# NORTH WEST SUTHERLAND DEER MANAGEMENT GROUP

# **MARCH 2015 DRAFT**

# DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN

# 2015 - 2025

# **Working Plan**

## PREFACE

This Deer Management Plan has been developed for the North West Sutherland Deer Management Group (NWS DMG) and also includes issues relating to domestic livestock. The Plan is funded both by the deer group and by Scottish Natural Heritage. It replaces a previous DMP that was partially drawn up in 2006, aiming to take account of changing circumstances with the group area. The Plan runs from 2015 until 2025 and has been formally endorsed by all the Members of the Group. It has been designed to be readily updated as needs arise and will be reviewed on a six-monthly basis or as required, with a systematic review taking place at the end of the first five year period in 2020.

This Plan has been compiled by: Victor Clements: Native Woodland Advice, Mamie's Cottage, Taybridge Terrace, Aberfeldy, PH15 2BS Tel (01887) 829 361 <u>victor@nativewoods.co.uk</u>

## THE WORKING PLAN

The following actions will be delivered by the Group during the period of this plan, in conjunction with SNH, ADMG and others. The actions will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis, and others added, as appropriate. These action points are taken from the previous two sections of the plan, covering both the Operation of the Group and the Public Interest Assessment. Wider background information on the current situation can be found in those sections.

### **OPERATION OF THE GROUP**

### Area & Boundaries

Action Point

1.1 Monitor the operation and accuracy of the three population models during the course of this plan, and review as required.

### Membership

Action Points

2.1 Before the end of 2016, look to recruit all landholdings as full members of the Group. It is likely that several will be paying a minimum subscription only.

2.2 During 2015, devise a suitable arrangement whereby the grazing committees can input in to the deer group, and where information on deer culled on crofters ground can be gathered to better inform Group management decisions.

### Meetings

Action Points

3.1 Look to encourage wider community participation, including invitations to community councils and grazing committees. All such groups to be given the opportunity to contribute to the agenda of meetings.

3.2 Minutes to be structured to include Action Points.

### **Constitution & Finances**

<u>Action Points</u> 4.1 A constitution to be adopted at Spring 2015 group meeting.

4.2 The group will produce annual budgets, and look to increase member subscription rates so that a buffer can be built up in bank account. A realistic aim would be to have the equivalent of one year's subscription to ADMG in reserve at all times.

Deer Management Plan

<u>Action Points</u> 5.1 Endorse DMP at spring 2015 meeting

5.2 Ensure a system of communications is in place whereby local interests have access to the plan, and can input to future development of it. This is especially important as many of these interests will only be seeing the document for the first time after endorsement by

### NW Sutherland Deer Management Group

group members themselves. The DMP will be copied to all local interests after adoption. Feedback will be invited, and any necessary changes will be made to the Plan at autumn 2015 meeting.

### **Code of Practice on Deer Management**

<u>Action Point</u> 6.1 Ensure adherence to code at all times, both by the Group, and by individual members.

### Data & Evidence gathering- Deer Counts

<u>Action Points</u> 9.1 It is highly recommended that a helicopter count is carried out in 2016 to establish a solid population baseline for the area. Such a baseline should then provide an appropriate degree of confidence to rely on population modelling over the subsequent five year period.

9.2 It is recommended that beyond 2016, that the Group undertakes a helicopter count every five years, relying on population modelling in between to set cull targets on an annual basis. Such counts may involve a degree of private or SRDP funding.

9.3 It is recommended that spring foot counts, if they are to take place at all, are integrated with recruitment counting each year in late April/early May, with the priority consideration at that point being to assess recruitment from the previous year, and to form a broad overview of the deer population and general health after the winter. There is a strong case to be made for abandoning spring counts if regular helicopter counts can be organized in their place, with the caveat that recruitment & mortality counts and population modelling are used and information used updated on an annual basis.

### Data & Evidence Gathering- Culls

Action Point

10.1 Update the population models and target culls on an annual basis, using recruitment and mortality data collected, as well as actual culls from the previous year.

### Data & Evidence Gathering- Habitat Monitoring

<u>Action Points</u> 11.1 A schedule of habitat and designated site monitoring will be devised in conjunction with SNH during 2015, and will be included in this Working Plan part of this document.

11.2 The DMG will co-operate with government agencies and provide or access sufficient resources to ensure that this programme is implemented over the ten year period of this plan.

11.3 Updated sheep information will be attained from SGRIPD for 2018 and 2023, in line with the data gathered on a five-year basis since 1993.

11.4 The DMG will liaise with grazing committees on an ongoing basis so that they are aware of any significant changes in sheep numbers or hill usage at a more local level.

### Competence

Action Point

12.1 DMG members will seek to ensure that DMQ Level 1 and Trained Hunter status are delivered as the now accepted industry standard within the area, and encouragement will

12.2 Questionnaire results suggest some confusion as to how "trained hunter" status is actually defined. NWS DMG to provide this clarification to all members, and to facilitate any necessary training to give all employees this status by the end of 2016.

12.3 Training or support in higher level qualifications will be encouraged where that is appropriate.

12.4 The DMG will work with crofters and grazing committees to ensure that deer culling carried out on crofting ground meets with all appropriate industry standards.

12.5 Training and support will also be sought from ADMG where that is required to help with running of the Deer Management group.

### Training

Action Points

13.1 Promote and facilitate the uptake of appropriate deer management qualifications, and specifically address the issue over how trained hunter status is defined.

13.2 Be aware of the ongoing development of Best Practice Guidance and any new techniques or standards that arise from that.

13.3 Review training needs on an annual basis.

### Venison Marketing

<u>Action Points</u> 14.1 The DMG will work with ADMG to promote uptake of SQWV within the area.

14.2 In the medium term, beyond the settling in period for this Plan, the DMG will explore options to market venison from the area in a more collaborative manner.

### Communications

Action Point

15.1 Implement the communications strategy as agreed, and ensure a mechanism is in place for dealing with business and issues between meetings.

### PUBLIC INTEREST ACTIONS

### Develop Mechanisms to manage deer

<u>Action Points</u> PIA 1.1 Publish and endorse the new NWS Deer Management Plan in spring 2015.

PIA 1.2 Re-assess the Group against both the Benchmark and the Public Interest criteria once DMP has been endorsed, and then annually thereafter.

PIA 1.3 Review the working plan on an annual basis and minute progress and changes.

### **Delivering Designated Features in to Favourable condition**

Action

PIA 2.1 Implement actions outlined in Working Plan re: designated sites.

- Druim na Coibe, Ben Loyal, Loch Meadie Peatlands and Bad na Gallaig are all now under an approved management regime, and it is considered that this will deliver Favourable condition in the medium term. Appropriate monitoring has been agreed.
- Cape Wrath and the Southern Parphe are also considered to be in Recovering condition, with appropriate levels of herbivores, but a better system of monitoring requires to be implemented there.
- Invernaver is in Recovering condition, but the required management prescription there involves active shepherding of sheep, and deer densities are considered to be appropriate to the site.

Six sites are in Unfavourable condition, and the action required for each is given here below:

• <u>Durness</u>

One of three major landholdings has yet to agree a suitable arrangement for managing sheep. No impacts are currently attributed to deer.

• <u>A'Mhoine</u>

Assured management is now in place on the major ownership, and deer densities are now likely to be appropriate across the whole. Agreement with crofters in relation to the northern part of the site would allow the whole area of nearly 6000 ha to move in to Recovering condition.

• <u>Ben Hope</u>

Measures currently in place should allow for restoration of all open ground features. Prescriptions currently being progressed for woodland area in conjunction with SNH, and once implemented, the whole site can be considered to be in Recovering condition.

• <u>Eriboll</u>

As with Ben Hope, the main concerns are associated with the woodland area, and with bracken in particular. Open ground habitats are in assured management and recovering. The woodland remnant here is particularly badly degraded.

### NW Sutherland Deer Management Group

• <u>Foinaven</u>

Positive progress with deer management has been made with most landowners, and the expectation is that Foinaven as a whole will move towards Recovering status in the near future. There requires to be a focus maintained on addressing regeneration of the woods at Strathbeg.

• <u>West Strathnaver</u>

The main issue is burning, leading to ground vegetation which is not very resilient and prone to trampling damage, although overall deer numbers are in line with densities on similar habitats which are in favourable or recovering condition. Drainage on part of the site is also an issue. The main management action here is to try and prevent any further fires across the site.

• <u>*River Borgie SSSI/ SAC</u> This site is designated for freshwater pearl mussels. There is little direct relevance to deer.*</u>

PIA 2.2 Also in Working Plan, implement the series of actions required to monitor designated sites over the ten year period of this plan.

# Manage Deer to retain existing Native Woodland cover and improve woodland condition in the medium to long term.

<u>Actions</u>

PIA 3.1 Achieve a reduction in browsing pressure using fencing in the Strathbeg Woods and Ben Hope Woodlands, by the end of the first five year period of this plan, 2020.

PIA 3.2 Monitor the browsing levels within the Loyal Estate and Hope Estate woodlands over the next 2-3 years to determine whether impacts have been reduced to low or medium.

### Demonstrate DMG contribution to woodland expansion target

<u>Actions</u>

PIA 4.1 NWS DMG members will not be asked to deliver a particular level of woodland creation over the period of this plan, but encouragement will be given to any proposals that increase regeneration and connectivity in and around designated and ancient woodland areas. In terms of mitigation of climate change, by far the greater contribution can be made by ensuring appropriate management of blankets bogs which extend to over 51,000 ha across the DMG.

PIA 4.2 It is anticipated that within the first 2-3 years of this plan that Wildland Ltd will outline the extent of woodland creation that they would like to undertake.

PIA 4.3 NWS DMG to assess the impact on deer populations of any proposals that come forwards from Wildland Ltd. It may be that the reduction cull already undertaken will result in a significant extension of low density woodland habitat across the 3 X properties and that no further action is required.

### Monitor and manage deer impacts in the wider countryside

Action Points

PIA 5.1 An agreed monitoring programme for these habitats will be devised during the summer of 2015, to be endorsed and included in this plan by autumn 2015.

### Improve Scotland's ability to store carbon

#### Actions

PIA 6.1 Achieve and maintain a broad target deer density of 5 deer per sq km or less across the DMG area. This should now broadly be the case already.

PIA 6.2 Achieve the reduction in herbivore impacts to woodland sites suggested earlier in this section of the document by the end of the first five year period of the plan.

PIA 6.3 Discourage any burning that might impact on peatland sites.

PIA 6.4 Contribute to River Basin Management Planning as appropriate when requests to do so are forthcoming.

### Reduce or mitigate the risk of invasive, non- native species

Action

PIA 7.1 Cull spreading sika deer in order to contain the current population in the southern part of the group.

PIA 7.2 Monitor woodland habitats in the south of the Group to establish if there is any evidence for sika numbers increasing there to unsustainable levels. This to be achieved by Group members, with advice from SNH as required. In practice, it is likely that an increasing population will export individuals to be culled in migration corridors to the west and to the north.

### **Protection of Historic and Cultural Features**

Actions

PIA 8.1 The DMG will maintain communication with the local community and look to address any issues that are identified with regards to sites of cultural interest and herbivore grazing.

PIA 8.2 As required by Forestry Commission, all potential woodland creation projects, including natural regeneration schemes, will be assessed by the applicants for any negative impacts on cultural or archaeological sites.

# Delivering higher standards of competence in deer management

Action Points

PIA 9.1 Clarify the definitions of "trained hunter" status and Fit & Competent register for all Group personnel, and look to ensure that all personnel hold trained hunter status by the end of 2016.

PIA 9.2 Maintain communication with Community Councils and Grazing committees in relation to any concerns that they may have in relation to unregulated deer culling activities, involving the local police where necessary.

### **Contribute to Public Health and wellbeing**

Action Points

PIA 10.1 Maintain communication with local Community Councils re: DVCs and look to implement any mitigation which may be deemed helpful in reducing local risk, particularly at Kinlochbervie.

PIA 10.2 DMG to clarify "Trained Hunter" status and ensure that all have attained this by end of 2016.

#### NW Sutherland Deer Management Group

PIA 10.3 Remind DMG members on an annual basis about the dangers of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) and individual members to ensure safety precautions are taken by anyone who has had recent contact with deer or habitats in North America.

PIA 10.4 DMG to highlight the risks of ticks and Lyme's Disease to their guests and the public more generally through all appropriate channels.

PIA 10.5 DMG to work with SNH and Highland Council re: improving access track at Ben Hope.

PIA10.6 Group members and DMG to all promote a positive and welcoming message to all those visiting the area throughout the year.

## Maximize Economic benefits associated with deer

Action Points

PIA 11.1 Increase awareness of the value of deer in and around areas of population, to emphasize the point that deer in these areas provide positive outcomes as well as some negative ones.

PIA 11.2 Investigate the possibility for a local means of advertising sporting opportunities within the area, during the first 2-3 years of this plan.

PIA 11.3 Investigate the potential for joint venison/lamb use of larders during the first 2-3 years of this plan. If appropriate, DMG to consider SRDP funding to help deliver.

### Minimize the economic costs of deer management

Action Points

PIA 12.1 DMG to assess the current PACEC survey in to the value/ costs of deer management and extract information from NWS in order to inform more fully the above narrative. Complete and adapt if necessary by spring 2016.

PIA 12.2 Engage with Grazing Committees to collate deer culls on lower ground, and see what management action might be employed to mitigate against unnecessary expense to crofters, and loss of deer to the deer management group as a whole. Set up communication and reporting structures by spring 2016.

### Ensure effective communication in deer management issues

Action Point

PIA 13.1 Take forwards those actions outlined in the Communications Policy/ Working Plan by spring 2016

### Ensure Deer welfare at individual and population level

Action Points

PIA 14.1 Engage grazing committees and help support training where appropriate to do so. Try to close down opportunities for unregulated stalking activity through peer pressure. PIA 14.2 Focus on bringing natural habitats in to favourable condition status.

PIA 14.3 Liaise locally on significant woodland management operations where these affect shelter for deer.

PIA 14.4 Collect deer information within the Group as per agreed recommendations. This will provide animal- specific data which can be monitored and compared to identify potential welfare issues within the area.

## **Population Modelling/ Five Year Cull Plan**

The following model is the agreed deer management model to be followed by the group during the period of this plan. The main objective of this management regime is to *actively maintain the habitats, forage and shelter required to sustain a healthy, resilient and productive deer herd,* capable of supporting a ongoing stag cull of 487 animals, and also be in keeping with the main natural heritage and woodland & croft protection objectives within the area. An agreed apportionment by Deer Management Unit of the cull for 2015-16, is also provided for each of the three sub-groups within NWSDMG as a separate document. An Excel spreadsheet version of these models is provided as <u>Appendix 7, NWS Five Year</u> <u>Population model.</u>

### North West Group

In this area, the 2013-14 cull, if repeated, will gradually reduce the overall deer population over the first five year period of the plan. There is no need to achieve this as almost all of the open ground features are in favourable or recovering condition, or under management that will reasonably allow a transition to favourable status to occur. It is suggested therefore that a stable population at the current level will broadly deliver the requirements of designated sites, and provide the resource needed to allow members to take their annual sporting requirement. A relatively small reduction of hinds will deliver a stable population, with no changes being required with regards to stag numbers culled. Any reduction of culling of hinds should be focused towards the North West of the area, with current practices being retained around Foinaven.

### North East Group

The population model allows for the current reduction cull at the centre of the Group, and then forecasts a steady maintenance cull over the five ear period which broadly supports the sporting requirements of most of the group members, while leaving a deer density low enough to allow the broad suite of habitat types to move in to favourable condition. The 2014-15 hind cull has been higher than anticipated, and it is therefore suggested that for 2015-16 that the stag and hind cull should be lower than the forecast ongoing maintenance cull.

### South Group

The deer population in the south of the group is believed to be fairly stable, with a stable cull having been taken from this for a number of years. The 2012 helicopter count was considered to be a serious under-estimate in this area, and requires to be regarded with some caution. The population model suggests that the sustainable cull in the South Group is lower than that actually taken. A reliable baseline count needs to be established to rectify this. Otherwise, designated features in this area are in favourable condition, the cull is stable and sporting requirements are being met, all suggesting that little change to current practice is required in this area.

North west sub group				
	Stags	Hinds	Calves	Density
March 2012 Population	1031	1543	555	4.2
2012 summer Population	1309	1821	674	5.1
2012/13 actual Cull	242	203	78	
2013 Mortality	26	36	40	
2013 Spring Population	1040	1581	555	4.3
2013 Summer Population	1318	1859	688	5.2
2013/14 Actual Cull	238	263	124	
2014 Mortality	26	37	41	
2014 Spring Population	1054	1559	522	4.2
2014 Summer Population	1315	1820	673	5.1
2014/15 Actual Cull	236	316	148	
2015 Mortality	26	36	40	
2015 Spring Population	1052	1467	485	4.0
2015 Summer Population	1295	1710	633	4.9
2015/16 Proposed Cull	230	220	80	
2016 Mortality	26	34	38	
2016 Spring Population	1039	1456	515	4.0
2016 Summer Population	1296	1713	634	4.9
2016/17 Proposed Cull	230	220	80	
2017 Mortality	26	34	38	
2017 Spring Population	1040	1459	516	4.0
2017 Summer Population	1298	1717	635	4.9
2017/18 Proposed Cull	230	220	80	
2018 Mortality	26	34	38	
2018 Spring Population	1042	1462	517	4.0
2018 Summer Population	1301	1721	637	4.9
2018/19 Proposed Cull	230	220	80	
2019 Mortality	26	34	38	
2019 Spring Population	1045	1466	518	4.1
2019 Summer Population	1304	1726	638	4.9
Target Summer Popn (2025)	1600	1600	650	5.2

Priority for the 2015-19 period is to produce a broadly stable deer population. Priority for the 2020-25 period is to achieve a 1:1 stag: hind ration, within the same overall density.

North east sub group				
	Stags	Hinds	Calves	Density
March 2012 Population	859	1939	603	5.5
2012 summer Population	1161	2241	784	6.8
2012/13 actual Cull	189	335	165	
2013 Mortality	23	45	47	
2013 Spring Population	948	1861	572	5.5
2013 Summer Population	1234	2147	751	6.7
2013/14 Actual Cull	224	766	310	
2014 Mortality	25	43	45	
2014 Spring Population	986	1338	396	4.4
2014 Summer Population	1184	1536	538	5.3
2014/15 Actual Cull	326	500	211	
2015 Mortality	24	31	32	
2015 Spring Population	834	1005	294	3.5
2015 Summer Population	981	1152	403	4.1
2015/16 Proposed Cull	110	100	30	
2016 Mortality	20	23	24	
2016 Spring Population	852	1029	349	3.6
2016 Summer Population	1026	1204	421	4.3
2016/17 Proposed Cull	162	160	55	
2017 Mortality	21	24	25	
2017 Spring Population	844	1020	341	3.6
2017 Summer Population	1014	1190	417	4.3
2017/18 Proposed Cull	162	160	55	
2018 Mortality	20	24	25	
2018 Spring Population	832	1007	337	3.5
2018 Summer Population	1000	1175	411	4.2
2018/19 Proposed Cull	162	160	55	
2019 Mortality	20	23	25	
2019 Spring Population	818	991	332	3.5
2019 Summer Population	984	1157	405	4.1
Target Summer Popn (2025)	1100	1100	425	4.3

Priority for the 2015-19 period is to produce a broadly stable deer population. Priority for the 2020-25 period is to achieve a 1:1 stag: hind ration, within the same overall density.

South sub group				
	Stags	Hinds	Calves	Density
March 2012 Population	794	575	190	5.2
2012 summer Population	889	670	235	6.0
2012/13 actual Cull	87	75	23	
2013 Mortality	18	13	14	
2013 Spring Population	784	582	197	5.3
2013 Summer Population	883	680	238	6.1
2013/14 Actual Cull	87	95	33	
2014 Mortality	18	14	14	
2014 Spring Population	778	572	191	5.2
2014 Summer Population	874	667	233	6.0
2014/15 Actual Cull	91	90	40	
2015 Mortality	17	13	14	
2015 Spring Population	765	564	179	5.1
2015 Summer Population	855	654	229	5.8
2015/16 Proposed Cull	80	70	28	
2016 Mortality	17	13	14	
2016 Spring Population	758	570	187	5.1
2016 Summer Population	851	664	232	5.9
2016/17 Proposed Cull	80	70	28	
2017 Mortality	17	13	14	
2017 Spring Population	754	581	190	5.1
2017 Summer Population	850	676	237	5.9
2017/18 Proposed Cull	80	70	28	
2018 Mortality	17	14	14	
2018 Spring Population	753	592	194	5.2
2018 Summer Population	850	690	241	6.0
2018/19 Proposed Cull	80	70	28	
2019 Mortality	17	14	14	
2019 Spring Population	753	606	199	5.2
2019 Summer Population	852	705	247	6.1
Target Summer Popn (2025)	850	850	270	6.6
**Model requires better count data to confirm current population				Too High

There is some doubt over the actual deer population at present within the southern area of the group, but this should be better informed by a count in 2016. Of the three population models, there is currently a lesser degree of confidence in this southern model.

### The property-specific culls are outlined in <u>Appendix 5, NWS Target Culls 2015-16</u>. These are confidential to Group members and to SNH.

## **Habitat Monitoring**

A key part of this plan will be to agree, fund and implement a comprehensive programme of habitat monitoring across the DMG, both on designated sites and in the wider countryside.

Such a programme will consist of a combination of statutory Site Condition Monitoring (SCM) by SNH, and private habitat impact assessments (HIA), a proportion of which may be carried out by contractor, or where training may be required to bring estate staff up to the necessary level of ability to do this themselves. A key part of any programme will be agency support in identifying sample plots, and storage and upkeep of information.

ADMG are currently working with SNH to deliver a mechanism for helping support habitat assessment and information storage. This programme is known as SWARD, it has been piloted over the past 18 months or so, and should be available for use in the near future.

Such a mechanism is required to allow the Group to quantify the resources needed to carry out monitoring over the ten year period of this plan. It is not considered that the Group are in a position to do this at the moment.

It is suggested that such a programme of monitoring is established by the Group in conjunction with SNH by April 2016, with sufficient information being available to allow an SRDP application to be submitted on behalf of the Group. It is suggested that between the Collaboration Fund, the Agro Environment Scheme and support from SNH, that it will be possible to cover the cost of development of such a habitat monitoring programme, which is expected to include provision for training as well as the potential use of contractors.

One interesting question going forwards will be the degree to which habitat monitoring should take place in the wider countryside, outwith designated sites. The extent and distribution of designated features across the group is such that assessment of the designated features could almost certainly be used as a proxy for the whole area.

There may be some exceptions to this, and this will have to be looked at in some detail, but the mixture of habitat types is relatively straightforward across the group area, the the condition of the designated habitats is likely to give a good indication of the condition of the habitat resources as a whole.

### **NWS DMG Rural Development Contracts**

The following group members have ongoing RDC contracts which include an element of deer management planning' focused mainly on restoration and maintenance of peatland habitats. In addition to these, a number of common grazing committees also have RDC contracts, again focused on peatlands/ moorland management. In most cases, these are important to the income of each committee, and include monitoring requirements as well as sheep stocking densities and a commitment not to burn heather. In almost all these latter cases, the grazing committees have very little information on deer numbers, let alone any input to management decisions regarding them.

In general, the applications have been individually applied for, albeit with some SNH encouragement. Monitoring requirements vary, and, as a whole, the contracts appear relatively disjointed. Going forwards, there is a strong argument for entering in to a larger, collaborative SRDP application, covering a number of key properties.

Most of these contracts are now coming to an end, or have just recently come to the end of their five year period. It would be beneficial for the Group, for individual applicants and for the habitats they wish to protect if their was a better co-ordination of contracts going forwards, and this should be possibly through the new mechanisms which are understood to be coming forwards under SRDP.

Altnaharra Keodale Rhigolter Farms Rispond/ Durness Strathmore Eriboll Syre/ North Loch Naver

A number of individual properties have their own deer management plans although, in general, these are off limited value as they do not really link to adjacent properties, and this current DMG plan should be off greater use and interest to them. Several of these plans amount to policy statements only.

Reay Forest Sandwood MoD Tongue estate Achnabourin.

A partial attempt was made to devise a Group DMP in 2006, and more recently, SNH tried to begin a management planning process, with a partial return of questionnaires.

There are a number of management agreements in place as well with SNH, particularly with common grazing committees, but also with Gualin Estate.

Reay Forest Estate and Syre/ North Loch Naver have long term forest plans in place, which include an element of felling/ fencing/ restocking of mature conifer plantations. A number of group members, as well as grazing committees, have entered in to woodland creation schemes in the past five years, and these will have maintenance obligations.

### Potential Schemes within the period of this Plan

A number of existing schemes will have lapsed, or are about to lapse, and some of these should be renewed going forwards.

It is likely to be more beneficial to all concerned if a single co-ordinated application is developed, and the new SRDP scheme should certainly allow for that. That would allow for better oversight of the whole, and reduce overall administrative and application costs, although it is likely that many properties will simply decide to deliver their individual deer culls through their own resources, and retain flexibility in that way.

In the preparation of this plan, no group members came forwards with any significant plans for woodland creation, or changes in livestock numbers which would include grant scheme input.

The proposals by Wildland Ltd to create/ maintain a range of habitat types are still in development, and it is likely that the deer cull already achieved will satisfy many of these. It will be a number of years before any woodland regeneration can be assessed and quantified, and it be the case that a formal SRDP application is applicable at that point. The scale and nature of that is not possible to determine at this time, but there may be deer management implications arising from that, and the DMG will be an important consultee in that process.