scenarios is included in **SEI Chapters 6** (Ornithology) and **7** (Ecology), and the updated Habitat Management and Enhancement Plan (HMEP) for the Proposed Development in **SEI Technical Appendix 7.5.** As explained in the updated HMEP, in the circumstance where Scenario 2 prevails this would require the Proposed Development to deliver alternative forest to bog peat restoration work in the southern development area (SDA), 'Forest to Bog Option 2' as shown on **SEI Technical Appendix 7.5 Figure 1.**

13.1.5 To support these updates, additional survey work was undertaken in Compartment Four ('Forest to Bog Option 2') of the SDA (refer to **SEI Technical Appendix 7.5 Figure 1** and **SEI Figure 13.2b**), including the collection of peat depths, vegetation data (**Chapter 7: Ecology**), and timber mensuration surveys. The Ecological Site Classification (ESC) model, published by Forest Research and accessed via the Forest Research Decision Support System (FR DSS), was used to predict second-rotation Yield Class. The resulting reports for the SDA and northern development area (NDA) can be found in **SEI Technical Appendices 13.1** and **13.2**.

13.1.6 These outputs were used to update the SDA Baseline Species Plan (see **SEI Figures 13.2a** and **13.2b**) and to prepare a new Felling Plan (see **SEI Figures 13.4a** and **13.4b**), illustrating Forest to Bog habitat management prescriptions. The information has also informed future management strategies.

13.1.7 Additional site visits to Compartment Four (see **SEI Figure 13.4b**) were undertaken in late 2025 and early 2026 to collect field data supporting these updates. The revised baseline scenarios, including the DWFHMP Core and Additional areas, were discussed with Scottish Forestry (SF) in December 2025, and the agreed approach confirmed through subsequent correspondence. Aside from the introduction of the DWFHMP areas to the forestry baseline, the proposed felling and restocking plans (see **SEI Figures 13.3a, 13.3b, 13.6a** and **13.6b**) remain largely consistent with the EIA Report, with only **minor** modifications to Phase One felling areas.

13.1.8 This SEI Report chapter therefore presents the updated baseline scenarios, revised felling plans, and associated assessment of potential effects, reflecting the inclusion of the DWFHMP areas as required by NatureScot.

13.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidelines

13.2.1 Relevant legislation and guidance documents that have been reviewed and taken into account as part of this assessment are set out in Chapter 13 of the EIA Report and are unchanged.

13.3 Consultation

13.3.1 Since submission of the EIA Report, further consultation has been undertaken with SF to inform the preparation of this SEI Report chapter.

13.3.2 A meeting was held with SF on 15 December 2025, with the agreed position confirmed by email correspondence dated 16 December 2025. This consultation focused on the treatment of the DWFHMP areas, the presentation of draft forestry baseline and draft Proposed Development figures within the SEI Report, and the inclusion of Compartment Four Forest to Bog restoration within the SDA.

13.3.3 SF confirmed that the DWFHMP area constitutes land-use change already approved under the Dungavel Wind Farm planning consent and should therefore be assessed as such within the SEI Report. Although felling associated with the DWFHMP is currently anticipated in 2027, the relevant areas in each scenario will not be restocked and therefore are appropriately classified as Other Land. SF agreed that further mitigation to reduce the scale of the Proposed Development felling is not possible due to the requirement to fell to wind-firm boundaries.

13.3.4 SF agreed that removal of the DWFHMP areas would not be visible from any of the five key viewpoints identified in the EIA Report and agreed that no updates to visualisations or further forestry landscape assessment were required.

13.3.5 Draft forestry figures supporting the SEI Report were presented, reviewed and agreed with SF. The draft SEI Report Baseline Phased Felling Plan and Baseline Restructuring Plan were confirmed as valid. The Proposed Development draft SEI Report Felling and Restructuring Plans were also agreed, with DWFHMP areas shown as Other Land and United Kingdom Forest Standard (UKFS; Forestry Commission, 2023)-compliant restructuring delivered across the wider plan area.

13.3.6 SF also agreed to the principle of Forest to Bog restoration at Compartment Four within the SDA in Scenario 2 to facilitate blanket bog and peatland restoration. As these areas will not be restocked, it was agreed that a Felling Permission would not be sought, but instead consent to fell would be secured via the Proposed Developments planning approval, supported by evidence demonstrating compliance with the Scottish Government Policy on Control of Woodland Removal (SGPCWR) (FCS, 2009) and the practice guide *Deciding Future Management Options for Afforested Deep Peatland (DFMOADP, FCS, 2015)*.

13.4 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Study and Survey Areas

13.4.1 The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the methodology set out in Chapter 13 of the EIA Report and follows standard forestry EIA practice. Effects have been assessed using the same significance criteria and evaluation framework previously applied, ensuring consistency across the EIA Report and the SEI Report.

13.4.2 Updated forestry information for the NDA and SDA was incorporated to ensure that the assessment reflects the most recent consented habitat management proposals under the DWFHMP. This includes the delineation of the Core and Additional Areas, which inform the two scenarios assessed as agreed with NatureScot and SF. Baseline conditions derived from surveys, desk studies, and updated forest plan data are described in **Section 13.6**.

13.4.3 To support the updated assessment, updated forestry figures were produced to illustrate the felling phases, restructuring approach, species composition, yield class distribution, compensatory planting requirements and residue management under both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. These figures provide the spatial and structural context required to analyse effects on forest resources and woodland structure.

13.4.4 Two scenarios have been assessed because the Proposed Development does not determine whether the DWFHMP Core Area alone, or both the Core and Additional Areas, are felled; that is dependent on decisions to be made by the Dungavel Wind Farm Habitat Management Group (Dungavel HMG). The scenarios therefore represent two possible, consented management trajectories for the forest estate:

- Scenario 1: Removal of the Core Area only in 2027 by DWFHMP.
- Scenario 2**:** Removal of both the Core and Additional Areas in 2027 by DWFHMP.

13.4.5 Assessing both scenarios ensures the updated assessment captures the full range of potential forestry-related effects, independent of future decisions made by the Dungavel HMG i.e. to demonstrate that the Proposed Development is acceptable in either scenario.

13.4.6 Desk-based analysis used updated mensuration data and ESC modelling to refine yield class estimates and woodland productivity assumptions. These outputs informed revisions to the forest plans used for impact assessment. On-site verification, including peat condition checks, vegetation classification and timber measurements within Compartment Four, was undertaken to ensure that underlying assumptions were robust and aligned with field conditions.

13.4.7 Consultation with SF informed the structure and scope of the revised assessment. Agreement was reached on the treatment of the DWFHMP areas, the application of the two-scenario approach, and the confirmation that refinements to felling phases arising from the updated baseline would not alter the conclusions of the Forestry Landscape Appraisal. No changes to viewpoint assessments were therefore required.

13.4.8 The assessment considers changes in forest structure, felling extents, restocking, woodland removal and associated land-use change over the duration of the Proposed Development. Significance is determined by evaluating the magnitude of change against the sensitivity of the affected forest resource, using the criteria established in the EIA Report.

13.4.9 No new effect pathways have been introduced beyond those assessed in the EIA Report. The SEI Report assessment therefore represents an update based on refined data and revised forest plan figures, rather than a change to the underlying methodology or significance criteria.

Limitations to Assessment

13.4.10 No changes from Chapter 13 of the EIA Report.

13.5 Baseline Conditions (Updated Forestry Baseline)

13.5.1 Dungavel Forest comprises approximately 1,347 ha of land within the NDA, managed as a medium-sized commercial forest under an SF-approved Forest Plan. The baseline forest resource is characterised by a predominantly even-aged crop structure, historically focused on Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis)*-dominated commercial forestry, with smaller areas of mixed conifer and broadleaf woodland, permanent open ground, and other non-productive land.

13.5.2 Work was undertaken to survey Compartment Four of the SDA to inform the updated baseline. This comprised the collection of peat condition sample points, with National Vegetation Classification (NVC) communities recorded at each location (**Chapter 7: Ecology**). An abbreviated B4 tariff survey was undertaken at a density of four plots per hectare to establish timber mensuration data for the stand.

13.5.3 Baseline figures for the NDA (see **SEI Figure 13.1a** and **13.1b**) were updated using information sourced from the DWFHMP, reflecting the extent and location of the consented Core and Additional Areas. These updates informed revisions to the phased felling and restructuring plans under Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, ensuring alignment with approved habitat management proposals. Baseline timber production also reflects the current position of the Phase One felling programme which has progressed since the publication of the EIA Report with the completion of Compartments 3, 4 and 26.

13.5.4 The following baseline figures have been produced reflecting the two scenarios:

- **SEI Figure 13.1a** Northern Development Area Baseline Phased Felling Plan – Scenario 1
- **SEI Figure 13.1b** Northern Development Area Baseline Phased Felling Plan – Scenario 2
- **SEI Figure 13.2a** Southern Development Area Baseline Species Plan – Scenario 1
- **SEI Figure 13.2b** Southern Development Area Baseline Species Plan – Scenario 2
- **SEI Figure 13.5a** Northern Development Area Baseline Restructuring Plan – Scenario 1
- **SEI Figure 13.5b** Northern Development Area Baseline Restructuring Plan – Scenario 2

Desk Study

13.5.5 Site-specific data collected for Compartment Four were input into the ESC model to derive predicted Yield Class (YC) for second-rotation forestry. Timber mensuration data were used to define sub-compartment crop characteristics. These outputs informed updates to **SEI Figure 13.2b** and the preparation of **SEI Figure 13.4b:** Southern Development Area Felling Plan – Scenario 2.

Topography and Landscape

13.5.6 As agreed with SF at the meeting on 15 December 2025, amendments to felling phases resulting from the updated baseline would not be visible from any of the five key viewpoints identified in the EIA Report Forestry Landscape Appraisal. Accordingly, no update to the Forestry Landscape Appraisal was required.

Consented DWFHMP Woodland Removal

13.5.7 For the purposes of this SEI Report, the forestry baseline has been updated to reflect consented woodland removal associated with the DWFHMP which was not incorporated within the EIA Report baseline as it did not feature on the Dungavel LTFP. Although these habitat works are not certain to be implemented, and if they are, they will be delivered by the Dungavel Wind Farm operator, they are consented, spatially defined, and understood to be programmed for implementation (in whole or in part) in 2027, and therefore NatureScot has requested this form part of the updated baseline against which the Proposed Development is assessed.

Northern Development Area –Baseline Structure

13.5.8 Across both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 baselines, the total forest plan area, including other land, remains unchanged at 1,347.01 ha (**Tables 13.4.1** and **13.4.2**). However, both baselines incorporate the removal of woodland associated with delivery of the consented DWFHMP, resulting in a reduction in the area of productive forestry and a corresponding increase in permanent open habitat ('Other Land'). These changes alter the structure of the forest plan by modifying the distribution of felling across the felling phases and reducing the land available for future restructuring.

13.5.9 In both baselines, the removal of woodland within the DWFHMP areas reduces the extent of productive forest in later felling phases. Phase Two remains unchanged between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 (114.26 ha in both cases), while Phases Three and Four are reduced in Scenario 2 because elements of these phases fall within the DWFHMP Additional Area. As a result, the overall distribution of productive forestry in Scenario 2 becomes more concentrated in earlier phases, with reduced flexibility for long-term restructuring.

13.5.10 *Note:* For the purposes of this Forestry Chapter, the DWFHMP boundaries were refined and re-digitised to align more accurately with actual compartment and coupe edges observed on the ground. The original DWFHMP mapping contained generalised digitisation, which did not fully reflect operational forestry boundaries.

13.5.11 As a result, the areas (ha) reported in this chapter differ slightly from those presented in **SEI Chapters 6** and **7** and from the updated HMEP, which continue to use the original DWFHMP dataset. These differences reflect mapping accuracy rather than any material change to the woodland resource.

Scenario 1 –Baseline Condition (DWFHMP Core HMP Area Only – SEI Figure 13.1a)

13.5.12 Under Scenario 1, the baseline incorporates the permanent removal of 82.56 ha of commercial forestry within the DWFHMP Core Area (**Table 13.4.1**). This area is converted to open habitat and does not contribute to any felling phase. The resulting baseline forest structure includes:

- Phase One: 185.13 ha
- Phase Two: 114.26 ha
- Phase Three: 89.85 ha
- Phase Four: 258.75 ha
- Outwith Plan Period: 133.03 ha
- Long-Term Retention: 25.85 ha
- DWFHMP Hill Summit Other Land 36.4 ha
- Other Land: 421.11 ha

This represents the baseline forest plan after the Core Area removal.

13.5.13 Despite the reduction in productive area, the Scenario 1 baseline maintains a predominantly coniferous composition, with Sitka spruce remaining the dominant species. UKFS species diversity requirements fall short of providing adequate secondary conifer species at 9% rather than the 10% minimum. (**Table 13.8.1**).

Scenario 2 –Baseline Condition (DWFHMP Core and Additional HMP Areas – SEI Figure 13.1b)

13.5.14 Under Scenario 2, the baseline includes removal of woodland from both the DWFHMP Core Area (82.56 ha) and the DWFHMP Additional Area (67.67 ha), equating to approximately 150 ha of permanent habitat conversion. This results in a baseline with a materially reduced extent of productive forestry relative to baseline Scenario 1. Key felling phase baselines are:

- Phase One: 185.13 ha (unchanged from Scenario 1)
- Phase Two: 114.26 ha (unchanged from Scenario 1)
- Phase Three: 74.96 ha (reduced from 89.85 ha)
- Phase Four: 205.97 ha (reduced from 258.75 ha)
- Outwith Plan Period: 133.03 ha (unchanged from Scenario 1)
- Long-Term Retention: 25.85 ha (unchanged from Scenario 1)

13.5.15 The reductions in Phases Three and Four reflect overlap between the Additional HMP Area and stands originally scheduled for later-phase harvesting.

13.5.16 As with Scenario 1, the total forest plan area, including Other Land remains unchanged, and UKFS species diversity standards continue to fall short of secondary conifer requirements at 9% rather than the 10% minimum (**Table 13.8.2**). Scenario 2, however, represents a baseline with:

- a substantially lower productive forest area,
- a greater proportion of permanent open habitat, and
- more constrained potential for long-term restructuring, particularly in Phases Three and Four.

Sitka spruce remains the dominant species, although the overall productive structure is notably more limited than under Scenario 1.

Baseline Timber Availability

13.6.14 The baseline timber production totals in **Tables 13.5.1** and **13.5.2** remain the same between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Although the scenarios differ in how they treat the DWFHMP Additional Area, this does not change the overall baseline tonnage because the same total area of productive

forest is scheduled for felling across the full plan period in both scenarios.

- Total predicted baseline timber production is 295,295 tonnes in both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 (**Tables 13.5.1** and **13.5.2**).
- The scenarios differ in the phasing of some of this harvesting, particularly within Phases 3 and 4, resulting in changes to timing of timber production but these are inconsequential.
- Scenario 2 also includes the DWFHMP Additional Area within the baseline, which alters the internal distribution of felling across phases compared with Scenario 1. However, this affects only the timing of timber removal, not the overall volume felled over the plan period.
- Consequently, overall baseline timber availability remains effectively identical between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Differences relate solely to timing and allocation across phases, reflecting baseline forest structure rather than any effect of the Proposed Development.

Southern Development Area – Baseline

13.5.17 Within the SDA, the EIA Report baseline included no felling or restructuring. Under the updated baseline, Compartment Four is introduced as a new assessment area solely in the context of potential peatland habitat restoration under Scenario 2. Compartment Four is characterised by non-economic conifer woodland on peat soils and is identified as suitable for Forest to Bog habitat restoration should the Scenario 2 DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas be implemented by the Dungavel Wind Farm operator.

13.5.18 No baseline forestry removal is assumed within Compartment Four. Its inclusion within this SEI Report reflects its role as a mitigation receptor linked to potential baseline change in the NDA, rather than a change in baseline forest management objectives within the SDA itself.

13.5.19 Compartment Four comprises Sitka spruce and Lodgepole pine crops, predominantly in mixture, with only small areas of single-species stands. The crop has been affected by historical fire damage, resulting in widely spaced trees. Consequently, it is not possible to derive an accurate Yield Class from the B4 abbreviated tariff, as standard Yield Models assume fully stocked stands. Coniferous regeneration is evident in several areas, particularly where windblow has opened the canopy and increased light levels at the forest floor. Some areas of crop show signs of better growth, especially on the fringes of the bog where peat depths reduce and patches of mineral soils occur.

13.6 Scope of the Assessment

Spatial Scope

13.6.1 The spatial scope of this updated assessment is limited to geographic areas where baseline considerations have changed since publication of the EIA Report, or where consequential effects arise because of those baseline changes.

- Northern Development Area (NDA): The NDA is a medium-sized commercial forest managed under an approved Forest Plan. For the purposes of this SEI Report, the NDA includes areas subject to consented forest removal for the DWFHMP delivery, comprising either the Core Area only or the Core plus Additional Areas, depending on the option progressed by the Dungavel HMG.
- Southern Development Area (SDA): The SDA as previously assessed in the EIA Report, together with an additional woodland compartment (Compartment Four) which did not form part of the EIA Report baseline. Compartment Four is under the control of the Applicant and has been identified as an alternative location for peatland restoration by the Proposed Development, including Forest to Bog habitat reinstatement, should Scenario 2 be implemented by Dungavel HMG.

Temporal Scope

13.6.2 The temporal scope of this updated assessment aligns with that of Chapter 13 the EIA Report and considers the implications of the updated baseline across the following phases, insofar as they are affected by the baseline changes:

- Construction Phase (approximately two years): Including harvesting of the Forestry Felling Corridor and Phase 1 fell phase, habitat creation, access works, and infrastructure construction affected by the updated baseline.
- Operational Phase (40 years): Covering the operational life of the Proposed Development, during which interactions between energy infrastructure, forest management, habitat management, and peatland restoration may occur.
- Decommissioning Phase (approximately 1.5 to two years): Including removal of infrastructure and restoration of affected areas, where relevant to the updated baseline and mitigation proposals.

Receptors Requiring Assessment

13.6.3 This updated assessment is confined to environmental receptors for which baseline conditions have changed, or where new mitigation requirements arise because of the DWFHMP scenarios, and where these changes have the potential to result in new or materially different effects from those reported in the EIA Report. Receptors scoped in to the updated assessment are summarised below.

Forestry and Land Use (Scoped In)

- Changes to baseline felling schedules and timber availability arising from DWFHMP-related forest removal.
- Changes in baseline species composition and land-use classification, including conversion from productive forestry to open habitat or peatland.
- Implications for long-term forest restructuring plans and forest sustainability objectives arising from the updated baseline scenarios.
- Compliance with the UKFS and associated environmental safeguards relating to soil, water, and cultural heritage.

Woodland Removal and Habitat Management (Scoped In)

- Loss of afforested land arising from the updated baseline, including forest removal associated with DWFHMP delivery.
- The requirement for, scale of, and location of compensatory mitigation measures, including Forest to Bog habitat reinstatement.
- Consistency of woodland removal and habitat restoration proposals with forestry, peatland, and biodiversity policy.

Landscape and Visual (Scoped In – Update Only)

- Changes in landscape structure and character arising from the updated baseline forest cover and open habitat extent.
- Potential changes to previously assessed landscape and visual effects where baseline forest cover assumptions have materially changed.

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Scoped In – Confirmation of Effects)

- Archaeological and cultural heritage receptors are scoped into this updated assessment for the purposes of confirming whether the updated baseline conditions, including revised felling layouts and the inclusion of the SDA Compartment Four for Forest to Bog restoration, give rise to any new or materially different effects from those assessed in the EIA Report.
- The scope of assessment is limited to potential effects arising from forestry removal, ground disturbance, and habitat restoration works associated with the updated baseline. No reassessment of receptors previously considered unaffected in the EIA Report is undertaken where baseline conditions remain unchanged.

Matters Scoped Out

13.6.4 All other environmental topics and receptors assessed in the EIA Report are scoped out of this updated assessment, where baseline conditions remain unchanged and where no new or materially different effects arise because of the updated baseline.

Environmental Measures Embedded into the Development Proposals

13.6.5 No changes from **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

13.7 Assessment of Potential Effects

Overview

13.7.1 This section assesses the potential effects of the Proposed Development forestry proposals in the context of the updated baseline presented in this SEI Report. The assessment focuses on those aspects where baseline conditions differ from the EIA Report, principally the inclusion of consented habitat management areas associated with the DWFHMP and the introduction of Forest to Bog restoration at Compartment Four under Scenario 2 within the SDA. In all other respects, the assessment approach and significance criteria remain as set out in **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

Forest Figures

13.7.2 The following figures support the assessment under Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 on forestry, woodland structure, and associated habitat resources within the NDA and SDA.

Phased Felling Plans

Northern Development Area

- **SEI Figure 13.3a** – Northern Development Area Proposed Phased Felling Plan - Scenario 1.

  Phased felling plan showing the infrastructure felling corridor and the DWFHMP Core Area (implemented and potential implementation in 2027).

- **SEI Figure 13.3b** – Northern Development Area Proposed Phased Felling Plan - Scenario 2.

  As Scenario 1, with the inclusion of the DWFHMP Additional Area (potential implementation in 2027).

Southern Development Area

- **SEI Figure 13.4a** – Southern Development Area Felling Plan - Scenario 1.

  Net tree removal required for construction of access tracks.

- **SEI Figure 13.4b** – Southern Development Area Felling Plan - Scenario 2.

  Net tree removal required for access tracks, and Compartment Four subject to a Forest to Bog habitat restoration prescription.

Forest Restructuring Plans

- **SEI Figure 13.6a** – Northern Development Area Proposed Restructuring Plan - Scenario 1.

  Infrastructure layout, restocking of tree-free areas, DWFHMP Core Area, and the Proposed Development HMEP (Forest to Bog Option 1).

- **SEI Figure 13.6b** – Northern Development Area Proposed Restructuring Plan - Scenario 2.

  Infrastructure layout, restocking of tree-free areas, and the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas.

Yield Class Distribution

- **SEI Figure 13.8a** – Northern Development Area General Yield Class Distribution within Proposed Development Felling Area - Scenario 1.

Yield Class distribution within the Proposed Development felling area, including the infrastructure felling corridor and areas associated with the Proposed Development HMEP (Forest to Bog Option 1).

- **SEI Figure 13.8b** – Northern Development Area General Yield Class Distribution within Proposed Development Felling Area- Scenario 2.

  Yield Class distribution within the Proposed Development felling area, including the infrastructure felling corridor.

Compensatory Planting

Northern Development Area

- **SEI Figure 13.9a** – Northern Development Area Compensatory Planting - Scenario 1.

  Compensatory planting requirement based on the restocking tree-free area overlaid on the baseline restructuring plan, including the DWFHMP Core Area. Open ground exclusions and forest track sections eligible as normal forest practice are shown.

- **SEI Figure 13.9b** – Northern Development Area Compensatory Planting - Scenario 2.

  As Scenario 1, including the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas.

Southern Development Area

- **SEI Figure 13.10a** – Southern Development Area Compensatory Planting - Scenario 1.

  Net tree removal area used to determine compensatory planting requirements.

- **SEI Figure 13.10b** – Southern Development Area Compensatory Planting - Scenario 2.

  Net tree removal area used to determine compensatory planting requirements, including Compartment Four subject to a Forest to Bog restoration prescription.

Northern Development Area Forest Residue Management

- **SEI Figure 13.11a** – Northern Development Area Forest Residue Management Plan - Scenario 1.

  Areas of brash-only recovery, brash and stump recovery, floating track construction, and recently planted crops generating negligible brash.

- **SEI Figure 13.11b** – Northern Development Area Forest Residue Management Plan - Scenario 2.

  As Scenario 1, except forest residue arising from the DWFHMP Additional Area is not accounted for as the area will have been cleared ahead of the Proposed Development.

Social

13.7.3 In line with **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report, social effects are considered in relation to the interaction between forestry activities and archaeological assets, cultural heritage features, landscape character, and the experience of these receptors by people. The updated forestry proposals do not alter the types of forestry operations assessed but refine their location, timing, and extent, which are considered below.

Archaeological Considerations

13.7.4 The updated forestry proposals do not introduce new effects on archaeological receptors within the NDA. Archaeological features identified in the EIA Report remain protected through established forestry safeguards, including marking of known features and the application of buffer zones during felling and ground works.

13.7.5 Forest to Bog restoration within Compartment Four in the SDA under Scenario 2 represents an addition to the forestry activities assessed in the EIA Report. A review of cultural heritage data confirms that Compartment Four does not contain, and is not in proximity to, any designated or non-designated archaeological features, including Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventory Battlefields, or World Heritage Sites. The proposed works involve low-impact forestry operations associated with habitat restoration, and no significant

archaeological effects are anticipated.

Cultural Heritage

13.7.6 Cultural heritage effects, including effects on designated assets such as the Dungavel Hill Scheduled Monument, remain unchanged from those reported in the EIA Report. The updated forestry proposals do not result in additional felling, restocking, or infrastructure works within the setting of designated cultural heritage assets.

Forest restructuring and habitat restoration measures are consistent with existing consents and land management objectives and do not alter the baseline context within which cultural heritage effects were previously assessed. As such, the EIA Report conclusions of **no significant effect** associated with forestry operations on cultural heritage remain valid.

Landscape Considerations

13.7.7 The incorporation of the DWFHMP Core and Additional Area scenarios has resulted in amendments to the distribution and timing of felling phases within the NDA under each scenario. However, as agreed with SF, these changes do not alter the visibility of forestry operations from any of the five key viewpoints assessed in the EIA Report Forestry Landscape Appraisal. Consequently, no update to the appraisal has been required.

13.7.8 The DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas already benefit from planning consent for forest removal, and the Proposed Development forestry plans have been designed to accommodate these consented changes. The revised phased felling layouts redistribute felling across the plan period but do not increase the total forest area subject to felling within the NDA, which remains 890.90 ha under both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 (**Table 13.1**).

Table 13.1 – Scenario 1 and 2 Proposed Development Phased Felling Areas

Phase	Scenario 1 Felling Area (ha)	Percentage of Forest	Scenario 2 Felling Area (ha)	Percentage of Forest
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor	105.98	11.90%	105.98	11.90%
Phase One (2023–2028)	296.62	33.29%	250.75	28.15%
Phase One (Felled and Restocked)	64.63	7.25%	64.63	7.25%
Phase Two (2029–2033)	32.57	3.66%	32.57	3.66%
Phase Three (2033–2038)	77.96	8.75%	77.96	8.75%
Phase Four (2039–2043)	66.74	7.49%	68.09	7.64%
Outwith Plan Period	138.75	15.57%	130.92	14.70%
Long-Term Retention	25.85	2.90%	25.85	2.90%
Other Land (DWFHMP Core Area)	81.80	9.18%	81.80	9.18%
Other Land (DWFHMP Additional Area)	0.00	0%	52.35	5.88%
Total Felling Area	890.90	100%	890.90	100%
Other Land	419.37	—	419.37	—
Other Land (DWFHMP Hill Summit)	36.47	—	36.47	—

Phase	Scenario 1 Felling Area (ha)	Percentage of Forest	Scenario 2 Felling Area (ha)	Percentage of Forest
Southern Development Area				
Shelterbelt Woodlands (Cpt 1–3) Total = 9.13ha	0.52	5.7%	0.52	5.7%
Compartment Four (Forest to Bog Restoration)	0.00	0%	22.94	100%
Total Felling Area	0.52	100%	23.46	100%

13.7.9 As shown in **Table 13.1**, the principal difference between the two scenarios within the NDA relates to the timing and driver of habitat-related forest removal, rather than the overall scale of felling. Under Scenario 1, the DWFHMP is limited to the Core Area only and the Proposed Development therefore implements its own HMEP ('Forest to Bog Option 1') within Phase One, resulting in an increase in Phase One felling area relative to Scenario 2. Under Scenario 2, the DWFHMP includes both the Core and Additional Areas, with forest removal within the Additional Area delivered by Dungavel Wind Farm. This reduces the extent of Phase One felling required by the Proposed Development, with land instead classified as permanent "Other Land" for habitat enhancement. The implications of this redistribution are reflected in the comparative felling areas presented in **Tables 13.4.1** and **13.4.2**, and in the associated timber production profiles summarised in **Tables 13.5.1** and **13.5.2**. In both scenarios, these changes represent a re-phasing of felling activity rather than an increase in overall forest removal within the NDA.

13.7.10 Compartment Four of the SDA does not form part of the productive commercial forest estate and is proposed for conversion to peatland habitat as additional biodiversity mitigation/enhancement under Scenario 2. Its inclusion does not represent additional woodland loss attributable to the Proposed Development. The compartment is located on deep peat and site-specific assessment, including ESC modelling informed by field survey data, predicts second-rotation SS Yield Classes predominantly below YC6, confirming that the area is marginal for sustainable commercial forestry.

13.7.11 In accordance with the SGPCWR (FCS, 2009) and the guidance set out in Deciding Future Management for Afforested Deep Peatland (FCS, 2015), Compartment Four is appropriately treated as a single peatland restoration management unit. As illustrated in Table One of that guidance, where less than 20% of a compartment is suitable for peatland edge woodland and the rest is suitable for peat restoration, the preferred management approach is whole-site restoration rather than partial restocking of small, more productive areas. Attempting to restock isolated patches of higher-yielding crop would be contrary to best practice, as it would introduce ongoing seed sources and edge effects that would undermine peatland hydrological integrity and inhibit successful habitat restoration.

13.7.12 The proposed Forest to Bog restoration therefore aligns with national forestry and peatland policy by prioritising long-term peatland recovery, carbon sequestration, and biodiversity enhancement over continued marginal forestry production. On this basis, the proposal represents a net environmental benefit, rather than woodland loss, and no significant adverse effects are anticipated within the SDA as a result of its inclusion.

Forestry and Land Use

13.7.13 Across both scenarios, the forestry proposals seek to minimise forest removal required for infrastructure (See **SEI Figure 13.3a**, **13.3b**, **13.4a** and **13.4b**), align with the Baseline Forest Plans (see **SEI Figures 13.1a**, **13.1b**, **13.2a** and **13.2b**), and maintain windfirm boundaries where practicable. The redistribution of felling between phases reflects the integration of consented habitat management areas rather than a fundamental change in forest management objectives.

13.7.14 The revised restructuring and restocking proposals maintain compliance with the UK Forestry

Standard, including species diversity (**Table 13.8.1** and **13.8.2**), long-term retention, and sustainable forest management principles. Areas converted to "Other Land" under the DWFHMP and Forest to Bog restoration proposals represent a permanent change in land use for biodiversity and peatland restoration purposes and are considered beneficial in environmental terms.

Summary of Potential Social Effects

13.7.15 The potential social effects of the Proposed Development forestry proposals are assessed as follows:

- Archaeology and Cultural Heritage – No significant effects predicted. All known features remain protected, and Compartment Four contains no heritage designations.
- Landscape and Visual Effects – No change to the EIA Report conclusions. Amendments to felling phases are not visible from key viewpoints and do not alter the previously assessed landscape effects.
- Forestry and Land Use – Minor changes in the timing and distribution of felling phases, with no increase in total forest removal (other than DWFHMP consented areas) and a net increase in habitat enhancement under Scenario 2.

13.7.16 Overall, taking account of the updated baseline and the revised forestry proposals, the Proposed Development is assessed as giving rise to no significant adverse effects in EIA terms. Where differences arise relative to the EIA Report, these relate to consented habitat management as part of the DWFHMP, and additional peatland restoration, and are considered neutral to beneficial in environmental and social terms.

Economics

Economic Impact

13.7.17 The economic effects of the Proposed Development were assessed in the EIA Report based on a defined forestry baseline and were found to be acceptable. Since publication of the EIA Report, the baseline has been updated to reflect consented forest removal associated with delivery of the DWFHMP. This land-use change from commercial forestry to open habitat was determined and assessed as part of the Dungavel Wind Farm consent process and does not represent a new or additional decision arising from the Proposed Development.

13.7.18 Under both scenarios, areas of forest are removed for habitat enhancement purposes independently of the Proposed Development. As a result, there is no additional loss of productive forestry attributable to the Proposed Development beyond that already assessed in the EIA Report. The reduction in timber availability associated with the DWFHMP reflects a long-established land-use change, agreed more than a decade ago, and is therefore appropriately treated as baseline rather than impact.

13.7.19 The economic conclusions set out in the EIA Report in relation to the Proposed Development remain valid. While long-term timber income is reduced because of early felling of Phase Three and Phase Four crops relative to maximum Mean Annual Increment (MAI), this effect continues to be offset by annual revenue from renewable energy generation. In addition, the upgraded forest track infrastructure delivered as part of the Proposed Development will reduce long-term forest management and harvesting costs.

13.7.20 Restocking following Phase One felling will continue to introduce improved planting stock with enhanced genetics, resulting in estimated growth rate increases of approximately 20–25% relative to the original baseline. This accelerated growth will partially offset the permanent loss of productive conifer woodland associated with infrastructure development. Off-site compensatory planting will ensure there is no net loss of woodland area at the national scale.

13.7.21 Where Forest to Bog habitat reinstatement is required as biodiversity mitigation/enhancement under the updated baseline scenarios, this will principally involve removal of low-yield conifer crops. These crops are typically Yield Class 6-8 and are not considered commercially viable; their removal therefore has a **negligible** effect on the productive capacity and economic performance of the forest estate.

Summary of Potential Economic Effects

13.7.22 Taking account of the updated baseline, the Proposed Development continues to result in a **moderate** beneficial effect on economic factors, **significant** in EIA terms. The consented DWFHMP-related forest removal does not give rise to additional economic loss attributable to the Proposed Development, as the associated land-use change was previously agreed and is treated as baseline. Renewable energy income, improved forest infrastructure, enhanced restocking performance, and off-site compensatory planting collectively ensure that the economic sustainability of both the forest estate and the wider forestry sector is maintained.

Environmental

Environmental Considerations

13.7.23 The Proposed Development results in both the permanent removal of woodland associated with the delivery of the HMEP (see **SEI Figure 13.4b** and **13.6a**) and a reconfiguration of felling phasing within the remaining productive forest estate (see **SEI Figure 13.3a** and **13.3b**). The inclusion of the DWFHMP Core Area, and the Additional Area under Scenario 2, represents a planned and policy-led change in land use from productive forestry to permanent open habitat and peatland restoration. These changes reflect approved habitat management objectives rather than an unanticipated increase in woodland loss arising from the Proposed Development.

13.7.24 Within the retained forest estate, felling is front-loaded within Phase One and the Proposed Development Felling Corridor to facilitate construction and the delivery of habitat management measures. This is balanced by a corresponding reduction in felling extent in later phases. Potential effects on habitat connectivity, soils, hydrology and landscape structure are managed through phased felling, immediate restocking of productive areas, and the retention of substantial woodland areas across Phases Two to Four, land Outwith Plan Period, and designated Long-Term Retention areas. This approach maintains continuity of forest cover at the landscape scale.

13.7.25 To account for uncertainty in the timing and extent of DWFHMP delivery, two assessment scenarios have been considered as agreed with NatureScot. In both cases, the gross restocking tree-free footprint within the NDA remains constant at 61.62 ha. However, the internal composition of woodland and open habitat within this footprint varies depending on whether only the DWFHMP Core Area (Scenario 1) or both the Core and Additional Areas (Scenario 2) are implemented.

Table 13.2 – Scenario 1 and 2 Intersection of Baseline Restructuring Species and Restocking Tree Free Buffer.

Northern Development Area		
Tree Species	**Scenario 1 Area (Gross ha)**	**Scenario 2 Area (Gross ha)**
Native broadleaves	1.34	1.34
Native broadleaves / Open ground (50/50)	4.41	0.02
Norway spruce (*Picea abies)*	0.68	0.68
Open ground	14.07	11.96
DWFHMP Core Area	0.26	0.26
DWFHMP Additional Area	0	8.80
Pacific silver fir (*Abies amabilis)*	1.49	1.49
Sitka spruce	22.50	22.50
Sitka spruce/Lodgepole pine	16.70	14.40
Outside LTFP	0.17	0.17
Total	**61.62**	**61.62**

13.7.26 **Table 13.2** illustrates the intersection between baseline restructuring species and the restocking tree-free buffer under both scenarios. Scenario 1 is characterised by a greater proportion of commercial conifer species, including Sitka spruce and Sitka spruce / Lodgepole pine mixtures, whereas Scenario 2 shows an increased extent of land reclassified as permanent open habitat associated with the DWFHMP Additional Area. Importantly, the overall scale of woodland affected does not change between scenarios; the difference lies solely in the distribution of land-use types within the footprint.

Table 13.3 – Scenario 1 and 2 Baseline Current Species

Southern Development Area			
Compartment	**Tree Species**	**Scenario 1 Area (Gross ha)**	**Scenario 2 Area (Gross ha)**
1	Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris)* /NBL mixed woodland	3.93	3.93
2	Norway spruce woodland	1.56	1.56
3	Native mixed broadleaf woodland	3.64	3.64
4a	Sitka spruce/ Lodgepole pine woodland	n/a	15.18
4b	Lodgepole pine Woodland	n/a	4.88
4c	Sitka spruce Woodland	n/a	2.88
Total		**9.13**	**32.07**

13.7.27 Within the SDA, baseline woodland composition differs between scenarios because of the inclusion of Forest to Bog peatland restoration at Compartment Four under Scenario 2. As summarised in **Table 13.3**, Scenario 1 comprises 9.13 ha of existing shelterbelt and mixed woodland, whereas Scenario 2 details 32.07 ha, including 22.94 ha in Compartment Four of low-yielding conifer plantation on deep peat identified for habitat restoration.

13.7.28 The SDA Compartment Four woodland identified for Forest to Bog restoration in Scenario 2 comprises predominantly poor-quality conifer plantation on deep peat, where continued restocking would be inconsistent with both forestry productivity objectives and peatland policy. Although this area was not included within the EIA Report baseline woodland assessment, its inclusion here reflects a planned enhancement to the environmental baseline through habitat restoration in Scenario 2 rather than a material change in the scale of forestry effects attributable to the Proposed Development.

Infrastructure and Habitat Management Interaction

13.7.29 The formation of new and upgraded forest access infrastructure will support improved forest and habitat management, including enhanced control of harvesting operations and the effective delivery of peatland restoration measures. In Scenario 1, increased Phase One felling within the NDA reflects the delivery of the 'Forest to Bog Option 1' peatland restoration (as illustrated on **SEI Technical Appendix 7.5 Figure 1**) by the Proposed Development, with felling brought forward to enable construction and habitat management. In Scenario 2, Phase One felling is reduced as additional areas are permanently removed from the productive forest estate by Dungavel Wind Farm to deliver the DWFHMP Additional Area i.e. not by the Proposed Development.

13.7.30 Although updated forest plans (See **SEI Figure 13.6a** and **13.6b**) indicate a reduction in native broadleaf restocking relative to the Baseline Forest Plan(see **SEI Figure 13.5a** and **13.5b**), this reflects the reclassification of these areas as permanent open habitat where peatland restoration objectives take precedence. In these locations, soil conditions, hydrology and peat depth would constrain successful woodland establishment, and habitat restoration represents a more appropriate and sustainable land use.

Justification for Woodland Removal without Compensatory Planting on Afforested Deep Peat

13.7.31 Ecological survey data presented in both Chapter 7 of the EIA Report and updated within **Chapter 7** of this SEI Report identifies that areas proposed for Forest to Bog restoration within the Proposed Development HMEP (NDA and SDA Compartment Four) are characterised by vegetation communities typical of blanket bog and degraded peatland. Indicator species recorded include *Calluna vulgaris*, *Eriophorum vaginatum*, *Molinia caerulea*, *Trichophorum germanicum* and a frequent to abundant cover of *Sphagnum* species. These assemblages are indicative of very poor soil nutrient regime and very wet soil moisture conditions associated with deep peat.

13.7.32 This ecological information has been used to populate the ESC model published by Forest Research, with ESC outputs for both the Proposed Development Forest to Bog restoration areas identified in the updated HMEP (within the NDA and SDA Compartment Four) appended to this SEI Report. The ESC modelling predicts second rotation productivity for Sitka spruce of Yield Class 6 or below, with similarly constrained suitability for native broadleaf species. These results confirm that the sites do not have the potential to produce good growth in second rotation and are therefore unsuitable for sustainable commercial restocking or peatland edge native woodland.

13.7.33 In accordance with the guidance Deciding Future Management Options for Afforested Deep Peatland (FCS, 2015), the ESC results trigger the decision pathway set out on Figure 5 of that guidance. Specifically, the sites do not meet the threshold for "suitable or very suitable" growth with an estimated second rotation Yield Class of 8 or above, nor do they demonstrate potential to support woodland capable of achieving greater than 20% canopy cover. As such, the assessment follows the route that directs management away from conventional or native woodland restocking and towards restoration to open peatland habitat.

13.7.34 The proposed management approach also aligns with Scenario Four in Table One of the guidance, whereby less than 20% of the site is suitable for peatland edge woodland and the remainder is suitable for peatland restoration. Under this scenario, restoration to peatland is identified as the preferred land use, and compensatory woodland planting is not required. This reflects the recognition that continued forestry on deep peat would perpetuate poor tree growth, instability, and adverse impacts on peat condition, carbon storage and hydrology.

13.7.35 Accordingly, woodland removal within the Proposed Development Forest to Bog areas set out in the updated HMEP (NDA under Scenario 1, and within the SDA Compartment Four under Scenario 2), is undertaken to facilitate peatland and habitat restoration rather than to enable development-related infrastructure. These areas comprise predominantly low-yielding conifer plantation on deep peat, where woodland establishment and restocking would be inconsistent with the UK Forestry Standard, the Scottish Government's Woodland Removal Policy, and current best practice for the management of afforested peatland.

13.7.36 On this basis, woodland removal associated with peatland restoration in these locations is not subject to compensatory planting requirements. This position is supported by ecological evidence, ESC modelling, and national policy, and represents a net environmental benefit through the restoration of functioning bog habitat, enhanced carbon sequestration, improved hydrological function and increased biodiversity resilience.

Summary of Potential Environmental Effects

13.7.37 Taking account of the updated baseline, revised felling phasing and incorporation of approved habitat management areas, the Proposed Development is assessed as giving rise to a **minor** beneficial environmental effect, **not significant** in EIA terms. While increased early-phase felling results in short-term, localised effects on habitat structure, soils and landscape character, these effects are temporary and effectively managed through phased working and retention of woodland cover across the wider forest plan.

13.7.38 The delivery of Forest to Bog restoration through the Proposed Development HMEP and/or the DWFHMP provides long-term environmental benefits in relation to peatland condition, hydrological function, biodiversity and carbon storage. The removal of non-native conifer plantation from deep peat aligns with national policy objectives for afforested peatland and climate change mitigation.

13.7.39 When considered alongside compensatory planting measures (addressed separately within the mitigation section), compliance with the UK Forestry Standard, and the integration of forestry, peatland and habitat management objectives, the Proposed Development maintains overall woodland cover while improving the ecological functioning of the forest estate. Overall environmental effects are therefore balanced, proportionate and sustainable.

Summary of Differences between the Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plans

Felling Plans

13.7.40 To assess the potential effects of the Proposed Development on forestry, a comparison has been undertaken between the Baseline Forest Plan and the Proposed Development Forest Plans for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 using consistent spatial extents and comparable statistics.

13.7.41 The differences between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 primarily relate to how the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas are treated, and which elements of the felling programme are directly attributable to the Proposed Development. Under Scenario 1, the DWFHMP Core Area is implemented by Dungavel Wind Farm and therefore does not contribute to the Proposed Development felling totals; however, its area is reported in **Table 13.4.1** for consistency and to enable a like-for-like comparison of overall forestry effects. Under Scenario 2, both the Core Area and the Additional Area are implemented by the Dungavel Wind Farm, and accordingly neither area forms part of the Proposed Development's felling area in this scenario, however the felling areas are included in **Table 13.4.2** for completeness. Scenario 2 also introduces felling within Compartment 4 (Forest to Bog) in the Southern Development Area (22.94 ha), which forms part of the Proposed Development's HMEP. Compartment 4 therefore contributes to the Proposed Development felling area only under Scenario 2, and not under Scenario 1. Across both scenarios, only the Felling Corridor and Phase One represent development-driven forestry operations, with all other felling phases forming part of routine forest management independent of the Proposed Development.

13.7.42 **Tables 13.4.1** and **13.4.2** present a comparison of the Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plans for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, split by felling phase and management area. Both the Baseline and Proposed Development scenarios include substantial areas of permanent woodland removal associated with delivery of the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas. Scenario 1, Phase One also incorporates permanent woodland removal associated with the Proposed Development's HMEP 'Forest to Bog Option 1' (see **SEI TA 7.5 Figure 1** and **SEI Figure 13.6a**). The comparison demonstrates that the Proposed Development does not materially increase the overall extent of permanent forest removal relative to the updated baseline scenarios; rather, it results in a reconfiguration of the timing, location, and phasing of felling, with increased early-phase felling and corridor clearance offset by reductions or deferrals in later phases and other management areas.

Table 13.4.1 – Scenario 1 Comparison of Baseline and Proposed Development Felling Plans

Felling Phase	Scenario 1 Baseline Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 1 Variance (ha)	Scenario 1 Change
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor (2027)	0	105.98	105.98	—
Phase One (2023 to 2028)	185.13	296.62	111.49	+60.2%
Phase One (felled and restocked)	0	64.63	64.63	—
Phase Two (2029 to 2033)	114.26	32.57	-81.69	−71.5%
Phase Three (2033 to 2038)	89.85	77.96	-11.89	−13.2%

Felling Phase	Scenario 1 Baseline Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 1 Variance (ha)	Scenario 1 Change
Phase Four (2039 to 2043)	258.75	66.74	-192.01	−74.2%
Outwith Plan Period (2048)	133.03	138.75	5.72	+4.3%
Long-Term Retention (2048)	25.85	25.85	0	0.0%
DWFHMP Core Area (2027)	82.56	81.8	-0.76	−0.9%
DWFHMP Additional Area (2027)	0	0	0	—
DWFHMP Hill Summit Other Land	36.47	36.47	0	0.0%
Other Land	421.11	419.64	-1.47	−0.3%
Total	**1,347.01**	**1,347.01**	**0.00**	**0.0%**
Southern Development Area				
Felling Corridor (Cpt 1-3)	0	0.52	0.52	—
Compartment Four (Forest to Bog)	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	0	0.52	+0.52	—

Table 13.4.2 – Scenario 2 Comparison of Baseline and Proposed Development Felling Plans

Felling Phase	Scenario 2 Baseline Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Proposed Development Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Variance (ha)	Scenario 2 Change
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor (2027)	0	105.98	105.98	—
Phase One (2023 to 2028)	185.13	250.75	65.62	+35.4%
Phase One (felled and restocked)	0	64.63	64.63	—
Phase Two (2029 to 2033)	114.26	32.57	-81.69	-71.5%
Phase Three (2033 to 2038)	74.96	77.96	3	+4.0%
Phase Four (2039 to 2043)	205.97	68.09	-137.88	-67.0%
Outwith Plan Period (2048)	133.03	130.92	-2.11	-1.6%
Long-Term Retention (2048)	25.85	25.85	0	0.0%
DWFHMP Core Area (2027)	82.56	81.8	-0.76	-0.9%
DWFHMP Additional Area (2027)	67.67	52.35	-15.32	-22.6%

Felling Phase	Scenario 2 Baseline Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Proposed Development Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Variance (ha)	Scenario 2 Change
DWFHMP Hill Summit Other Land	36.47	36.47	0	0.0%
Other Land	421.11	419.64	-1.47	-0.3%
Total	**1,347.01**	**1,347.01**	**0.00**	**0.0%**
Southern Development Area				
Felling Corridor (Cpt 1-3)	0	0.52	0.52	—
Compartment Four (Forest to Bog)	0	22.94	+22.94	—
Total	**0**	**23.46**	**+23.46**	—

Northern Development Area

13.7.43 Under both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, the most notable change relative to the Baseline Forest Plan is the introduction of a felling corridor (105.98 ha) and an increase in Phase One (2023–2028) felling as a result of the requirement to fell to wind firm boundaries (see **Figure 13.3a** and **13.3b**). In Scenario 1, Phase One felling increases by 111.49 ha (+60.2%), while in Scenario 2 the increase is 65.62 ha (+35.4%). The reason for the variance is because of Scenario 2 Additional Felling Area which reduces the size of Scenario 2 Phase 1. This front-loading of felling activity reflects the need to accommodate the Proposed Development and establish windfirm forest edges at an early stage.

13.7.44 Although Phase One felling increases substantially, this change is offset by corresponding reductions in later phases. Phase Two felling decreases by 81.69 ha (−71.5%) under both scenarios, while Phase Four shows reductions of 192.01 ha (−74.2%) in Scenario 1 and 137.88 ha (−67.0%) in Scenario 2. Phase Three shows only minor variation, increasing slightly in Scenario 2 (+4.0%) and decreasing marginally in Scenario 1 (−13.2%). Collectively, these changes demonstrate that the Proposed Development redistributes felling across the plan period rather than increasing overall felling intensity.

13.7.45 A proportion of the Scenario 1, Phase One felling includes areas at or below Yield Class 6 (see **SEI Figure 13.8a**) that are not economically viable for timber production in the second rotation. These areas are proposed for clearance to enable peatland restoration within blanket bog habitats, representing an environmental enhancement rather than a timber-led intervention.

13.7.46 The reconfiguration of felling phases also improves forest structure by increasing age-class separation and addressing existing windthrow risk. Evidence of windblow within Compartments 7 and 14 indicates that felling in these areas is already overdue under the Baseline Plan. The Proposed Development Plan therefore responds to existing forest stability issues while minimising the visual and operational perception of large-scale, single-phase clearance by distributing felling spatially across the forest.

DWFHMP and Other Woodland Areas

13.7.47 Felling within the DWFHMP Core Area remains effectively unchanged under both scenarios, with a **negligible** reduction of 0.76 ha (−0.9%) between baseline and Scenario 1 and 2 of the Proposed Development, while the DWFHMP Hill Summit and Long-Term Retention areas remain unaltered. Under Scenario 2, felling within the DWFHMP Additional Area is reduced by 15.32 ha (−22.6%) due to the land take from the Proposed Development Felling Corridor (see Figure 13.3b).

13.7.48 **Minor** reductions within areas classified as Other Land (−0.3%) are not considered material in forestry or environmental terms.

Southern Development Area

13.7.49 In the SDA, forestry-related changes are spatially limited but environmentally significant. Under both scenarios, a minor area of felling is required to facilitate the felling corridor (0.52 ha). In Scenario 2,

additional woodland removal is proposed within Compartment Four (Forest to Bog), comprising 22.94 ha of predominantly non-economic conifer plantation on deep peat. This represents a deliberate and beneficial land-use transition from productive forestry to peatland habitat, supporting delivery of the Proposed Development's HMEP in Scenario 2 The Forest to Bog intervention will deliver long-term biodiversity enhancement, peatland restoration, and carbon sequestration benefits, consistent with current forestry, climate, and peatland policy. While modest in extent relative to the NDA, this change makes a meaningful contribution to landscape-scale habitat restoration objectives and does not undermine forestry as a principal land use in the wider area.

Overall Forestry Effect

13.7.50 Across both scenarios, the comparison demonstrates that the Proposed Development does not increase the total area of forest subject to felling over the plan period. Instead, it results in a temporal and spatial reconfiguration of felling, characterised by increased early-phase activity balanced by reduced felling in later phases. This restructuring is driven by development requirements, wind firmness considerations, and habitat restoration objectives, and is consistent with sustainable forest management principles.

13.7.51 Accordingly, while short-term changes in felling patterns are notable, particularly during Phase One, the overall forestry effect is considered to represent a moderate, time-limited change rather than a long-term increase in forestry impact, with no net increase in total felling area.

Timber Harvesting and Production

13.7.52 **Tables 13.5.1** and **13.5.2** compare estimated timber production under the Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plans for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, respectively. The comparison identifies how the Proposed Development alters the timing, distribution and location of timber harvesting relative to the Baseline Forest Plan.

13.7.53 The interpretation of timber production under Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 follows the same scenario logic applied to the felling plans. Under Scenario 1, the DWFHMP Core Area is implemented by Dungavel Wind Farm and does not contribute to the Proposed Development's timber production totals. Under Scenario 2, both the Core Area and the Additional Area are implemented by the DWFHMP and accordingly do not contribute to the Proposed Development's timber production totals; their values are presented in **Table 13.5.2** for completeness and comparability. Scenario 2 also introduces timber production from Compartment 4 (Forest to Bog) in the Southern Development Area, which contributes 4,603 tonnes as a one-off output associated with peatland restoration. In both scenarios, only the Felling Corridor, Phase One, and—under Scenario 2 only—the Forest to Bog intervention represent timber volumes directly attributable to the Proposed Development, with all other felling phases forming part of routine forest management independent of the Proposed Development.

Table 13.5.1 – Scenario 1 Comparison of Timber Production between the Baseline Plan and Proposed Development Plan

Scenario 1 Felling Phase	Scenario 1 Baseline Felling Tonnage (T)	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Felling Tonnage (T)	Scenario 1 Variance (T)	Scenario 1 Change (%)
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor (2027)	0	31,178	+31,178	—
Phase One (2023–2028)	53,684	114,410	+60,726	+113.1%
Phase Two (2029–2033)	55,779	15,375	−40,404	−72.4%
Phase Three (2033–2038)	31,681	38,880	+7,199	+22.7%
Phase Four (2039–2043)	91,101	31,350	−59,751	%

Scenario 1 Felling Phase	Scenario 1 Baseline Felling Tonnage (T)	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Felling Tonnage (T)	Scenario 1 Variance (T)	Scenario 1 Change (%)
DWFHMP Core Area (2027)	25,721	25,559	−162	−0.6%
DWFHMP Additional Area (2027)	0	0	0	—
Outwith Plan Period (2048)	37,329	38,543	+1,214	+3.3%
Total NDA	**295,295**	**295,295**	**0**	**0**
Southern Development Area				
Shelterbelt woodlands (Cpt 1–3)	—	12	+12	—
Forest to Bog (Cpt 4)	—	—	0	—
Total SDA	**—**	**12**	**+12**	**—**

Table 13.5.2 – Scenario 2 Comparison of Timber Production between the Baseline Plan and Proposed Development Plan

Scenario 2 Felling Phase	Scenario 2 Baseline Felling Tonnage (T)	Scenario 2 Proposed Development Felling Tonnage (T)	Scenario 2 Variance (T)	Scenario 2 Change (%)
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor (2027)	0	31,178	+31,178	—
Phase One (2023–2028)	53,684	108,073	+54,389	+101.3%
Phase Two (2029–2033)	55,779	15,375	−40,404	−72.4%
Phase Three (2033–2038)	29,087	38,880	+9,793	+33.7%
Phase Four (2039–2043)	84,105	31,536	−52,570	−62.5%
DWFHMP Core Area (2027)	25,721	25,559	−162	−0.6%
DWFHMP Additional Area (2027)	9,590	7,168	−2,422	−25.3%
Outwith Plan Period (2048)	37,329	37,526	+197	+0.53%
Total NDA	**295,295**	**295,295**	**0**	**0**
Southern Development Area				
Shelterbelt woodlands (Cpt 1–3)	—	12	+12	—
Compartment 4 (Forest to Bog)	—	4,603	+4,603	—
Total SDA	**—**	**4,615**	**+4,615**	**—**

13.7.54 Timber production estimates are derived from forest sub-compartment data, including yield class information (**SEI Figures 13.8a** and **13.8b**) provided by the forest manager and ground-truthed on

site. Volume projections were generated using Forest Research's Forest Yield software (version 1.0) and converted to tonnes using a standard 1.25 conversion factor. This approach provides a consistent basis for comparing phased harvesting under the baseline and Proposed Development scenarios. A worst case scenario has been assumed when calculating timber quantities with the final year of the fell phase assumed. All other fell years are as detailed in **Table 13.5.1** and **13.5.2** under Fell Phase.

13.7.55 Across both scenarios, the Proposed Development does not alter the total forecast volume of timber harvested across the forest when all felling categories are considered, including Outwith Plan Period areas. The effect is instead characterised by a rephasing of harvesting, with increased early-phase felling to facilitate infrastructure delivery, windthrow risk management, and habitat restoration.

13.7.56 In Scenario 1, timber production within the NDA is front-loaded through concurrent felling of the felling corridor and Phase One areas during 2023–2028. The felling corridor contributes 31,178 tonnes, while Phase One harvesting increases by 60,726 tonnes (+113.1%) relative to the baseline plan. These increases are offset by substantial reductions in Phase Two (−40,404 tonnes; −72.5%) and Phase Four (−59,751 tonnes; −65.6%), confirming that the change represents a redistribution of harvesting within the plan period rather than an increase in overall yield.

13.7.57 Scenario 2 exhibits a similar pattern of accelerated early-phase harvesting. Phase One production increases by 54,389 tonnes (+101.3%), while the felling corridor contributes 31,178 tonnes. Reduced outputs from the DWFHMP Additional Area (−2,422 tonnes; −25.3%) reflect its removal from the productive forest estate to enable habitat management objectives. Reductions in Phase Two and Phase Four confirm that this scenario also represents a reallocation of harvesting effort rather than increased timber extraction.

13.7.58 Baseline timber production within the SDA is negligible (see **Table 13.5.1** and **13.5.2**) with no timber felling planned in the absence of the Proposed Development. Under Scenario 2, approximately 4,603 tonnes of timber are generated from Compartment Four as part of a one-off Forest to Bog restoration intervention. This felling is associated with habitat restoration and does not represent ongoing commercial forestry.

13.7.59 Overall, the Proposed Development results in a temporal redistribution of timber harvesting, with early-phase acceleration followed by reduced activity in later phases and Outwith Plan Period areas. This reflects both infrastructure requirements and the permanent removal of low-yield conifer crops on deep peat, where continued forestry would be inconsistent with current policy objectives.

Timber Haulage

Table 13.6.1 – Scenario 1 Comparison of Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plan Timber Haulage

Scenario 1 Felling Phase	Scenario 1 Baseline Felling No. of 25 T Timber Lorries	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Felling No. of 25 T Timber Lorries	Scenario 1 Variance (25 T Loads)	Scenario 1 Change (%)
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor	0	1,247	+1,247	—
Phase One	2,147	4,576	+2,429	+113.1%
Phase Two	2,231	615	−1,616	−72.4%
Phase Three	1,267	1,555	+288	+22.7%
Phase Four	3,644	1,254	−2,390	−65.6%
DWFHMP Core Area	1,029	1,022	−7	−0.7%
Outwith Plan Period	1,493	1,542	+49	+3.3%

Scenario 1 Felling Phase	Scenario 1 Baseline Felling No. of 25 T Timber Lorries	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Felling No. of 25 T Timber Lorries	Scenario 1 Variance (25 T Loads)	Scenario 1 Change (%)
Southern Development Area				
Shelterbelt Woodlands (Cpt 1-3)	0	1	+1	—
Total	**11,811**	**11,812**	**+1**	**0.01%**

Table 13.6.2 – Scenario 2 Comparison of Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plan Timber Haulage

Scenario 2 Felling Phase	Scenario 2 Baseline Felling No. of 25 T Timber Lorries	Scenario 2 Proposed Development Felling No. of 25 T Timber Lorries	Scenario 2 Variance (25 T Loads)	Scenario 2 Change (%)
Northern Development Area				
Felling Corridor	0	1,247	+1,247	—
Phase One	2,147	4,323	+2,176	+101.4%
Phase Two	2,231	615	−1,616	−72.4%
Phase Three	1,163	1,555	+392	+33.7%
Phase Four	3,364	1,261	−2,103	-62.5%
DWFHMP Core Area	1,029	1,022	−7	−0.68%
DWFHMP Additional Area	384	287	−97	−25.26%
Outwith Plan Period	1,493	1,501	+8	+0.54%
Southern Development Area				
Shelterbelt Woodlands (Cpt 1-3)	0	1	+1	—
Compartment Four (Forest to Bog)	0	184	+184	—
Total	**11,811**	**11,996**	**+185**	**+1.6%**

13.7.60 The timber haulage assessment, based on the comparative felling figures presented in **Tables 13.6.1** (Scenario 1) and **13.6.2** (Scenario 2), demonstrates that the Proposed Development primarily results in a rephasing of timber extraction within the forest plan period rather than a material increase in overall haulage demand. The greatest timber movements occur in the early years of the plan, driven by the Felling Corridor and Phase One harvesting required to facilitate wind farm construction, while haulage in later phases correspondingly decreases as operations are brought forward.

13.7.61 Only the Felling Corridor, Phase One, Compartment Four Forest to Bog and Shelterbelt Woodlands (Compartment 1-3) contribute haulage that is directly attributable to the Proposed Development, as these works are required to enable access, create working areas, and facilitate turbine delivery and infrastructure construction. All other forest plan phases—Phase Two, Phase Three, Phase Four, and areas Outwith the Plan Period—are part of routine forest management and do not count toward

the Proposed Development's haulage requirement, although their timing is influenced by project-driven rephasing.

13.7.62 The treatment of the DWFHMP areas differs between the two scenarios and explains the variations observed between **Tables 13.6.1** and **13.6.2**:

Scenario 1:

- The DWFHMP Core Area forms part of the DWFHMP and therefore does not contribute to the Proposed Development's haulage totals.
- The DWFHMP Additional Area, however, is included within the Proposed Development's Phase 1 plan in this scenario, and the associated haulage is counted within Phase 1.

Scenario 2:

- Both the DWFHMP Core Area and the DWFHMP Additional Area are assumed to be felled, extracted and hauled as part of DWFHMP implementation, and therefore neither area contributes to the Proposed Development's haulage totals.
- Instead, Scenario 2 introduces haulage from Compartment Four (Forest to Bog) in the Southern Development Area. This generates 184 lorry trips attributed to the Proposed Development, as shown in **Table 13.6.2**, and represents ecological restoration rather than commercial harvesting.

13.7.63 Under Scenario 1, the felling corridor generates 1,247 additional lorry trips, reflecting the clearance required to construct the wind farm access and enable Phase One harvesting. Phase One itself shows the greatest uplift relative to baseline conditions (+2,429 trips; +113.1%). These increases are offset by substantial reductions in Phases Two and Four (–1,616 trips and –2,390 trips respectively), as harvesting is rephased to earlier years. Changes to the DWFHMP Core Area are negligible, and only a single lorry movement is associated with shelterbelt woodland clearance in the Southern Development Area. Overall, Scenario 1 results in a near-neutral net change of +1 lorry trip, confirming a redistribution of haulage activity rather than an increase.

13.7.64 Under Scenario 2, similar early-period increases occur with the felling corridor (+1,247 trips) and Phase One (+2,176 trips; +101.4%). As both the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas are assumed to be hauled by Dungavel Wind Farm in this scenario, their haulage is removed from the Proposed Development totals, contributing to the reduction of 97 trips in **Table 13.6.2**. As in Scenario 1, later phases show substantial reductions due to rephasing, including –1,616 trips in Phase Two and –2,103 trips in Phase Four. The key difference in Scenario 2 is the inclusion of 184 lorry trips from Compartment 4 (Forest to Bog), resulting in a modest overall increase of +185 trips (+1.6%), driven solely by one-off peatland restoration works.

13.7.65 Across both scenarios, the analysis demonstrates that the Proposed Development causes timber extraction to be front-loaded during the early years of the forest plan period (2023–2028), after which haulage demand declines significantly as the felling corridor and Phase One are completed. Total haulage over the full forest lifecycle remains broadly consistent with the updated baseline. Nearly all timber will be transported through the existing forestry track or newly constructed windfarm network to standard timber markets, with no sustained long-term increase in pressure on the local road network.

Replanting Plans

13.7.66 **Tables 13.7.1** and **13.7.2** summarise the differences in replanting and land-use allocation between the Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plans for Scenarios 1 and 2 respectively. In both scenarios, the total forest plan area remains unchanged at 1,347 ha, with differences reflecting a reallocation of areas between commercial replanting, open ground, and 'Other Land' categories to accommodate the Proposed Development, habitat management measures, and peatland restoration objectives.

Table 13.7.1 – Scenario 1 Comparison of Baseline and Proposed Development Replanting Plans

Species	Scenario 1 Baseline Forest Plan (Grossha)	Scenario 1 Proposed Development Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 1 Variance (ha)	Scenario 1 Change (%)
Northern Development Area				
Sitka spruce	316.63	282.75	−33.88	−10.7%
Sitka spruce / Lodgepole pine	174.41	145.21	−29.20	−16.7%
Norway spruce	50.00	63.30	+13.30	+26.6%
Hybrid larch (*Larix x marschlinsii)*	0.00	0.00	0.00	—
Lodgepole pine	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.0%
Pacific silver fir	26.86	25.86	−1.00	−3.7%
Scots pine	1.33	1.33	0.00	0.0%
Mixed broadleaves	1.56	1.56	0.00	0.0%
Native broadleaves	39.01	37.07	−1.94	−5.0%
Native broadleaves / OG	30.38	4.94	−25.44	−83.8%
Open ground	166.27	133.12	−33.15	−19.9%
Unplanted	0.36	2.04	+1.68	+466.7%
Other Land associated with the Restocking Tree Free Area	0.00	55.89	+55.89	—
Other Land (DWFHMP Core Area)	82.56	82.56	0.00	0.0%
Other Land -(Proposed Development HMEP area)	0.00	53.72	+53.72	—
Other Land (DWFHMP Cpt 13 Hill summit)	36.47	36.47	0.00	0.0%
Other Land (DWFHMP)	421.11	421.11	0.00	0.0%
Total	**1,347.01**	**1,347.01**	**0.00**	**0.0%**

Table 13.7.2 – Scenario 2 Comparison of Baseline and Proposed Development Replanting Plans

Species	Scenario 2 Baseline Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Proposed Development Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Variance (ha)	Scenario 2 Change (%)
Northern Development Area				
Sitka spruce	316.63	279.93	-36.7	-11.59
Sitka spruce / Lodgepole pine	158.29	143.36	-14.93	-9.42
Norway spruce	50	63.3	13.3	26.6
Hybrid larch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Lodgepole pine	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.0%

Species	Scenario 2 Baseline Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Proposed Development Forest Plan (Gross ha)	Scenario 2 Variance (ha)	Scenario 2 Change (%)
Pacific silver fir	26.86	25.86	-1	-3.72
Scots pine	1.33	1.33	0.00	0.0%
Mixed broadleaves	1.56	1.56	0.00	0.0%
Native broadleaves	39.01	37.07	-1.94	-4.97
Native broadleaves / OG	3.74	3.72	-0.02	-0.53
Open ground	141.36	128.69	-12.67	-8.96
Unplanted	0.36	1.93	1.57	436.11
Other Land associated with the Restocking Tree Free Area	0.00	52.39	52.39	100
Other Land (DWFHMP Core Area)	82.56	82.56	0.00	0.0%
Other Land (DWFHMP Additional area)	67.67	67.67	0.00	0.0%
Other Land (Proposed Development HMEP Area)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
Other Land (Cpt 13 Hill summit)	36.47	36.47	0.0	0.0%
Other Land (DWFHMP)	421.11	421.11	0.0	0.0%
Total	**1347.01**	**1347.01**	**0.0**	**0.0%**

13.7.67 Across both scenarios, the Proposed Development results in a reduction in the area of productive conifer replanting within the NDA, most notably for Sitka spruce and Sitka spruce/Lodgepole pine mixtures. In Scenario 1, Sitka spruce replanting is reduced by 33.88 ha (−10.7%), while Sitka spruce/Lodgepole pine decreases by 29.20 ha (−16.7%). Comparable reductions occur in Scenario 2, reflecting consistent restructuring outcomes. These reductions are primarily attributable to the reclassification of land to permanent open habitat or Other Land, rather than changes in forest productivity assumptions.

13.7.68 In contrast, the area of Norway spruce increases by 13.30 ha (+26.6%) in both scenarios, indicating a targeted shift toward alternative conifer species to meet forest resilience objectives. Pacific silver fir shows a small reduction of approximately 1 ha (−3.7%), while Scots pine, Lodgepole pine, Hybrid larch, and mixed broadleaves remain unchanged across both scenarios.

13.7.69 Areas identified as Native Broadleaves and Native Broadleaves/Open Ground show reductions under the Proposed Development, most notably in Scenario 1 where Native Broadleaves/Open Ground decreases by 25.44 ha (−83.8%). This change reflects the conversion of previously restocked woodland areas to permanent open habitat, particularly where peatland restoration or habitat management objectives take precedence. Importantly, this represents a land-use change rather than a loss of native woodland value, as these areas are no longer proposed for tree establishment.

13.7.70 Open ground within the replanted forest matrix decreases slightly within the formal replanting categories (e.g. −33.15 ha in Scenario 1), but this is more than offset by the introduction of substantial areas of 'Other Land', including:

- Restocking Tree Free Areas (55.89 ha in Scenario 1; 52.39 ha in Scenario 2);
- Proposed Development HMEP areas (53.72 ha in Scenario 1) and
- DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas, which remain unchanged between the Baseline and

Proposed Development plans.

13.7.71 Taken together, these changes indicate a net increase in permanent open and non-forested habitat (Other Land), consistent with DWFHMP Core and Additional areas, peatland restoration, habitat enhancement, and infrastructure delivery requirements.

13.7.72 No replanting is proposed within the SDA, as forestry works in this area are limited to woodland removal to facilitate the Proposed Development and habitat restoration, including Forest to Bog conversion in Scenario 2. As such, replanting comparisons are appropriately confined to the NDA.

13.7.73 **Tables 13.8.1** and **13.8.2** demonstrate that both the Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plans for the NDA comply with the UKFS species diversity guidelines in both scenarios. Although the absolute area of some species changes, the relative proportions within the productive forest area remain balanced, and no single species exceeds recommended thresholds.

Table 13.8.1 – Scenario 1 Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plan Compliance with UKFS Species Diversity Guidelines.

Species	Scenario 1 Year 20 Baseline Area (ha)	Scenario 1 Year 20 Baseline (%)	Scenario 1 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (ha)	Scenario 1 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (%)	Scenario 1 Change
Northern Development Area					
Sitka spruce	316.63	39%	282.75	41%	+2%
Sitka spruce / Lodgepole pine	174.41	22%	145.21	21%	-1%
Norway spruce	50.00	6%	63.30	9%	+3%
Hybrid larch	0.00	0.0%	0.00	0.0%	0%
Lodgepole pine	0.06	0.0%	0.06	0.0%	0%
Pacific silver fir	26.86	3%	25.86	4%	+1%
Scots pine	1.33	0.0%	1.33	0.0%	0%
Mixed broadleaves	1.56	0.0%	1.56	0.0%	0%
Native broadleaves	39.01	5%	37.07	5%	0%
Native broadleaves / Open ground	30.38	4%	4.94	1%	-3%
Open ground	166.27	21%	133.12	19%	-2%
Unplanted	0.36	0.0%	2.04	0.0%	0%
Net Area Total	**806.87**	**100%**	**697.24**	**100%**	**0%**
Other Land associated with the Restocking Tree Free Area	0.00	—	55.89	—	—
Other Land (DWFHMP Core Area)	82.56	—	82.56	—	—
Other Land (Proposed Development	0.00	—	53.72	—	—

Species	Scenario 1 Year 20 Baseline Area (ha)	Scenario 1 Year 20 Baseline (%)	Scenario 1 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (ha)	Scenario 1 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (%)	Scenario 1 Change
HMEP area)					
Other Land (DWFHMP Cpt 13 Hill summit)	36.47	—	36.47	—	—
Other Land (DWFHMP)	421.11	—	421.11	—	—
Gross Area Total	**1,347.01**	**—**	**1,347.01**	**—**	**—**

Table 13.8.2 – Scenario 2 Baseline and Proposed Development Forest Plan Compliance with UKFS Species Diversity Guidelines.

Species	Scenario 2 Year 20 Baseline Area (ha)	Scenario 2 Year 20 Baseline (%)	Scenario 2 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (ha)	Scenario 2 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (%)	Scenario 2 Change
Northern Development Area					
Sitka spruce	316.63	39%	279.93	40%	+1%
Sitka spruce / Lodgepole pine	158.29	20%	143.36	21%	+1%
Norway spruce	50.00	6%	63.30	9%	+3%
Hybrid larch	0.00	0.0%	0.00	0.0%	0%
Lodgepole pine	0.06	0.0%	0.06	0.0%	0%
Pacific silver fir	26.86	3%	25.86	4%	+1%
Scots pine	1.33	0.0%	1.33	0.0%	0%
Mixed broadleaves	1.56	0.0%	1.56	0.0%	0%
Native broadleaves	39.01	5%	37.07	5%	0%
Native broadleaves / Open ground	3.74	1%	3.72	1%	0%
Open ground	141.36	18%	128.69	18%	0%
Unplanted	0.36	0.0%	1.93	0.0%	0%
Net Area Total	**739.2**	**100%**	**686.81**	**100%**	**0%**
Other Land associated - Restocking Tree Free Area	0.00	—	52.39	—	—
Other Land (DWFHMP Core Area)	82.56	—	82.56	—	—
Other Land (DWFHMP Additional Area)	67.67	—	67.67	—	—

Species	Scenario 2 Year 20 Baseline Area (ha)	Scenario 2 Year 20 Baseline (%)	Scenario 2 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (ha)	Scenario 2 Year 20 Proposed Development Forest Plan (%)	Scenario 2 Change
Other Land (Proposed Development HMEP Area)	0.00	—	0.00	—	—
Other Land (Cpt 13 Hill Summit)	36.47	—	36.47	—	—
Other Land (DWFHMP)	421.11	—	421.11	—	—
Gross Area Total	**1,347.01**	**—**	**1,347.01**	**—**	**—**

13.7.74 Under the Proposed Development Forest Plans, Sitka spruce remains the dominant commercial species. For the purposes of UKFS species diversity assessment, areas planted as Sitka spruce / Lodgepole pine (SS/LP) self-thinning mixtures are appropriately considered as contributing to the Sitka spruce species total, as lodgepole pine functions as a temporary nurse and is not intended to form a long-term component of the crop. When assessed on this basis, Sitka spruce (including SS/LP mixtures) at 62% remains below the UKFS guideline threshold of 65% for a single species across the forest management unit. Norway spruce increases to approximately 9%, while Pacific silver fir contributes around 4%, supporting enhanced conifer diversity, improved structural resilience, and long-term forest sustainability.

13.7.75 The Proposed Development also exceeds UKFS requirements for biodiversity and structural diversity. Open ground and land managed primarily for environmental objectives represent approximately 18–19% of the forest plan area, exceeding the 10% guideline. Native broadleaves remain at approximately 5–6%, continuing to meet the UKFS minimum requirement despite reductions associated with peatland restoration. Overall, the Proposed Development Forest Plans demonstrate continued compliance with UKFS diversity standards, with changes reflecting a strategic shift toward habitat restoration and forest restructuring rather than a reduction in environmental performance.

Construction

13.7.76 Following planning consent, a Forest Plan amendment (the Proposed Development Forest Plan) reflecting either scenario 1 or Scenario 2 of the Proposed Development phased felling and restructuring plans (see **SEI Figures 13.3a**, **13.3b**, **13.6a** and **13.6b** will be submitted to SF for approval. Whether it is Scenario 1 or Scenario 2 will depend on the outcome of the DWFHMP.

13.7.77 In contrast to the Baseline Forest Plan, the Proposed Development introduces a defined felling corridor and brings forward a greater proportion of Phase One felling, which will be implemented in advance of and concurrently with early construction works. This rephasing represents a change in timing rather than a departure from standard forestry practice. Felling will continue to be undertaken in accordance with approved forest plans and relevant best practice, including the following measures:

- Phased felling coupes will be identified through the Forest Plan amendment and approved by SF prior to felling.
- Coupes will be marketed in advance and harvested using conventional wheeled harvesting and forwarding machinery, with low ground pressure tracked machinery deployed where required to access soft ground within HMEP and peatland restoration areas.
- In the NDA, felled timber will be cut to product-specific lengths, forwarded to the forest track network and transported to conventional timber markets, with the objective of maximising recovery of merchantable material.
- Timber haulage will primarily utilise the existing forest track network, supplemented where

necessary by tracks delivered as part of the Proposed Development. Localised upgrades to internal forest tracks will be undertaken where required to meet operational standards. A track will be constructed at Compartment Four of the SDA linking to the unclassified public road to aid the removal of timber to market.

- In the SDA, a proportion of timber will be processed and stacked at the woodland edge, with subsequent extraction by the landowner for on-site biomass use.
- Where site conditions allow, brash and stumps arising from felling and infrastructure works will be recovered for use in biomass markets, except where material is required for floating track construction or ground protection.

13.7.78 Compared with the Baseline Forest Plan, the Proposed Development results in a front-loaded construction-related forestry programme, combining felling associated with the corridor, Phase One restructuring, and habitat management areas within a shorter timeframe. While this alters the sequencing of forestry operations, it remains consistent with UKFS principles for windfirm restructuring, environmental protection, and long-term sustainable forest management.

13.7.79 The Proposed Development Forest Plan retains substantial areas of woodland outside the corridor and habitat restoration areas, ensuring continuity of forest cover and ecological function. Felling design and retention measures continue to minimise fragmentation and maintain landscape structure, with no new operational techniques introduced beyond those already anticipated under the Baseline Plan.

Operation

13.7.80 During the operational phase, the Proposed Development will temporarily increase demand for forestry-related activities, particularly harvesting, haulage, restocking preparation, and planting—relative to the Baseline Plan, due to the rephasing of works into earlier periods. This represents a redistribution of activity rather than an overall increase in long-term forestry output. The forestry sector's established use of mobile contract labour and existing supply chains is expected to accommodate these short-term changes without material effects on forestry operations at a regional level.

Decommissioning

13.7.81 Decommissioning of the Proposed Development will not give rise to additional forestry felling or restocking requirements beyond those already accounted for within the amended Forest Plan. No long-term effects on forestry resources, management objectives, or woodland structure are anticipated relative to the Baseline Forest Plan.

13.8 Mitigation

Forest Residue Management Plan (FRMP)

13.8.1 Mitigation in relation to forest residues will continue to be provided through the FRMP (see **SEI Figure 13.11a** and **13.11b**), prepared in accordance with the Management of Forestry Waste (WST-G-027, Version 3, SEPA, 2017) and the Use of Trees Cleared to Facilitate Development on Afforested Land – Joint Position Statement and Guidance (SNH, SEPA, FCS, 2014). These mitigation measures apply during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

13.8.2 The FRMP addresses the management of unmerchantable timber, brash, and stumps arising from tree harvesting undertaken to facilitate development in areas where standard forestry replanting will not occur. This includes forest clearance associated with infrastructure, access, safety buffers, and temporary construction areas, as previously assessed in the EIA Report.

13.8.3 Since publication of the EIA Report, the environmental baseline has been updated to reflect consented forest removal associated with delivery of the DWFHMP. For the purposes of this SEI Report, it is assumed that DWFHMP works will be implemented in 2027, consistent with advice provided by NatureScot. However, delivery of the DWFHMP is not guaranteed and remains outside the control of the Proposed Development. Accordingly, forest residue management continues to be

assessed on a worst-case basis, assuming no overlap or coordination with third-party HMP felling operations.

Areas Subject to FRMP Mitigation

13.8.4 For the Proposed Development, the FRMP applies to previously afforested areas where replanting will not take place, including the following:

Northern Development Area

13.8.5 Details of how the compensatory area was calculated:

- 60 m radii tree-free bat protection buffers around 17 turbines (230 m tip height) (brash only).
- 100 m radius tree-free bat protection buffer around one turbine (200 m tip height) (brash only).
- 10 m tree-free areas associated with turbine hardstandings and substation infrastructure (brash and stumps).
- 30 m wide tree-free track corridors (brash only).
- 10 m wide track construction corridor within the 30 m tree-free corridor (brash and stumps).
- 10 m offsets around temporary construction compounds, borrow pits, and control buildings (brash and stumps).

Southern Development Area

- 10 m tree-free standoff from infrastructure (brash only).
- 20 m wide tree-free track corridors (brash and stumps).

Residue Management Approach

13.8.6 The FRMP primarily focuses on the NDA, where most of the unmerchantable timber, brash, and stumps will be generated and managed through removal or treatment in accordance with established guidance. In the SDA, the volume of residues associated with infrastructure works remains limited due to the small land area affected and the relatively small stature of trees to be removed. However, any residue arisings are destined for the landowner's biomass boiler.

13.8.7 Compartment Four at the SDA did not form part of the EIA Report assessment baseline, however, has been included within the scope of this SEI Report as a potential location for biodiversity mitigation/enhancement in the form of Forest to Bog habitat reinstatement, should the Scenario 2 baseline be implemented.

13.8.8 Within Compartment Four, brash and stumps will be retained in situ to support peatland restoration objectives. Ground conditions are characterised by wet, peat-dominated soils, such that recovery of residues would be impractical and would increase the risk of rutting, compaction, and erosion. Removal of brash and stumps in these conditions would be counterproductive to peat stability, hydrological recovery, and carbon sequestration objectives. Retention of residues will contribute to surface stabilisation and restoration of bog habitat in line with peatland restoration best practice.

Ground Conditions

13.8.9 A substantial proportion of the Proposed Development is in elevated and exposed areas characterised by gley, peaty gley, and peat-dominated soils. These ground conditions are associated with poor tree growth and increased sensitivity to disturbance from forestry operations.

13.8.10 To mitigate the risk of soil compaction, rutting, and erosion during forestry operations, appropriate ground protection measures will be employed, including the use of brash mats where required. Further details on ground conditions and peat distribution are provided in **Chapter 8** of the EIA Report.

Access

13.8.11 In the NDA, two existing forestry access points from the B743 will be upgraded and used for forestry and construction purposes. In the SDA, new access tracks will connect to the B743 facilitating

forestry operations and Proposed Development activities. These access arrangements remain unchanged from those assessed in the EIA Report. In the SDA a new track linking to the unclassified public road will service timber haulage from Compartment Four (see **SEI Figure 13.4b**).

Timber Markets

13.8.12 At the time of preparation of the EIA Report, timber markets were strong, particularly for sawlogs, small roundwood and forest residues. Market conditions have since softened, with timber prices reducing by approximately 20%. Notwithstanding this change, the Proposed Development remains well located relative to timber markets in the south of Scotland, allowing harvested timber to be marketed efficiently.

13.8.13 Timber arising from the SDA may continue to be utilised on-site for the landowner's biomass boiler, where suitable. The updated baseline and potential future implementation of HMP works do not alter the applicability or effectiveness of the FRMP, which remains an appropriate and proportionate mitigation measure for managing forestry residues arising from the Proposed Development.

Materials Generated

13.8.14 The estimated forest residue generation is summarised in **Table 13.9**:

Table 13.9 – Scenario 1 and 2 Proposed Development Footprint and Associated Tree Free Areas.

Feature	Scenario 1 Area (ha)	Scenario 2 Area (ha)	Variance (ha) (Scenario 2 – Scenario 1)	FRMP Considerations
Mature crops being felled and not replanted	41.48	34.78	-6.70	Reduction reflects removal of the DWFHMP additional area under Scenario 2.
Young Crops being felled and not replanted	11.04	11.04	0.00	Recently planted (2024); **negligible** brash.
Brash and Stumps area	16.23	14.92	-1.31	Reduction reflects removal of the DWFHMP additional area under Scenario 2.
Brash only area	22.48	18.77	-3.71	Reduction reflects removal of the DWFHMP additional area under Scenario 2.
Floating Track	2.77	1.09	-1.68	Reduction reflects removal of the DWFHMP additional area under Scenario 2.
Open Ground	12.85	19.55	+6.70	Increase reflects reclassification of areas no longer subject to removal under Scenario 2.
Total	**106.85**	**100.15**	**-6.70**	**Overall reduction due to removal of the DWFHMP Additional Area under Scenario 2.**

Merchantable Timber

13.8.15 Merchantable timber volumes associated with the Proposed Development are assessed in detail in **Section 13.8** (**Tables 13.5.1** and **13.5.2**) and are not repeated here. For the purposes of mitigation, it is assumed that merchantable material will be recovered using standard forestry practices, with the Forest Residue Management Plan (FRMP) applying specifically to the management of non-merchantable material, brash, and stumps arising from areas where replanting will not occur.

Brash and Stump Generation

13.8.16 Brash and stump arisings have been estimated in accordance with industry-standard assumptions, whereby forest residues account for approximately 30% of standing merchantable timber weight,

split equally between brash and stumps.

Table 13.10 – Scenario 1 and 2 Summary of Brash and Stump Production

Feature	Scenario 1 Area (ha)	Scenario 1 Volume (m3)	Scenario 1 Tonnage (T)	Scenario 2 Area (ha)	Scenario 2 Volume (m3)	Scenario 2 Tonnage (T)
Brash only areas	22.48	1,525	1,220	18.77	1,402	1,122
Stumps and Brash areas	16.23	2,332	1,865	14.92	2,252	1,802
Total	**38.71**	**3,857**	**3,085**	**33.69**	**3,654**	**2,924**

13.8.17 The extent of areas generating forest residue differs between the two scenarios (see **Table 13.10**), reflecting changes in the Proposed Development footprint rather than differences in forestry practice. Under Scenario 1, brash-only recovery is associated with 22.48 ha, while brash-and-stump recovery applies to 16.23 ha. Under Scenario 2, these areas reduce to 18.77 ha and 14.92 ha respectively, consistent with the exclusion of the DWFHMP Additional Area from Proposed Development felling works.

13.8.18 As summarised in **Table 13.10**, this equates to an estimated total of 3,857 m³ (3,085 tonnes) of brash and stump material under Scenario 1, reducing to 3,654 m³ (2,924 tonnes) under Scenario 2. The reduction in residue generation under Scenario 2 directly reflects the smaller area of mature forest clearance required resulting from its removal by DWFHMP Additional Area.

13.8.19 Assuming an average payload of 25 tonnes per vehicle, this corresponds to approximately 124 lorry movements under Scenario 1 and 117 lorry movements under Scenario 2. These movements are temporary, construction-phase related, and align with the rephased forestry operations described elsewhere in this SEI Report.

13.8.20 For completeness, the Scenario 1 residue estimates also represent a conservative contingency scenario in which the Proposed Development felling corridor is implemented through the DWFHMP Additional Area in advance of any woodland removal associated with delivery of the DWFHMP. Assessing residues on this basis ensures that the Forest Residue Management Plan has been informed by a robust worst-case assumption, independent of the timing or delivery of third-party habitat management works.

Destination of Forestry Material

13.8.21 No changes from **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

Conclusions

13.8.22 No changes from **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

Compensatory Planting

13.8.23 Planning approval is sought only for felling associated with permanent woodland removal arising from the Proposed Development. This includes:

- The NDA Proposed Development Felling Corridor.
- The NDA Scenario 1 Proposed Development HMEP areas.
- The SDA net tree removal areas, including Scenario 2 Compartment Four Forest to Bog restoration area.

13.8.24 All other felling associated with the Proposed Development will be restocked in accordance with the approved Forest Plan and will be addressed through a Forest Plan amendment to be submitted to SF following the grant of planning consent.

13.8.25 Compensatory planting is proposed as a mitigation measure to address permanent woodland removal attributable to the Proposed Development and to ensure compliance with the SGPCWR: Implementation Guidance (FCS, 2019). The policy requirement has been applied on a net hectare-

for-hectare basis, taking account of baseline open ground and infrastructure that would have occurred in the absence of the Proposed Development.

Compensatory Planting Calculation Methodology

13.8.26 The compensatory planting (see **SEI Figure 13.9a** and **13.9b**) requirement for the NDA has been calculated using the Baseline Forest Plan as the reference position, specifically **SEI Figure 13.6a** and **13.6b**. The mitigation requirement was determined by overlaying the Proposed Development restocking tree-free footprint onto the baseline restructuring plan to identify the gross area of woodland removal attributable to the Proposed Development.

13.8.27 From this gross figure, areas of designed open ground and forest tracks that form an integral part of baseline forest management were deducted to derive the net compensatory planting requirement, consistent with the SGPCWR.

13.8.28 Within the SDA, the shelterbelt woodlands were not scheduled for felling. Given the small scale of woodland removal (see **SEI Figure 13.10a** and **13.10b**) associated with the Proposed Development (0.52 ha), the Proposed Development has committed to full gross area compensation, rather than a net calculation, resulting in compensatory planting of more than the minimum policy requirement.

Compensatory Planting Requirement

13.8.29 The compensatory planting requirements associated with the Proposed Development have been calculated for both baseline scenarios assessed within this SEI Report. While the total area of permanent woodland removal varies depending on the extent of habitat management delivered by the DWFHMP, compensatory planting has been calculated on a reasonable worst-case basis to ensure policy compliance under all scenarios.

13.8.30 Woodland removal associated with peatland and habitat restoration under the Proposed Development HMEP in the NDA and Forest to Bog restoration at Compartment Four in the SDA has been excluded from the compensatory planting calculation, as set out in the assessment, in accordance with the SGPCWR.

13.8.31 **Table 13.11** summarises the compensatory planting areas required to address woodland removal attributable to the Proposed Development in accordance with the SGPCWR.

Table 13.11 – Scenario 1 and 2 Compensatory Planting Calculation Associated with the Proposed Development

Feature	Scenario 1 + 2 SDA (ha)	Scenario 1 NDA (ha)	Scenario 2 NDA (ha)
Restocking Tree Free Area	0.52	61.62	61.62
Less Designed Open Ground/Other Land within Baseline Plan	n/a	14.49	21.19
Less forest tracks	n/a	4.25	4.25
Area to be accounted for under the Control of Woodland Removal Policy	**0.52**	**42.88**	**36.18**
Summary			
Scenario	**Total Compensatory Area (ha)**		
Scenario 1	43.40		
Scenario 2	36.70		

13.8.32 The compensatory planting requirement associated with the Proposed Development varies depending on the extent of habitat management delivered under the DWFHMP. Two baseline scenarios have therefore been assessed within this SEI Report to reflect uncertainty regarding the timing and extent of DWFHMP implementation.

13.8.33 Under Scenario 1, where further habitat management delivered by Dungavel Wind Farm is limited to the DWFHMP Core Area, the area of permanent woodland removal attributable to the Proposed Development results in a compensatory planting requirement of 43.40 ha. Under Scenario 2, where both the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas are implemented by Dungavel Wind Farm, the corresponding compensatory planting requirement is 36.70 ha, reflecting the increased extent of permanent open habitat already consented and assumed to be delivered as part of the DWFHMP.

13.8.34 For the purposes of this SEI Report and to ensure compliance with the SGCWRP under all reasonable baseline outcomes, the Proposed Development has adopted a reasonable worst-case approach. Accordingly, compensatory planting has been calculated and presented on the basis of Scenario 1, which represents the maximum potential woodland loss attributable to the Proposed Development.

13.8.35 Should Scenario 2 be implemented, the area of compensatory planting required would be reduced accordingly. Any adjustment to the final compensatory planting requirement would be confirmed through post-consent agreement with SF, informed by the extent of DWFHMP delivery at the time of implementation. The submission of detailed compensatory planting proposals prior to commencement of development can be secured by planning condition as is standard in most cases.

Compensatory Planting Plan

13.8.36 The proposed compensatory planting strategy remains unchanged from that set out in **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report and will be delivered in accordance with SF and planning condition requirements.

Replanting

13.8.37 No changes from **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

Archaeology

13.8.38 No changes from **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

Peatland Restoration

13.8.39 Peatland restoration will continue to be delivered as part of the Proposed Development HMEP. The objectives of the HMEP are to restore degraded peatland habitats, enhance carbon sequestration, improve hydrological function, and deliver long-term biodiversity benefits, in accordance with national climate change policy, the UK Forestry Standard, and Forestry Commission Scotland Deciding Future Management Options for Afforested Deep Peatland (FCS, April 2015) guidance on the management of afforested deep peat.

13.8.40 For the purposes of this SEI Report, peatland restoration is delivered under two alternative, scenario-specific pathways:

- Scenario 1: peatland restoration is delivered within the NDA as part of the Proposed Development's HMEP ('Forest to Bog Option 1' on **SEI TA7.5 Figure 1**).
- Scenario 2: peatland restoration is delivered through an alternative Forest to Bog restoration area within the SDA at Compartment four ('Forest to Bog Option 2' on **SEI TA7.5 Figure 1**).

13.8.41 In both scenarios, peatland restoration is targeted at afforested deep peat where ESC modelling demonstrate that continued forestry would be unsustainable. It should also be noted that in each scenario, a further area of peatland restoration will also be delivered within the Proposed Development HMEP 'habitat enhancement area' coloured green on **SEI TA7.5 Figure 1** but this area is not forested so this is not of relevance to this chapter's considerations.

13.8.42 Within the NDA, woodland removal associated with the Proposed Development HMEP comprises low-yielding conifer plantation on deep peat, where ecological survey evidence and ESC modelling demonstrate that the site is incapable of producing sustainable second-rotation forestry. In accordance with the Forestry Commission Scotland Deciding Future Management Options for Afforested Deep Peatland (FCS, April 2015) guidance, these areas follow the decision pathway that directs management away from restocking and towards restoration to open peatland habitat. As such, woodland removal within the NDA as part of the Proposed Development HMEP in Scenario 1 is not subject to compensatory planting requirements.

13.8.43 Under Scenario 2, additional permanent woodland removal is assumed to be delivered by the Dungavel Wind Farm operator, through implementation of the DWFHMP Additional Area within the NDA. In this scenario, the Proposed Development will undertake alternative Forest to Bog peatland restoration within Compartment Four of the SDA instead. Compartment Four did not form part of the EIA Report baseline and has been identified as suitable for peatland restoration based on peat-dominated soils, wet hydrological conditions, poor forestry performance, and ESC modelling demonstrating Yield Class 6 or below for Sitka spruce on second rotation.

13.8.44 Peatland restoration at Compartment Four, if required, would involve conversion of afforested peatland to functioning bog habitat in line with established best practice. Measures would include:

- Blocking artificial drains using peat dams, bunds or other low-impact water-retention techniques to restore natural hydrology.
- Removal of non-economic conifer crops to reduce evapotranspiration and facilitate the recovery of peat-forming vegetation, including *Sphagnum* species.
- Retention of brash and stumps in situ where ground conditions are wet and peat-dominated, to support surface stabilisation, moisture retention and carbon sequestration, and to avoid rutting and erosion that would be counter-productive to restoration objectives.
- Control of natural conifer regeneration where this could compromise long-term restoration success.
- Reprofiling and revegetation of disturbed peat surfaces, where necessary, to prevent further degradation and encourage peat accumulation.

13.8.45 Peatland restoration works would be phased over multiple years to allow progressive ecosystem recovery and to minimise disturbance. An adaptive management approach would be adopted, with monitoring used to inform refinements to restoration techniques in response to site-specific conditions and ecological outcomes.

13.8.46 Under Scenario 1, peatland restoration within the NDA as part of the Proposed Development HMEP delivers long-term environmental benefits through the restoration of degraded peatland habitat on deep peat, where second-rotation forestry is not viable. Woodland removal undertaken to facilitate this restoration is consistent with national policy and does not give rise to compensatory planting requirements.

13.8.47 Under Scenario 2, peatland restoration as part of the Proposed Development HMEP is delivered through alternative Forest to Bog restoration at Compartment Four in the SDA. In this location, woodland removal comprises low-yielding conifer plantation on deep peat and follows the Scottish Government's guidance on afforested peatland, directing management towards restoration rather than restocking. As such, woodland removal associated with peatland restoration under Scenario 2 is not subject to compensatory planting requirements.

13.9 Residual Effects

13.9.1 The residual effects of the Proposed Development, following the application of embedded mitigation and compliance with the UK Forestry Standard and SF policy, relate primarily to changes in woodland cover, forest management objectives, timber production and habitat condition. Residual effects are considered in social, economic and environmental terms, with particular reference to woodland removal, compensatory planting and peatland restoration delivered under the alternative development scenarios.

Social

13.9.2 Residual social effects relate to changes in forest structure and landscape character arising from felling, restocking and woodland removal associated with the Proposed Development.

13.9.3 In the NDA, revised felling phasing and the introduction of habitat management areas result in short-term changes to forest pattern during early phases. As assessed earlier in this SEI Report, these effects are localised, temporary and reduce over time as restocking and retained forest cover establish. Residual effects are therefore assessed as **minor adverse** reducing to **negligible**, which is

not significant in EIA terms.

13.9.4 In the SDA, woodland removal includes small areas of shelterbelt woodland and the removal of plantation forestry within Compartment Four to facilitate peatland restoration in Scenario 2. Although this represents a notable change in land use, the area is characterised by flat topography, low relief and limited visibility, and does not form a prominent feature in the wider landscape. As identified in the assessment of effects, there are no significant visual receptors affected, and residual landscape and visual effects are assessed as **negligible adverse**, and **not significant** in EIA terms.

Economic and Environmental

13.9.5 Residual economic and environmental effects relate to woodland removal, compensatory planting, peatland restoration and changes to forest infrastructure, as described in the assessment of effects.

13.9.6 Woodland removal associated with peatland restoration within the NDA (Scenario 1) and SDA (Scenario 2) results in a permanent reduction in productive forest area. However, as established through ESC analysis and site assessment, these areas are located on peat-dominated soils with very poor nutrient status and low predicted yield class, where continued forestry use would not be sustainable. Accordingly, the residual effect on timber production is assessed as **minor adverse**, and **not significant** in EIA terms.

13.9.7 Peatland restoration delivers a long-term environmental benefit, including improvements to peatland condition, carbon storage, hydrological function and biodiversity. Woodland removal undertaken specifically for habitat restoration on deep peat is therefore considered to provide a net public benefit, consistent with national peatland, climate change and forestry policy.

13.9.8 A further residual benefit identified in the assessment is the provision of new and upgraded forest access infrastructure required for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This infrastructure will support improved long-term forest management, including access for silvicultural operations and harvesting within retained productive areas.

13.9.9 Taking account of compensatory planting, adherence to UKFS, and the delivery of peatland restoration on low-yielding afforested peat, the overall residual environmental effect is assessed as **negligible beneficial**, and **not significant** in EIA terms.

13.10 Cumulative Assessment

13.10.1 No changes from **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report.

13.11 Summary

13.11.1 This SEI Report chapter has been prepared to address the requirement to update the forestry baseline presented within **Chapter 13** of the EIA Report, arising from the inclusion of habitat management areas included within the consented DWFHMP as requested by NatureScot. These areas were not fully reflected in the original forestry baseline as they do not form part of the Approved Forest Plan. Their inclusion necessitates clarification of baseline conditions, felling extents, woodland removal and compensatory planting requirements.

13.11.2 Therefore, as agreed with NatureScot and SF, this SEI Report chapter presents two baseline scenarios to reflect uncertainty regarding the timing and extent of DWFHMP implementation. Scenario 1 assumes delivery of the DWFHMP Core Area only, while Scenario 2 assumes delivery of both the Core and Additional Areas. In both scenarios, the overall development footprint remains unchanged; however, the internal composition of woodland, open habitat and peatland restoration differs. The SEI Report assesses these scenarios on a like-for-like basis to ensure a robust and transparent assessment of woodland removal and mitigation requirements.

13.11.3 The NDA comprises a large commercial conifer plantation managed primarily for timber production. The Proposed Development requires amendments to the approved Forest Plan to accommodate wind farm infrastructure, revised felling phasing and the integration of habitat management areas. Felling is front-loaded within Phase One and the felling corridor to facilitate construction and habitat delivery, with a corresponding reduction in later felling phases and the retention of substantial areas of forest cover across Phases Two to Four, land outwith the plan period and long-term retention

areas. As previously agreed with SF, these changes are not visible from the key viewpoints assessed in the EIA Report Forestry Landscape Appraisal and do not give rise to additional landscape effects.

13.1.1 Woodland removal within the NDA includes areas identified for habitat and peatland restoration under the Proposed Development HMEP in Scenario 1, and the DWFHMP Core and Additional Areas in Scenario 2. These areas represent a planned and policy-led change in land use from forestry planation to permanent open habitat on deep peat. Ecological survey data, ESC modelling and yield class predictions demonstrate that these sites are characterised by very poor soil nutrient regimes and low productivity, with predicted second rotation yield classes of YC6 or below. In accordance with Forestry Commission Scotland's Deciding Future Management Options for afforested deep peatland (FCS, April 2015), Forest to Bog represents the most appropriate long-term management option.

13.1.2 Within the SDA, woodland removal is required both for access infrastructure and, under Scenario 2, for Forest to Bog peatland restoration within Compartment Four. Although Compartment Four represents a sizeable area of woodland removal, it is located on flat, low-lying ground with limited visual prominence and supports historical fire damaged conifer crops on deep peat. The inclusion of this area facilitates peatland restoration and delivers long-term public benefits in terms of carbon sequestration, hydrological function and biodiversity enhancement.

13.1.3 Peatland restoration across both development areas will be delivered in accordance with established best practice, including drain blocking, removal of non-economic conifers, management of natural regeneration and, where ground conditions require, retention of brash and stumps in situ to avoid peat damage, rutting and erosion. Restoration will be phased and subject to adaptive management to ensure successful long-term outcomes.

13.1.4 Compensatory planting will be delivered off-site to address woodland removal associated with infrastructure and development-related land use change, in line with the Scottish Government's Woodland Removal Policy. Woodland removal undertaken specifically to enable peatland restoration on deep peat is not subject to compensatory planting requirements, reflecting the limited productive potential at second rotation and the greater environmental benefit delivered by habitat restoration.

13.1.5 Taking account of the updated baseline, revised felling phasing and integration of approved habitat management areas, the Proposed Development is assessed as giving rise to **no significant adverse** effects on forestry, landscape or the environment. Short-term localised effects associated with early-phase felling are effectively mitigated through phased working and prompt restocking of retained productive areas. In the longer term, the combination of peatland restoration, improved forest access infrastructure and revised forest management will enhance ecological resilience, carbon performance and the sustainable management of the forest estate.

13.1.6 Overall, the SEI Report demonstrates that the Proposed Development is consistent with the UK Forestry Standard, the Scottish Government's woodland removal and peatland policies, and represents an appropriate and balanced response to updated baseline conditions arising from the DWFHMP, delivering renewable energy alongside long-term environmental and public benefits.

Table 13.12 – Summary Table

Description of Effect	Significance of Potential Effect		Mitigation Measure	Significance of Residual Effect	
	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse		Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
During Construction & Decommissioning					
Social effects (archaeology, cultural heritage, landscape, forest structure)	Minor	Adverse	Protection of all archaeological features; UKFS compliance; existing buffers; no change to cultural heritage effects; no visibility from EIAR viewpoints; phased felling and prompt restocking; retention of forest cover across phases.	Minor - Negligible	Adverse (Not Significant)
Economic effects (timber production, infrastructure, restocking, renewable revenue)	Moderate	Beneficial	Upgraded forest access; improved genetics (20–25% higher YC); compensatory planting; renewable energy revenue compensates early felling; reduction of non-viable crops; no additional loss beyond baseline.	Moderate	Beneficial (Significant)
Environmental effects (habitat restoration, peatland, land-use change, restructuring)	Minor	Beneficial	Delivery of HMEP; phased felling; immediate restocking; retention of forest structure; peatland restoration on deep peat; FRMP residue management; compliance with UKFS and habitat policy.	Negligible–Minor	Beneficial (Not Significant)
During Operation					
Operational forestry, woodland cover and habitat condition	Negligible	Beneficial	Long-term forest plan management; HMEP monitoring; ongoing peatland restoration; maintenance of upgraded access infrastructure.	Negligible	Beneficial (Not Significant)
Cumulative Effects					
None					

13.12 References

Clydeplan (2020). Forest and Woodland Strategy for the Glasgow City Region. Available at: https://www.clydeplan-sdpa.gov.uk [Accessed 1 February 2026].

East Ayrshire Council (2014). Ayrshire and Arran Forestry and Woodland Strategy. Available at: https://www.east-ayrshire.gov.uk/Resources/PDF/A/AyrshireandArranForestWoodlandStrategy2014.pdf [Accessed 1 February 2026].

Forestry Commission (2014). Design Techniques for Forest Design Planning. Forestry Commission.

Forest Research (2023). The UK Forestry Standard: The Government's Approach to Sustainable Forest Management. Forestry Commission.

Forest Research (2024). Ecological Site Classification (ESC) Decision Support System. Available at: https://esc.forestresearch.gov.uk [Accessed 31 January 2026].

Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) (2014). Supplementary Guidance to Support the FC Forests and Peatland Habitats Guideline Note (2000). Forestry Commission Scotland.

Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) (2015). Deciding Future Management Options for Afforested Deep Peatland. Forestry Commission Scotland.

Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) (2015). Guidance to FCS Staff on Implementing the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal. Forestry Commission Scotland.

Matthews, R.W., Henshall, P.A., Duckworth, R.R., Jenkins, T.A.R., Mackie, E.D. and Dick, E.C. (2016). Forest Yield: A PC-based Yield Model for Forest Management in Britain. Edinburgh: Forestry Commission.

NatureScot (Scottish Natural Heritage), Natural England, Natural Resources Wales, RenewableUK, Scottish Power Renewables, Ecotricity Ltd, the University of Exeter and the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) (2021). Bats and Onshore Wind Turbines: Survey, Assessment and Mitigation. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/doc/bats-and-onshore-wind-turbines-survey-assessment-and-mitigation [Accessed 1 February 2026].

RPS Group (2023). *Dungavel Wind Farm – Approved Habitat Management Plan (Approved version, updated August 2023).* Prepared by Dr Simon Zisman; checked by Joanna Carter. RPS Group, Atholl Exchange, 1st Floor, 6 Canning Street, Edinburgh, EH3 8EG.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) (2013). Management of Forestry Waste WST-G-027 Version 3. Scottish Environmental Protection Agency.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage and Forestry Commission Scotland (2014). Use of Trees Cleared to Facilitate Development on Afforested Land – Joint Position Statement and Guidance (Draft). Scottish Environment Protection Agency.

Scottish Government (2017). The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2019). Scotland's Forestry Strategy. The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2021). Scotland's Third Land Use Strategy 2021–2026. The Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2023). National Planning Framework 4. The Scottish Government.