Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks

TRANSMISSION

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report

LT383 Alyth to Tealing Overhead Line (OHL) 400kV Upgrade

November 2024

VOLUME 2: CHAPTER 9 - FORESTRY

9.	FORESTRY	**9-1**
9.1	Introduction	9-1
9.2	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	9-1
9.3	Baseline Conditions	9-4
9.4	Issues Scoped Out	9-6
9.5	Assessment of Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects	9-6
9.6	Summary	9-10

Figures (Volume 3 of this EIA Report)

There are no Figures associated with this chapter.

Appendices (Volume 4 of this EIA Report)

There are no Appendices associated with this chapter.

9. FORESTRY

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 The potential impact resulting from the construction and operation phases of the Proposed Development on forestry are addressed in this EIA Report chapter. Forestry in this context considers commercial and non-commercial woodland. Other arboricultural features of groups of trees and individual trees are identified to illustrate impacts and opportunities, but assessment is of forestry.

9.1.2 Commercial forests are dynamic and changing through landowner activities and natural events. This would include the changes to, for example, felling programmes and compositional changes that follow from changes to management objectives or response to biotic or abiotic factors.

9.1.3 The environmental services provided by woodlands in relation to habitats are recognised within Chapter 7: Ecology (Volume 2) of this EIA Report and these topics should be considered together.

9.2 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Scope of the Assessment

9.2.1 Resilience is the ability of a network to withstand a shock event and then return to its former purpose and quality. In this context, management of vegetation in proximity to the energy network considers growth and potential failure of trees. Assessment is based on this principle, recognising that a risk-based approach should be followed. In particular, the opportunity for maintaining broadleaf trees within the existing and expanded corridor was considered, on a case-by-case basis, and retention of trees within the corridor is presented within Table 9-4.

Extent of the Study Area

9.2.2 The study area adopts a 90 m wide corridor (45 m from the centre line of the OHL) and incorporates the wayleave corridor, of 80m, for the existing OHL. Where the Proposed Development passes through forestry, the adjacent or continuous crop was further considered in relation to extending felling for windfirmness. Assessment of tree growth stage and condition may lead to proposals to extend vegetation management beyond the existing corridor, and any extended tree felling proposals and subsequent restocking will, subject to landowner agreement, be presented within the EIA Report. Access routes, within forestry areas, were assessed for their impact on woodland structure and the opportunities created by improved access for woodland operations. Arboricultural impact assessment of trees and tree groups adjacent to access routes has been scoped out.

Consultation Undertaken to Date

9.2.3 SSEN consulted Scottish Forestry regarding the Proposed Development. Scottish Forestry is the Scottish Government agency responsible for policy, support and regulation of the forestry sector in Scotland. A written response was received on 5th July 2024, which notes earlier discussion with SSEN's woodland advisor. Scottish Forestry advised that:

- the EIA Report includes a specific chapter on Forestry, providing detailed information on the types and areas of forestry to be felled;
- Scottish Government's policy on control of woodland removal is followed and adopts guidance on implementation;
- any requirement for extended management felling is recognised and that this will require permission from Scottish Forestry separately from the planning application; and
- compensatory planting requirements may themselves be subject to EIA.

9.2.4 Scoping did not elicit any forestry specific responses.

Method of Baseline Data Collation

9.2.5 An initial baseline of forestry receptors was derived from Scotland's environmental web[1] and Scottish Forestry map viewer[2]. These digital mapping tools have enabled identification of woodland within the National Forest Inventory (NFI). The NFI definition of woodland is a minimum area of 0.5 ha with trees possessing, or with the potential to achieve, tree crown cover of more than 20% of the ground. Within the NFI some woodlands are identified as native woodlands. The Native Woodland Survey of Scotland (NWSS) provides a baseline survey of all native woodlands (of minimum 0.5 ha), nearly native woodlands and plantations on ancient woodland sites in Scotland. A further subset of these woodlands is contained within the Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) of Scotland, which identifies ancient woodland, long established woodland of plantation origin and semi-natural woodlands. However, the AWI is based on woodlands over 2ha. NFI, NWSS and AWI are identified within the baseline conditions.

9.2.6 Subsequently, the baseline was enhanced by provision of a resilience survey of the existing overhead line (OHL), undertaken in the field by third party utility arborists, in March 2024. Data were shared in the form of site maps and field records of tree species, top heights and separation from the existing OHL, with some additional field notes. The survey data was more comprehensive than the scoped assessment to identify individual arboricultural receptors. The baseline data were within a 45 m wayleave of the centre line of the OHL, that is to provide a 90 m survey corridor. This represents the expanded wayleave of the Proposed Development. Beyond the survey corridor consideration was given to the need for expanded management felling of neighbouring woodland to mitigate the risk of windblow.

9.2.7 The field data are presented under Section 9.3, with trees and forestry identified in relation to tower intervals.

Determining Magnitude of Change and Sensitivity of Receptors

9.2.8 Descriptions of magnitude of impact, sensitivity of the receptor and significance of effect that are used in this forestry assessment have been developed for the Proposed Development.

9.2.9 There is no universally accepted guidance to assess forestry receptor sensitivity, in part because trees are dynamic, and the stage of tree growth may influence sensitivity criteria. Professional judgement and familiarity with forestry EIA for the energy sector, has been used to develop the receptor sensitivity values in Table 9-1 Sensitivity criteria for forestry and trees.

Table 9-1 Sensitivity criteria for forestry and trees

Sensitivity value	Sensitivity criteria
High	Woodland Sites of Special Scientific Interest; ancient woodland; ancient and veteran trees.
Medium	Native woodland, long-established woodland of plantation origin; mid-rotation commercial woodland, established parkland trees.
Low	Recently established woodland (yet to reach canopy closure); woodland shrubs, low-stature amenity tree planting, poorly performing /pest-damaged woodland.
Negligible	Commercial woodland at economic rotation (clear-felling) stage; diseased trees or woodland.

[1] Gov.scot (2024) Scotland's Environment Map (online) Available at: https://www.environment.gov.scot/maps/scotlands-environment-map/ [Accessed: July 2024]

[2] Gov.scot (2024) Scottish Forestry Map Viewer (online) Available at: https://www.forestry.gov.scot/support-regulations/scottish-forestry-map-viewer [Accessed: July 2024]

9.2.10 In the UK there is a strong presumption against permanent deforestation unless it addresses other environmental concerns or where it would achieve significant and clearly defined additional public benefits. In Scotland such deforestation is dealt with under the Scottish Government's "Control of Woodland Removal Policy" (2009)[3]. The purpose of the policy is to provide direction for decisions on woodland removal in Scotland.

9.2.11 Any removal of woodland has an impact but there is no absolute guidance on impact magnitude. In part this is because impacts may be influenced by the scale of the local forestry resources and the effects relative to local forestry management activity. Furthermore, forest impacts of a linear scheme are not experienced at a scheme-wide scale but more locally. This fragmentation of impacts is readily addressed for forestry holdings and named woodlands, which may incorporate distances of multiple tower spans. A full arboricultural survey of individual trees and tree groups was scoped out and impact assessment is restricted to forestry and woodland.

9.2.12 Forestry impact assessment relates only to the expansion of the wayleave from 40 m to 45 m from the centre line of the OHL. Permitted vegetation management within the existing wayleave is identified in the table of effects but is not incorporated into the magnitude of impact. For example, 1000 m of existing forest wayleave has potential expansion of 5 m plus 5 m, if affecting both sides of the corridor: the area of impact is 10,000 m^2 or 1 ha. Impact magnitude, within Table 9-2 Magnitude criteria for forestry has been developed using professional judgement and thresholds are presented applicable to individual receptors. The thresholds are not intended to be considered collectively, for scheme-wide impacts, for the reasons outlined in Section 9.2.11.

Table 9-2 Magnitude criteria for forestry

Magnitude	Magnitude Criteria	Demonstrated outcome
High	Permanent removal of land from forestry >5 ha (to be mitigated ex situ). Premature felling >10 ha (to be restocked in situ).	Large adverse: removal of healthy and ecologically suitable forestry. Large benefit: removal of forestry from peat or inappropriate habitat. Response to plant health notice.
Medium	Permanent removal of land from forestry >1 ha<5 ha (to be mitigated ex situ). Premature felling of >5 ha<10 ha commercial forestry (to be restocked in situ).	Medium adverse: removal of healthy and ecologically suitable forestry. Medium benefit: removal of forestry from peat or inappropriate habitat. Response to plant health notice.
Low	Permanent removal of land from forestry <1 ha (to be mitigated ex situ). Premature felling of >1 ha<5 ha commercial forestry (to be restocked in situ).	Small adverse: removal of healthy and ecologically suitable forestry. Small benefit: removal of forestry from peat or inappropriate habitat. Response to plant health notice.
Negligible	No discernible permanent loss to forest land. Premature felling of <1 ha commercial forestry (to be restocked in situ).	Effects small-scale or short-term. Like-for-like reinstatement generally possible.

9.2.13 The receptor sensitivity (Table 9-1 Sensitivity criteria for forestry and treesand magnitude of impact (Table 9-2 Magnitude criteria for forestry) are combined in a classification of the likely significance of effect (Table 9-3 Significance Matrix) Major and moderate effects are significant: minor and negligible effects are not significant.

Table 9-3 Significance Matrix

	Magnitude of impacts			
	High	**Medium**	**Low**	**Negligible**

[3] Scottish Forestry (2024) The Scottish Governments Policy on Control of Woodland Removal (online) https://www.forestry.gov.scot/publications/285-the-scottish-government-s-policy-on-control-of-woodland-removal [Accessed: July 2024]

Receptor Sensitivity	**High**	**Major**	**Major**	**Moderate**	Minor
	Medium	**Major**	**Moderate**	Minor	Negligible
	Low	**Moderate**	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
	Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Limitations and Assumptions

9.2.14 The absence of UK- wide criteria for receptor sensitivity and effect magnitude are not considered a limitation. The assumptions and application of professional judgement to both sensitivity and magnitude criteria have been developed around forestry assets and activity in the region of the Proposed Development and that requirement is the reason for the absence of universal guidance. This tailoring of sensitivity and magnitude criteria has considered project scale, its linear form, the intensity of local forestry services and landscape character: It has been developed specifically in the geographic context of the Proposed Development and follows the experience of the author in contributing to several forestry EIA Report across Scotland and in lowland England.

9.3 Baseline Conditions

9.3.1 Baseline conditions are the tree groups and woodland intersecting with the existing wayleave. No high sensitivity receptors were identified.

9.3.2 A full arboricultural survey of the Proposed Development was scoped out of forestry assessment, but the utility arboriculture survey throughout the proposed wayleave of 45 m has provided information over and above woodland receptors. It follows that the data contained in Table 9-4: Forestry and tree baseline from resilience survey, within the full width of existing wayleave and the proposed expanded wayleaveincludes both currently permitted tree works (those within the existing 40 m wayleave) and further requirements from expanding the wayleave. The baseline forestry described in Table 9-4: Forestry and tree baseline from resilience survey, within the full width of existing wayleave and the proposed expanded wayleave is illustrated in Figure 7.1d (Volume 3).

9.3.3 For the most part the proposed tree works would have 'no discernible impact on forest land' and the magnitude of effects would be very low (Table 9-2 Magnitude criteria for forestry) which would result in minor or negligible effects (Table 9-3 Significance Matrix) which are not significant. However, the inclusion of the comprehensive data provides context, particularly regarding the risk-based approach being adopted to tree retention.

Table 9-4: Forestry and tree baseline from resilience survey, within the full width of existing wayleave and the proposed expanded wayleave

Tower number/interval	Felling	Retention
641	Fell willow and sycamore below OHL on banks of River Isla.	
641-646	South of River Isla crown reduction of mature mixed broadleaves to allow retention.	
641-646	At tower 644, selective felling of mixed broadleaves, close to the tower, connecting areas of long-established woodland of plantation origin.	

Tower number/interval	Felling	Retention
641-646	Mature mixed broadleaf for selective removal but some retention with crown reduction.	
646-647	Mature mixed conifers and broadleaves, south of A94. Dismantle fell of conifers. Crown reduction of broadleaves to allow for retention.	
646-648	Fell one roadside oak along the A94.	Retain mature sycamore at Drumkilbo Farm but undertake crown reduction.
650-651	Drain north of Tower 651: selective felling of hawthorn. Fell birch up to edge of corridor.	
650-653	Fell mixed conifers to edge of corridor, within long-established woodland of plantation origin. Fell willow and birch growing beneath OHL.	
655	Fell individual trees (ash, sequoia).	
657-661	Fell sycamore to west of Tower 657. May currently retain sycamore to east of tower but removal not arboriculturally significant.	
657-661	Fell mixed conifers to edge of corridor, in the vicinity of Tower 660.	
663-664	Fell mixed conifers to corridor edge. Selective felling of mixed broadleaves.	
666-670	Fell mixed conifers at Linn Den plantation within corridor. Assess windthrow risk of retained trees beyond corridor.	Retain woodland edge mixed broadleaves due to significant over-sail of OHL. Restock with same broadleaf species to enhance woodland edge habitat.
666-670	Fell mixed conifers within corridor at edge of woodland on Scotston Hill (north and south of Tower 667)	Selective felling of mixed broadleaves below the OHL but low risk to OHL from low stature species.
666-670	At Tower 668, Scots pine has been topped. Within the corridor. Repeat height reduction. An alternative option is to fell to the full width of wayleave and, with agreement, fell fragment parts of contiguous woodland. Then replant with smaller stature mixed broadleaves.	
666-670	Between Towers 669 and 670 fell mixed conifers to edge of corridor.	Scope to retain sycamore if crown reduction undertaken.
671-672	Compartment edge, within 45 m corridor standing but extensive internal windblow of mixed conifers, identified as long-established woodland of plantation origin.	With agreement, redesign compartment including boundaries to ensure long term windfirmness and ecological enhancement.
674-676	Fell sporadic mixed conifers and birch to the edge of corridor. Fell all species in vicinity of Tower 676.	

Tower number/interval	Felling	Retention
676	Fell two larch trees.	
676-680	Fell mixed conifers at Balkello woodland to corridor width. Selective felling and reduction of mixed broadleaves.	Potential for maintaining narrower wayleave corridor, whilst trees not yet at windthrow risk stage. If open corridor fully may achieve ecological enhancement with suitable broadleaf edge mixture.
685-686	Selective felling of mixed broadleaves.	Part retention.
687-688	Fell 1 hawthorn under OHL.	
689-690	Fell~~ow~~ row of poplar to edge of corridor.	Retain holly, sycamore, wild cherry.
691-692	Fell mixed conifers to corridor edge.	Scope to retain mixed broadleaves with selective felling.
691-692	Trees at Seventeen Acres currently low risk. Monitor laurel and hawthorn.	
692	Fell mixed conifers to edge of corridor between 691 and 692. Fell common alder below OHL at the substation fence and along the bund.	Retain mixed conifer screen of the substation by top height reduction of mixed conifers. Laurel and hawthorn could be retained currently but possible opportunity for ecological enhancement.

Future Baseline

9.3.4 Trees are dynamic, living organisms and close to an OHL will require ongoing inspection leading on occasion to management. However, as proposals represent a reinforcement of an existing OHL the future baseline will reflect this dynamism of trees in the same way as the current baseline.

9.3.5 Within the wayleave, the future baseline will be monitored through future arboricultural surveys to allow for removal or reduction in stature of individual trees where the possibility of tree failure presents an unacceptable risk to infrastructure. Similarly, woodlands within the wayleave will be managed to provide environmental services within this risk framework. Decisions within the wayleave may have consequences for continuous woodland compartments to reduce the risk of windthrow.

9.3.6 The potential future baseline, without the Proposed Development, would be unchanged from the current baseline. A continuation of the risk-based tree management strategy within the existing OHL wayleave would apply.

9.4 Issues Scoped Out

9.4.1 The Scoping Report (Section 7.6) scoped out a full BS5837:2012 assessment of all arboricultural features.

9.4.2 Ancient and veteran trees had not been identified in previous arboricultural surveys of the existing wayleave corridor and were not identified within the Woodland Trust's Ancient Tree Inventory. These were therefore scoped out.

9.4.3 Forest hydrology was scoped out of the forestry assessment, as per Section 7.4 of the Scoping Report.

9.5 Assessment of Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

Mitigation by Design

9.5.1 Mitigation by design is provided by the reinforcement of an existing OHL. The existing wayleave of 40 m will be extended to 45 m because of the upgrade to the infrastructure. Within the existing wayleave a risk-based approach to tree management has been adopted and trees within the operational corridor are retained where the

risk to network resilience from falling trees or tree branches during adverse weather is deemed low. That is, some trees and forestry are retained within the wayleave where the risk is deemed acceptable.

Construction Phase Impacts and Effects

9.5.2 From Table 9-4: Forestry and tree baseline from resilience survey, within the full width of existing wayleave and the proposed expanded wayleave, the woodland receptors only have been used to determine the potential forestry impacts of an expanded wayleave, presented in Table 9-5: Potential forestry effects.

Table 9-5: Potential forestry effects

Tower Interval Number	Receptor Name	Receptor Sensitivity	Area Affected (ha)	Effect Magnitude	Effect Significance
644	Crow Wood	Medium	<0.1	Negligible	Negligible
651-653	Kirkinch Wood	Medium	0.3	Low	Minor
666-670	Scotston Hill	Low	0.2	Low	Negligible
671-672	Unnamed	Medium	<0.1	Negligible	Negligible
676-680	Balkello Wood	Medium	1.0	Low	Minor

9.5.3 The effect of an increased wayleave gives rise to minor effects at Kirkinch Wood, and Balkello Wood and negligible effects at Crow Wood, woodland at Scotston Hill and an unnamed plantation, north of Kirkton of Auchterhouse.

9.5.4 Crow Wood and Kirkinch Wood and the unnamed plantation are long established woodlands of plantation origin. At Crow Wood the selective removal of trees from a narrow band of trees, connecting with woodland on the banks of the Dean Water, is negligible in extent and effect. At Kirkinch Wood selective felling of naturally regenerated willow and birch from within the wayleave and of mixed conifers at the wayleave edge is proposed. There is scope, at construction and for a period of operation, to maintain the current (narrower) wayleave, because of favourable ground conditions, but permanence of a reduced corridor is not guaranteed, and the case presented here, of a minor effect, is the long-term worst case. The unnamed plantation, north of Kirkton of Auchterhouse, is extensively windthrown and the few standing trees at the wayleave edge would be removed, the effect of which is negligible. With the owner's agreement a more windfirm compartment edge of small stature broadleaf trees could be re-established in situ.

9.5.5 At each location the requirement for an extended management felling of trees beyond the wayleave was considered. Extended management felling may be required if a newly exposed woodland edge presents an opportunity for windthrow of trees beyond the wayleave. It was concluded that the openness and stature of the neighbouring trees does not require extended management felling.

9.5.6 For all of the locations, in Table 9-5: Potential forestry effects, the effect of removing trees within an expanded wayleave is deemed minor. Trees are managed at the periphery of the existing wayleave and are not part of commercial plantation and often of relatively small statute. The minor significance of expanding the wayleave is not a significant effect of the scheme to forestry.

9.5.7 At Balkello Wood consideration was given to the need for extended management felling beyond the wayleave but was deemed unnecessary and felling will not extend to the full width of the expanded wayleave. Topography

elevates the towers in relation to the woodland and the trees are considered yet to present a significant windthrow risk.

9.5.8 Woodland edge management in situ is possible with the planting of woodland shrub species such as hazel and blackthorn. The residual effect will remain **minor** or **negligible**.

9.5.9 Access to the wayleave, will require some upgrades to existing forestry tracks, which may involve reprofiling of the ground to create favourable gradients. Upgrades are anticipated to require some vegetation management beside these existing routes, but this is a standard forestry management practice and there are no high sensitivity receptors. Furthermore, upgrading forestry routes would improve accessibility for timber lorries: forest roads are typically considered an asset for access for forestry management operations. The enhanced forest roading does not readily translate to the significance matrix within Table 9-3 Significance Matrix, but benefit is estimated to be **minor** or **negligible** and hence not significant.

9.5.10 Beyond areas of forestry, access proposals have the potential for adverse effects to individual trees, requiring their removal or crown reduction. A full BS5837:2012 arboricultural impact assessment was scoped out of the forestry assessment. Effects are identified in relation to heritage and ecology, where mitigation, including embedded mitigation through access redesign, has been developed with collaborative forestry input.

9.5.11 It is not proposed to provide physical protection, with fencing, of retained woodland trees beyond the wayleave. Good environmental practices within woodland will be secured through provision of the Construction Environment Management Document (CEMD), which will be consistent with the UK Forestry Standard[4].

Operational Phase Impacts

9.5.12 The operator has a legal obligation, under Electricity Safety Quality and Regulations 2002[5] to ensure trees are a safe distance from the OHL. Hence, throughout the operational phase cyclical utility arboricultural surveys will be conducted, reflecting that trees are dynamic organisms. The obligations of the operator to meet industry standard safety clearance will be met and may require tree felling, crown reduction, selective pruning, or height reduction.

9.5.13 Embedded mitigation during the operational phase is provided by the continuation of a risk-based assessment of individual trees and areas of forestry within the wayleave corridor.

9.5.14 The residual effect is that essential works to maintain a safe and reliable OHL power supply will result, over the operational phase, in tree management operations within the corridor that restricts trees to species of small stature and shrubs.

Mitigation

9.5.15 Mitigation is not proposed for the non-significant minor forestry effects.

9.5.16 The applicant has committed to undertake off-site compensatory planting within the local authority boundary (where possible) to reflect the removal of tree cover, from the expanded corridor, identified in Table 9-5.

Cumulative Effects

9.5.17 The cumulative assessment has been undertaken for projects listed in Chapter 5 (Volume 2) Of these projects only the Tealing to Westfield 400 kV OHL upgrade affects forestry and is shown, indicatively, on Figure 5.1 (Volume 3). The remaining projects are listed in 9-6 Cumulative effects from associated SSENT developments

[4]Gov.uk (2017) The UK Forestry Standards (online) Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-uk-forestry-standard [Accessed: July 2024]

[5] https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2002/2665/contents

9.5.18 Table 9-6 and Table 9-7. Where planning documentation was unavailable a high-level review of forestry was conducted using aerial photography and the development boundary. This revealed that these other developments at an earlier stage in the planning process are principally located within agricultural land or have land uses other than forestry. The effects on forestry of the Tealing – Westfield 400 KV OHL upgrade have been assessed following the same methodology presented in this EIA Report chapter.9-6 Cumulative effects from associated SSENT developments

Table 9-6 Cumulative effects from associated SSENT developments

Development	Ref. on Figure 5.1	Location	Residual Significant Effects (if known) / information from any available sources on likely significant effects	Cumulative assessment	Additional mitigation
Tealing -Westfield 400 kV OHL upgrade	A	Tealing-Westfield/ Glenrothes	Forestry present, no significant residual effects.	Potential for minor cumulative effects.	Mitigation provided local to forestry impact.
Emmock (Tealing) substation	B	Near Emmock Road, Tealing	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.
Kintore- Tealing 400 kV Connection	C	Kintore- Tealing	Not available.	Forestry present Potential for minor cumulative effects.	Mitigation provided local to forestry impact.
Alyth-Tealing OHL Tealing Emmock substation tie-ins and associated tower dismantling	D	Tealing	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.

Table 9-7 Cumulative effects from non-associated SSENT and third-party developments

Development	Ref. on Figure 5.1	Location	Residual Significant Effects (if known) / information from any available sources on likely significant effects	Cumulative assessment	Additional mitigation
Muir of Pert Energy Storage Facility	E	Muir of Pert Farm, Tealing, Dundee, DD4 0QL	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.
Moatmill Bridge Tealing Energy Storage Facility	F	Land at Moatmill Bridge, Tealing	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.
Tealing Solar Energy Park	G	Near Duntrune at DD4 0PR	No forestry present.	No cumulative effects.	None.

Development	Ref. on Figure 5.1	Location	Residual Significant Effects (if known) / information from any available sources on likely significant effects	Cumulative assessment	Additional mitigation
Tealing Battery Energy Storage Farm	H	Land to the north-east of Gagie Home Farm, Duntrune, DD4 OPR	No forestry present.	No cumulative effects.	None.
Fithie Energy Park BESS	I	Land to the north-west of Tealing Substation	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.
Ark Hill Wind Farm Extension	J	Approximately 2.5 km north-east of Alyth-Tealing	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.
Balnuith Farm BESS (Tealing)	K	Balnuith Farm, Tealing, DD4 0RE	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.
Myreton BESS	L	Land to the south of Tealing Substation	Not available.	No forestry present therefore no cumulative effects.	None.

9.5.19 It was identified in Section 9.2.11 that forestry impacts of linear schemes are experienced locally, and the assessment of effects considered discrete areas of woodland independently. This approach is equally applicable for the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development and the Tealing-Westfield 400kV OHL upgrade. No significant effects have been presented within either project.

9.5.20 No significant cumulative effects are identified. It is further noted that the cumulative area of forestry impacts is insubstantial relative to the typical scale of forestry management activity within the vicinity of the Proposed Development and the Tealing – Westfield 400 kV OHL upgrade.

9.6 Summary

9.6.1 The results of a of a tree survey, undertaken in March 2024 by a third party, have been made available to provide baseline data for a forestry impacts assessment. The data provides greater detail than would ordinarily be available for a forestry impact assessment. A full arboricultural survey had been scoped out, but the data demonstrates the risk-based approach to tree felling or retention within the wayleave.

9.6.2 There is no national guidance relating to receptor sensitivity or impact magnitude, in part because this needs to be presented within the local context of the forest landscape and forestry industry. Sensitivity descriptors and impact thresholds have been developed for these proposals and combined in a sensitivity matrix. The approach considers woodlands as separate receptors rather than cumulatively across the proposals.

9.6.3 Woodland sites at Kirkinch Wood, woodland at Scotston Hill, and Balkello Wood will require tree removals for an expanded wayleave. In each case the effect is deemed negligible or minor, and no significant impact is identified for forestry. The relationship between tree cover and open ground, within forestry units, is important for providing a range of ecological niches. The UK Forestry Standard requires the incorporation of open ground, within forestry

management units, to a minimum of ten per cent. The extent of tree removal, identified in Table 9-5 represents a modest change to the ratio of tree cover and open habitat. None of the woodland sites would experience tree removal from the whole of a woodland compartment.

9.6.4 Extended areas of tree felling (which would require landowner agreement) have not been identified, but limited management felling and restocking with mixed broadleaves of limited stature to create a graduated edge to the wayleave would represent a positive ambition for long term tree stability and would secure landscape and ecological benefits. Whilst retention of small woodland fragments may become vulnerable to windthrow an absolute requirement for extended management felling to commercial forestry compartments, beyond the wayleave, has not been identified.

9.6.5 Access to the wayleave using upgraded forestry tracks may require vegetation management but this is standard forestry management that develops an asset that will assist woodland management and timber transport. The benefit is likely to be negligible or minor, and not present a significant impact.

9.6.6 Mitigation proposals for open habitat are considered within Chapter 7 (Volume 2) of this EIA Report.

9.6.7 Environmental safeguards for retained trees and associated ecosystems will be provided in a CEMD, compliant with the UK Forestry Standard.

9.6.8 No significant effects are likely on either an individual or cumulative basis in relation to forestry, as reported in this chapter.