



Appendix 6.1

Email correspondence with [REDACTED]

Email from [REDACTED], sent on the 17 October 2023

To: Sarah Henshall, Andy Ford, Jonathan Willet, nature@cairngorms.co.uk, Grant Moir, mailmanager@cairngorms.co.uk

CC: Ali McKnight; [REDACTED], John Kirk, Ian Wilson, [REDACTED], Kirsten Brewster, Anne Elliott, enquiries@nature.scot, Lewis Pate

Dear Sarah, Johnathon, Andy etc

I am not sure if I did a written response to the official Beaver "consultation" and had assumed all our points raised at the Farmers meeting in Kingussie and the consultation / engagement meeting in the Duke of Gordon Hotel.

I understand the meetings at Laggan and Nethybridge seem to have been given more focus than the Kingussie one. Possibly because their immediate concerns were flood banks from damage and breaching from Beaver Burrows. Although we did not discuss it directly in Kingussie it is still a concern to us on the Spey and its tributaries. Personally I have spent a lot of money in the last 7 years repairing my flood banks on the Gynack for instance. They are adjacent to the river so potentially at risk ?

So I think cthe main points are:

- 1: Nature Scot should NOT issue a licence for Beaver Release / Translocation until a PROPER BEAVER MITIGATION PLAN is in place that is satisfactory to local farmers and crofters. This should be structured to address some of the points below.
- 2: A proper written framework of support and payment assistance to land managers to cover any damage or remedial work as a result of the introduction of Beavers. Or reduction in land value from wetting.
- 3: A proper written mitigation plan to cover things like areas where Beavers should be excluded from and where Burrows and or Dams etc would not be allowed.



4: Who removes the Beaver Dams ? Why should the farmers have to do it ? It is not their Beavers ?

5: What compensation will there be to damage to trees and other natural features etc ?

6: Damage to any wooden structures of flood banks, paths etc ?

7: WHEN I ASKED NATURE SCOT WHO WOULD PAY TO REPAIR A BREACHED FLOOD BANK AT THE DUKE OF GORDON EVENT THEY SAID "NOT US BECAUSE WE HAVE NO MONEY".

REPAIRING FLOOD BANK DAMAGE CAN COSTS TEN'S OF THOUSANDS TO REPAIR - SO WHO WILL PAY FOR IT ?

8: We want a Beaver exclusion zone on the flood plain at Kingussie - Dellmore, DellBeag, Pitmain etc to stop drainage ditches, channels and canals from being blocked.

That is all I can think of for now - but this needs to be on record. We are not in favour of the reintroduction of Beavers till the above have been addressed.

Thanks



PS:

1: One of the biggest issues raised at the Kingussie Meeting was that Farmers and Crofters feel like we are not included or consulted on most issues in the CNPA. There has been very little engagement for years since the days of Gordon McConnachie. We are at the fore front of a lot of CNPA policy implementation and should be onboard from the start. After all we deliver a lot of "the heavy lifting" required to produce the results CNPA have committed too when it comes to nature, biodiversity and climate change / carbon capture etc.

2: I do not think most of us even begin to understand carbon offsetting, capture, licencing, trading - yet we are told we are a big part of it ? Why do we have to carbon audits on our farms ? So that somebody can SELL OFF the "local jewels" to offset somebody else's carbon. Why should we be made to feel guilty with our "polluting cows" when an airport can be "green" because it has declared itself carbon neutral ?? Why is the carbon capture potential of our lands being sold so others can continue to pollute. Why is the CNPA helping this "grand scheme" by using public money for Peatland Restoration so



land owners can sell their carbon capture potential for even more ????. Is it all some weird scam, money making scheme to benefit large land owners ? I cannot be the only one asking this question ? I heard it from a friend last that it feels like "Others are having a party on our behalf and we are being left to do the dishes?"

3: In view of the above point 2 why can communities not get a percentage of this "carbon cash" to help provide things like local community housing.etc ? Because we are a NP we cannot get this community funding from Windmills. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] we were told we would be getting in the region of £1200 per year per turbine for two wind turbines that were planned [REDACTED] near the village. That was almost 20 years ago - so what would it be today ? Especially with the huge increase in power prices.

4: I have also heard of a £10 million deal to offset carbon for Gatwick Airport - if it is true I am sure you will know of it ? We also have Standard Life / abrdn "developing" their carbon capture on +/- 5000 acres at Far Ralia Kingussie / Newtonmore - how exactly is the money made and by whom and because our natural local landscape is being used why can the communities not benefit if it is allowing others to "party on as before" and not reducing carbon footprint ?

[REDACTED]