

Appendix I – Public Consultation Record.

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
<p>Local community and neighbors.</p> <p>All properties directly adjacent to the landholding were contacted via leaflet drop and/or email (where ownership details could be determined) and posters were erected in local community centers. Community Councils were requested to disseminate the consultation details amongst their members.</p>	20/08/2024	<p>10/09/2024 Ballingry drop-in event</p> <p>18/09/2024 Cardenden drop-in event</p> <p>Other than those received at the two drop-in events, no other comments were provided.</p>	<p>Responses / comments provided at Ballingry drop-in event Attendance of 6 from Ballingry and the surrounding area, main issues raised summarised below:</p> <p>Paths and access: Some queries were raised about paths through Benarty and other sites, in particular construction of a link path to the top of Benarty Hill.</p> <p>Flooding: One attendee commented that several properties in Ballingry have suffered from seasonal flooding coming off Benarty Hill and that this was often attributed to our previous felling operations. However, the attendee felt the flooding has been a long-standing issue and is more likely linked to inadequate infrastructure in the village (e.g. collapsed culvert).</p> <p>(Public) road condition: One person raised concerns regarding the unclassified road [U018] entering Ballingry from the west, which is in poor condition and is not a priority for the Local Authority. Concerns about encroachment of trees reducing the useable width of the road (on and off FLS land) and Japanese knotweed fly tipping (off FLS land), which has been reported to the Local Authority. Repeated fly tipping has also reduced the number of laybys available on this road.</p> <p>Road upgrade at Pitcairn (Torres Loan): One resident from the Pitcairn area raised a concern regarding the proposed road upgrade/new turning area on Torres Loan and that</p>	<p>Response to comments raised and provided at Ballingry drop-in We are grateful to all attendees for their comments and have detailed our response to the individual enquiries below:</p> <p>Paths and access: Paths will be kept open as long as possible and only closed for a limited period (for safety purposes) when operations are ongoing. [See also comments below re. Benarty paths and diversions.] Noted that most of the suggested path up Benarty Hill would be outwith FLS ownership, and that surfaced paths/tracks and good quality desire lines are available within and up to our ownership boundary.</p> <p>Flooding: We are grateful to the individual for raising this issue and providing information regarding the localised flooding problems in Ballingry. In light of this response we have conducted an assessment on the potential impact of forestry operations to flood risk within this local catchment (based on published guidance from Forest Research), and determined that the previous and proposed felling operations fall well below the threshold which would significantly influence water run-off and downstream flooding in this area.</p> <p>(Public) road condition: As highlighted during the drop-in, we consider it to be the responsibility of the Local Authority to maintain road condition, including maintaining a suitable operating width and that roadside trees on FLS land are appropriately inspected for safety purposes. Japanese knotweed has also been reported to the relevant Local Authority for action.</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>the surface of this would not be suitable for riding if the planned thinning operation was delayed or did not go ahead.</p> <p>Responses / comments provided at Cardenden drop-in event Attendance of 11, mainly from Keirs Brae, Cardenden, in addition to representatives from the Local Access Forum and Cardenden Community Council; and Riding Off Road Scotland.</p> <p>The representative for the Local Access Forum and Cardenden Community Council raised several queries/concerns, which are detailed in their response on behalf of Cardenden Community Council, below.</p> <p>The representative from Riding Off Road Scotland enquired as to the plans for the Tullylumb Plantation area of Cardenden and highlighted that Cardenden Motorcross (Kingdom Offroad) may request some of this area through the Community Asset Transfer Scheme in future.</p> <p>Several residents from Keirs Brae raised similar queries regarding management of the New Carden Plantation which is directly behind these properties. In particular, concerns were raised about the boundary trees adjacent to the Keirs Brae properties (specifically tree safety (including during high winds), shading, and leaf fall); and a proposed management of these trees and the wider woodland area.</p> <p>Two residents (in particular), from the same address, also raised concerns about runoff from the woodland which affected their property at Keirs Brae.</p> <p>Generally attendees were happy with the proposals for the New Carden Plantation, and the wider LMP area.</p>	<p>Road upgrade at Pitcairn (Torres Loan): Noted that this is more of an issue to be dealt with at the work planning/programming stage but we will endeavor to ensure the planned road upgrade is planned to minimize disruption.</p> <p>Response to comments raised and provided at Cardenden drop-in We are grateful to all attendees for their comments and have detailed our response to the individual enquiries below.</p> <p>Our response to queries raised on behalf of Cardenden Community Council and the Local Access Forum are detailed together with that written response (see below).</p> <p>Clarified our plans for Tullylumb Plantation, including what management would likely be required if this area was transferred through the CATS, and noted potential application through CATS may be made for this area in the future.</p> <p>We clarified the plans for the New Carden Plantation – specifically thinning/LISS felling and development of native woodland – which were well received. Also clarified that boundary trees are inspected annually for tree safety purposes, but would not be actively managed unless this was deemed necessary for safety purposes.</p> <p>Noted the issue/concern raised regarding surface water runoff from the woodland, however we consider this to be a natural seasonal phenomenon which is not within our responsibility to manage. Some concerns were highlighted regarding a drainage ditch along the boundary of the woodland and we have undertaken to informally inspect this feature, although we would not normally manage these ditches unless required as part of standard forestry operations compliance. The proposed small-scale operations in this area are considered unlikely to significantly alter runoff from this site, or otherwise affect water movement in the local area.</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
Cardenden Community Council and Local Access Forum	16/08/2024	16/08/2024 22/09/2024	<p>Requested extension until 25/09/2024.</p> <p>Please find below Cardenden Community Council comments in respect of the proposed South East Woodland Management proposals. Best regards Cardenden Community Council Representative</p> <p>Cullaloe FLS indicate that no work is planned as much of the area is leased for future extraction work. Our concern here is the proximity of this leased area to the existing core path through the area . The core path doesn't seem to show in any maps in the document pertaining to this area! I personally have already heard from many path users that the area has been spoiled for recreational use because of the proximity of the quarry . We note that Historical Environment Scotland , in the planning application documents , do not comment on the folly situated on the core path . This core path is a well established route linking to the Old North Road . This was highlighted this to the Access Officer around 4 years ago when planning applications were first seen. Could FLS let us know what information they have been given by Fife Council in respect of the core path in this area.</p> <p>South Dundonald This seems to be predominantly establishing new planting areas and we can see the benefits of this plus the proposal for the creation of two new access areas to the new plantations . From an access perspective FLS are creating a new access road from South Dundonald . We would like to request that this is extended to meet the existing forest / core path which would facilitate access to paths users when work is complete. Presently access to the Shawsmill area of forest involves walking along road without a pavement so this would be safer access. The other access point nearer to Muirhead is beneficial as it links more easily to core paths towards Auchtertool .</p>	<p>Extension granted.</p> <p>[Response sent 27/01/25]</p> <p>Thank you for sending these comments regarding the draft South East Fife Woods Land Management Plan (LMP) on behalf of Cardenden Community Council, and for attending our drop in event at the Corrie Centre on the 18th of September. I appreciate the time and detail you took to comment on the draft LMP and have responded to the comments you raised below.</p> <p>Regarding Cullaloe, we note your concerns regarding Core Path R738 (Goat Quarry, Cullaloe Hills), and can confirm that FLS, Fife Council and Collier's Quarry are working together to resolve current issues with the core path within the quarry area and identify suitable mitigation including an alternative route.</p> <p>Regarding the folly at Cullaloe (assuming this is referring to Cullaloe Tower, and not Cullaloe Temple which is outwith our ownership); as highlighted in the LMP text, we have no plans to manage this feature, nor do we propose any management which would be likely to affect it. While Cullaloe Tower is outwith the lease area for the quarry, any concerns regarding the protection of this feature in relation to the quarry development would be best and addressed by Historic Environment Scotland and/or the Fife Council Planning Department.</p> <p>Regarding South Dundonald, as discussed at the drop-in event, only one of the two proposed new forest roads will be constructed within the lifetime of this plan, although both will be developed in the fulness of time (in addition to a separate access to the field south of the public road). Unfortunately due to budget limitations and the significant cost of road construction we would not be able to extend the easternmost road, or similarly construct a new footpath and crossing point for the Den Burn to link with Core Path R490 (Shawsmill to Carden Wood), as suggested, at present. However, the route of any new road(s) will still be available for recreation under SOAC and we would be happy to work in collaboration with other groups who could invest in installation and maintenance of additional access infrastructure. Otherwise, we were pleased to hear</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>Cardenden As this seems to involve timber extraction and thinning we guess this is justified . FLS intend to upgrade Tullylumb access which is no bad thing as present tracks are prone to flooding . Our other comments in respect of this are that ,from past experience in the whole Carden forest area , FLS employ sub contractors to undertake this type of work . In the past this did not seem to be micro managed by FLS and the paths were left in a mess with off cut branches not cleared , deep vehicle tracks and there appeared to be little consideration by these subcontractors to restore paths to an acceptable level . Could any paths used please be restored to an acceptable level .</p> <p>Pitcairn Obvious concerns here are the acknowledgment that there are several key routes involved where the proposed work is to be undertaken.</p> <p>1: Fife Pilgrim Way/ Torres Loan 2: Access track from Torres loan to new cycle path on B9097 3: Pitcairn Path Network (on proposed core path list) 4: Core path 519 which is crucial link from FPW to Cardenden</p> <p>FPW / Torres Loan will benefit from an upgrade as will the access track to new cycle path . We would hope there would be an assurance that the Pitcairn path network and core path 519 will be treated with respect and any damage rectified appropriately . We note that in the Pitcairn area the path disruption will be kept to a minimum and diversions put in place where necessarythis is to be done through liaison with Fife Access OfficerFife Council currently do not have an Access Officer in post.</p> <p>Benarty This work would appear to severely limit access to some key routes ...Sleeping Giant Path and various Benarty Hill access points . Whilst there are some community paths that link to the main core path they all ,at some point , meet the access track to where FLS wish to undertake work. It will be interesting to see what plans FLS propose for safe diversions. I personally have seen some clever diversions undertaken in Blairadam when similar work was undertaken but it</p>	<p>the Community Council are supportive of the woodland creation proposals for South Dundonald.</p> <p>Regarding Cardenden, it is now unlikely the Tullylumb access will be upgraded as originally indicated as we are planning to reduce the scope of operations in this area over the next 10 years, which would in turn negate or reduce the need for the upgraded access road. However, it is good to know you would be supportive of upgrade works on this section of access road, which we may revisit in the future. With regards to the quality of work and damage to, or blockage of, tracks due to forest operations – we are aware there have been some instances where this has occurred in the past, for example due to unforeseen staff illness. However, I understand that more recent operations (completed in 2023) were carried out to a high standard and as far as we are aware these resulted in minimum damage or disruption to public access. We will of course endeavor to ensure this standard continues to be the case for future operations.</p> <p>Regarding Pitcairn, we note that an upgrade to the Torres Loan access track would similarly be seen as beneficial; and that there is a balance to be achieved (as highlighted by another consultee response) between the quality of the upgrade, the impact of proposed operations, and the suitability of the surface for recreational use thereafter. We will endeavor to ensure these works are planned and implemented accordingly, should the proposed operations in this forest go ahead.</p> <p>Regarding the core paths at Benarty and Pitcairn, access routes will be planned and managed prior to and during operations to minimize disruption and temporary closures while maintaining safety for forestry operators and the general public. In the absence of a Local Access Officer in Fife Council, consultation will be with a suitable alternative team within the Council, as is currently happening for the Core Path issue at Cullaloe.</p> <p>More generally, regarding the maintenance of desire lines, unfortunately these cannot always be protected during forestry operations given their transitory nature and the need to consider other constraints. However, where there are well-used local routes</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			would be important that there are diversions and not total closures . Historically FLS have undertaken work in the Benarty area and decimated desire lines including a superb path up to Benarty Hill from the core paths . This path has ,over the years , been re-established of sorts but not because of any efforts by FLS but by local mountain bikers . It is important that paths and desire lines are acknowledged and protected.	we will endeavor to minimize damage to the effect that these, or a similar equivalent route can be accessed again in future. Where there are particularly well-used desire lines, we are happy for these to be highlighted. (As always, Jenny Ventham or Andrew Clark would be the best first points of contact for any future queries or concerns regarding public access).
Ballingry Community Council			No response received.	n/a
Fife Council (Biodiversity Officer)	20/08/2024		Good morning, Thank you for your email. I was wondering whether you'll be putting in a data request for information on species recorded in the affected areas, etc.? I was also wondering whether the Land Management Plan areas were available in GIS format? Would you like us to circulate details of the consultation / drop in events? Information Officer - Fife Nature Records Centre	Requested circulation of details for consultation / drop-in events. Provided shapefiles for LMP area. Confirmed we have good information on habitats / species within these sites and will not be submitting a data request. [No further responses received from Fife Nature Records Centre.]
NatureScot	20/08/2024	04/09/2024	Good morning Thanks for consulting us the South East Fife Forest Land Management Plan. We would like to highlight the following advice regarding forestry work on or near peatland. We thought this would be of use to you if any of the works fall into this category. https://www.nature.scot/doc/peatland-action-technical-compendium regards Operations Officer - South	Thanks for your response to the SE Fife LMP consultation. I've had a look at the guidance you sent and as this appears to relate to peatland restoration I don't believe it is relevant to our plans for these sites.
Stirling and Fife Timber Transport Project Officer	20/08/2024		As is usually the case when commenting on LMPs etc., I've provided specific points on roads of which I'm aware, then general information and links to industry good practice. Should timber traffic measures be required for any of the roads (which, as you've already highlighted, will be), it would be for FLS and the council's roads authority to discuss and confirm those which may need to be considered as and when timber haulage was being planned.	[Response sent 27/01/25] Many thanks for your response and in particular providing a link to the Fife Council Road Adoption map which will be useful in discussions with the Council, and for inclusion of the correct road numbers on our timber haulage maps. Thanks also for the confirmation there are no TTMPs currently active within the Fife Local Authority area.

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>In terms of specific timber haulage considerations, I would make the following comments for each of the woodlands where felling/thinning will/may be taking place: -</p> <p>Benarty</p> <p>1. Many thanks for noting in the Scoping information under Key Considerations that you will consult with Fife Council and the local Timber Transport Officer over the minor rural road which serves the forest. For your information, this road is the U018 according to Fife Council's Road Adoption map;</p> <p>2. Thanks too for showing the exit point at which timber lorries would join the public road network on Map 03 (see also point 4. under All woodlands re. grid references).</p> <p>Pitcairn</p> <p>1. Whilst timber haulage isn't mentioned in the Key Considerations section, it looks like the forest road joins up with the B9097 at BNG: 320341, 697323. The B9097 and surrounding B-class roads (B921 and B981) are currently classified as Consultation Routes under the Agreed Routes Map system, as, given Fife Council doesn't yet have a more formal Agreed Routes Map, we use the default system whereby A-class roads are considered to be Agreed Routes (unless any carry a weight/height/width restriction or other Traffic Regulation Order which would prevent timber lorries from using the route) and B-class, C-class and unclassified roads, Consultation Routes. As has been done for Benarty, please could reference to these ARM classifications be noted (ideally in the text of the LMP as well as on the relevant maps), together with the measures that will be taken (e.g. consult with Fife Council and the local Timber Transport Project Officer).</p> <p>Cardenden</p> <p>1. As mentioned for Pitcairn above, other than the A92 (an Agreed Route), all the public roads providing access to the woodland blocks (e.g. the B981, C2, Sunnyside Road) would be considered Consultation Routes under the Agreed Routes Map system. In which case, please could reference to these ARM classifications be noted (again, ideally in the LMP text as well as on the relevant maps), together with the measures that will be taken.</p>	<p>Fife Council Roads Department were also contacted as part of the consultation but unfortunately failed to provide any comments. Rest assured we will be contacting the Council again, and in particular concerning timber haulage onto consultation routes at Benarty, Pitcairn and Cardenden; and proposals for a new road entrance at South Dundonald (Cardenden).</p> <p>A timber transport map has been produced as part of the full LMP submission, which includes marked entrance points with NGRs, estimated tonnage for each phase, and in light of this response, ARM classification for the receiving public road concerned. Similarly, reference has been added to the Timber Transport Forum's good practice guidance. Considering there are no ARM classified roads in Fife, I have used standard OS symbology on the relevant timber transport map.</p> <p>Noted and thanks also for the advice regarding TTF publications, ongoing liaison with Community Councils and Local Authority Roads Department(s), inclusion of haulage particulars in standing sales tenders/contracts, and recommendation to record road condition (outwith most agreed routes) pre- and post-haulage.</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>Cullaloe</p> <p>1. I note that no active management is currently proposed here for the next 10 years, unless felling of the larch needs to be brought forward to address any outbreaks of P. ramorum. Were this to happen (let's hope not!), I note that the exit point on the public road network would be onto the A909 (an Agreed Route) but depending on onward travel, may take lorries onto the B925 (a Consultation Route). As with the other woodlands, please could reference to these ARM classifications (and measures to be taken should any Consultation Routes be used) be noted in the LMP text and relevant maps.</p> <p>All woodlands</p> <p>1. If marking up any roads on maps with their Agreed Routes Map classifications, if possible (though not essential), could this be done in the standard ARM colours (e.g. Agreed Route = green, Consultation Route = yellow) so that there is a consistency with the Agreed Routes Map website;</p> <p>2. I expect you will be doing this already but please can adherence to the Timber Transport Forum's good practice guidance such as Transporting Timber on Public Roads, the Road Haulage of Round Timber Code of Practice and Loading timber from roadside forests be highlighted in the main body of LMP where appropriate;</p> <p>3. I'm sure you'll have this information through local knowledge and the current scoping process for the LMP, but as most of the roads are Consultation Routes, meaning prior notification of haulage operations should be given to the relevant Community Council, details of these can be found on Fife Council's Map of Community Councils and their boundaries;</p> <p>4. Again, I'm sure this would be happening anyway, but please can the LMP include a timber haulage map for timber haulage exit points (as per Table C.2.8. and Appendix 2 of the Forestry Commission Scotland Long Term Forest Plans Applicant's guidance) which shows the grid references of all exit points where the forest access/es join/s the public road network (I appreciate that in this case, there will be a few), together with the forecast tonnage in each LMP Phase which would be hauled out of each point; the latter would be particularly helpful for providing catchment level forecasts and assisting with the coordination of multiple haulage operations, if required.</p>	

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>More generally, when responding to LMP/LTFP/FPA/woodland creation proposals, the Stirling & Tayside Timber Transport Group would comment as follows: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We would ask that applicants refer to the Timber Transport Forum publication Transporting Timber on Public Roads and follow the recommendations contained therein, particularly those set out in the Timber Haulage Consultation Protocol (Fig. 1) on pages 5 and 6 and the Advisory Traffic Management Measures (Fig. 2) on pages 7 and 8 for each of the road categories used in the Agreed Routes Map system; 2. We particularly wish to highlight that consultation between the forest manager/agent and local authority should occur at various stages throughout the process (see steps 1, 2 & 5 of the Timber Haulage Consultation Protocol) and, again, between the forest manager/agent/forest works manager and local authority (see steps 6 & 7) and not just at the scoping stage; 3. Should harvesting operations be undertaken under a standing sale contract, we would ask that tenders and contracts make specific reference to any timber transport measures (including to any TTMPs - I can confirm that there are currently no TTMPs in place on any roads in Fife) that follow discussions with the relevant local authority so that all parties are aware of what is expected; 4. On roads other than Agreed Routes (or on Agreed Routes if there are any concerns), we would encourage applicants/forest works managers to take a video (and/or photos) pre and post haulage and retain as a record of their condition so that any changes can be identified and discussed with the local authority, if required. <p>I hope these comments are helpful as the South East Fife Woods LMP develops, but should you have any queries or require further information, please don't hesitate to contact me.</p>	
Fife Council			<p>Please find attached consultation response from the Fife Council Planning Services Environment Team (covering Archaeology, Tree Protection and Natural Heritage).</p> <p>If you have any queries or require clarification/s, just let me know.</p>	<p>[Response sent 27/01/25]</p> <p>Thanks again for providing the attached response to the South East Fife Woods Land Management Plan consultation on behalf of the Fife Council Planning Services Environment Team, and providing the subsequent clarifications re. archaeology. As promised, I've</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>Natural Heritage Officer Policy & Place Team Planning Services Fife Council</p> <p>[Summary of PDF and subsequent email response(s) copied below, full response available on request.]</p> <p>Archaeology</p> <p>[Confirmed via email that archaeological records are shared by HES and are publicly available via PastMap.]</p> <p>Tree protection</p> <p>No statutory tree protections affect any described woodland. ... there are long established (plantation origin) woodlands [and it is] likely soil environments have developed complex physical structure, microbiota communities, and carbon storage. This natural resource is incredibly valuable and finite, so protection must be prioritised; INNS encroachment must be appropriately managed; and CCF used where possible to ensure consistency of canopy and minimise risks to soil environments such as erosion.</p> <p>All described woodland and coupes are affected by proximity to Core Paths and public walking use, so impact to amenity must be properly considered, along with health and safety during harvesting operations.</p> <p>With regards to proposed woodland creation at South Donaldson Farm ... UKFS states no more than 65% allocation to a single species should occur for a forest management unit, so if this farm is viewed as a single unit, this 65% maximum for Norway spruce should be followed in the interest of maximising resilience and adaptability.</p> <p>Broadly, this LMP is in line with UKFS, [UK]WAS and the Scotland Forestry Strategy 2019-2029. Greater diversification of existing and future woodlands, reliance of native broadleaf where possible, and transition away from monocultures in the creation of sources of local timber, will improve sustainability as well as climate change resilience. Local timber production can contribute to local</p>	<p>considered the points raised by the Planning Services team and responded to the main issues raised, in general terms, below.</p> <p>Firstly, we clarified that the relevant archaeological records held by Fife Council are available via PastMap; therefore we consider that no further consultation is required regarding archaeology at this stage. (Archaeological records are held in our GIS systems and mitigation advice provided by the FLS Environment team and national advisers as required.)</p> <p>Noted there are no statutory tree protections (Tree Protection Orders or Conservation Areas) present within the LMP area. The presence of LEPO sites is noted in the LMP and the majority of these are identified for low-impact management where this is possible. INNS control will be carried out as budgets and resource constraints allow (and this has been noted in the final LMP).</p> <p>Regarding core paths – access routes will be suitably planned and managed prior to and during operations to minimize disruption and temporary closures while maintaining safety for forestry operators and the general public. (In the absence of a Local Access Officer in Fife Council, consultation will be with a suitable alternative team within the Council.) The future forest design and management proposals within the LMP have also considered the presence of significant recreation routes such as Core Paths and Rights of Way.</p> <p>Regarding species diversity for South Dundonald Farm – this area is included as part of the wider Cardenden forest block, and for the purposes of UKFS species requirements the forest management unit is taken as the whole Land Management Plan area (i.e. Benarty, Pitcairn, Cardenden and Cullaloe forest blocks).</p> <p>Noted that Fife Council are supportive of the LMP proposals in line with the UK Forestry Standard, UKWAS, and Scotland’s Forestry Strategy 2019-2029, including proposed new woodland creation at South Dundonald Farm, and we are pleased the Council are supportive of these proposals.</p> <p>Noted presence of species of conservation interest and reference to the guidance issued by Scottish Forestry relating to wildlife and</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>economies and developing local timber markets, and use of LISS can minimise impact of harvesting.</p> <p>Natural Heritage</p> <p><u>Woodland Creation</u> The proposed planting of South Dundonald will significantly increase the woodland cover of the Cardenden LMP area, particularly as a range of productive (i.e. for timber production) non-native conifers and native broadleaves and other native species planted for biodiversity/amenity value are proposed. The proposed woodland creation will increase the continuity of woodland habitat in this area, reinforcing the east-west habitat network extending along the Gelly and Den burns and south towards the coast, where the forestry is a mixture of fragmented coupes and linear woodland features linking to the urban edge of Kirkcaldy and within the Cullaloe Hills and Coast Local Landscape Area. With the process of identifying Nature Networks and suitable areas for Climate Forest plantation and links to resources beyond Fife currently under way, additional woodland resources, such as this proposed area, will play an increasingly important role in delivering these initiatives.</p> <p><u>General Considerations</u> The presence of wildlife within the forestry resource and adjacent habitats will require to be considered during forestry operations, [including red squirrel, badger, various bird species of conservation interest and pine marten.]</p> <p>Core Path Network and local paths will require temporary re-routing as appropriate, during forestry operations, following Land Manger’s as detailed by the Scottish Outdoor Access Code (SOAC), under the terms of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 (as amended in 2016).</p> <p>Guidance issued by Scottish Forestry related to wildlife and forestry operations [is] considered of relevance to this application.</p> <p><u>Designated sites</u> [Noted presence of numerous LEPO woodlands already highlighted.]</p>	<p>forestry operations; and these considerations are referenced in the final LMP text.</p> <p>Noted the presence of various Local Nature Conservation Sites, and that forestry operations are not considered likely to impact these.</p> <p>In response to the specific recommendations under section 03. Natural Heritage:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-operational surveys are carried out, as required, in accordance with the relevant guidance. 2. Wildlife protection/mitigation measures will be implemented as per the appropriate guidance, and/or relevant species licenses/advice from statutory consultees. 3. The LMP future forest design and restocking proposals have considered the development of a forest habitat network across the LMP area. 4. Noted the presence of LNCS sites and LEPO woodlands; the FLS Environment team will provide guidance on appropriate working methods as required at the time of operational planning. 5. Biodiversity considerations in the LMP have been informed by the relevant local and national forestry policies (e.g. Scotland’s Forestry Strategy 2019-2029 and the Fife Forest and Woodland Strategy 2013).

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>Benarty: This woodland is immediately adjacent to WS08 Benarty Hills LNCS and Loch Leven NNR is c.130m to the north-west and both sites will therefore require consideration during the proposed forestry works (WS04 Ballingry Meadow is on the other side of Ballingry). The Loch Leven SSSI <1km to the north, should be beyond a potential disturbance zone/Zone of Influence (Zoi) of any forestry works.</p> <p>Cardenden: The closest nature conservation sites are WS03 Auchtertool Linn LNCS c.1.6km to the south and WS64 Orebank Marsh LNCS c.200m to the north of the Den Burn forestry. WS03 is well beyond a potential disturbance zone/Zoi; WS64, though close, should be unaffected by low-intensity thinning.</p> <p>Pitcairn: [No sites potentially affected by forestry works.]</p> <p>Cullaloe: The closest designated site to Cullaloe Woods is the Cullaloe Reservoir SSSI which shares part of the Cullaloe LNR area (the LNR is also an SWT reserve) to the east of the plantation. ... The designated area is considered unlikely to be within a zone of potential disturbance/Zoi should larch-felling works be required.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In accordance with guidance, all areas to be subject to forestry operations should be fully surveyed by a suitably qualified ecologist (SQE) to establish any ecological constraints to, and licensing requirements for, the works programme. The SQE will then be able to advise on the next steps. 2. Method Statements should include choice of commencement location and direction of felling/thinning to ensure any animals present are not isolated by felling works and are able to move away to safety. 3. Future restocking and management should ensure maintenance of habitat connectivity, which will enable displaced wildlife to safely transition away from any future forestry management activities. 4. Works methods should take into account the presence of sites designated for their nature conservation value, with working practices defined such as to ensure no impact to these sites. 5. The biodiversity objectives of the re-stocked coupes should take into account the developing focus on increasing Scotland's biodiversity, as presented via NPF4, Scottish Forestry policies 	

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			and as promoted through the Fife Council Local Development Plan (LDP; currently FIFEplan) policies.	
Ramblers Scotland Area Access Officer	20/08/2024	22/09/2024	<p>I have some observations to make on the Plan, particularly as it relates to the areas of woodland on Benarty Hill.</p> <p>There is a problem about path routes in the north-eastern corner of the Hill which arises from the remarkably careless way in which the Fife Core Paths Plan was mapped. I have attached three jpeg files to assist me in explaining the matter.</p> <p>The first thing to point out is that there are two issues with that Plan, as currently drafted. There are no paths on the ground either where shown between C and E or running north of F. That is for the simple reason that ground conditions there are too dangerous for any other would-be users than rock climbers.</p> <p>I have attached extracts of the Open Street Map and of the Strava Global Heatmap which show how the majority of people proceed from point A to point C. There is also a little-used path created by users between B and D, which is both steep and uneven and unsuitable as a core path. In consequence of this, the route from A via B to C serves in effect as a part of the longer very important core path route until such time as the Fife Core Paths Plan is reviewed. I trust that you will take note of this when carrying out any works in this area.</p> <p>In addition, I have a further request of a more general nature. There is an informal, but well-used path which runs from the trig point at 356 metres in a SSE direction across the open ground then down through Benarty Wood to meet the core path that exits onto the minor road opposite Harran Hill.</p> <p>During the felling programme which took place a few years ago, this path was completely destroyed, so that people arriving from the north at the top of the steep descent there could find no safe way to continue downhill to reach the core path. I was a member of a group which unexpectedly encountered this difficulty and, despite taking all the care that we could, three or four of us fell in the attempt. I think that this lack of attention to the public interest is not something one should expect from an organisation like yourselves</p>	<p>[Response sent 27/01/25]</p> <p>Thank you for your response to our South East Fife Land Management Plan consultation, and for raising the points therein, which we have responded to below.</p> <p>Firstly, regarding the routing of paths in the north-eastern corner of Benarty Hill, we would clarify that Forestry and Land Scotland are not responsible for the mapping and designation of core paths, which are a matter for the relevant Local Authority. Therefore, we can only suggest you discuss the issue of alternative core path routes with Fife Council directly; and we would be happy to liaise with the Council as appropriate regarding any potential alternative routes thereafter.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the core path mapping issue, we are aware of the alternative informal route which you have highlighted and believe this is unlikely to be significantly affected by the proposed operations, although a suitable closure or diversion will be required during at least part of the felling to maintain public and operator safety. (We also note that there are several alternative informal routes which may be available for public use if/when this route is impacted by forestry operations.)</p> <p>Regarding the maintenance of desire lines more generally, unfortunately these cannot always be protected during forestry operations given their transitory nature and the need to consider other constraints. However, where there are well-used local routes we will endeavor to minimize damage to the effect that these, or a similar equivalent route can be accessed again in future. In addition, where there are particularly well-used desire lines, we are also happy for these to be highlighted, as you have done so here. (As always, Jenny Ventham or Andrew Clark would be the best points of contact for any future queries or concerns regarding public access).</p> <p>Specifically with regards to the route which you have mentioned coming off Benarty Hill, we note that this is now effectively re-instated, and was included in the concept mapping for the recent</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>and I would urge you to take note of the fact that, although many important routes do not have a formal status as a core path or right of way, they are nonetheless a crucially important part of the public access network. I hope that, in future, you and your operatives will take careful note of the relevant guidance in the Scottish Outdoor Access Code and such publications as The Forestry Commission's 'Managing Woodland Access and Forest Operations in Scotland'.</p>	<p>LMP consultation (map 03 'South East Fife Woods LMP Benarty Management Concept'). Furthermore, we would highlight that the harvesting operations in this area created some additional access routes in this area; and that this has been restocked with native broadleaved trees, thus reducing the need for more intensive operations in the future.</p>
<p>Scottish Water</p>	<p>04/09/2024</p>	<p>04/10/2024 15/11/2024</p>	<p><u>Initial response 04/10/24:</u></p> <p>Thank you for consulting with Scottish Water regarding the above activity.</p> <p>Drinking Water Protected Areas A review of our records indicates that there are no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive, in the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.</p> <p>Scottish Water Assets A review of our records indicates that there are no Scottish Water assets (including water supply and sewer pipes, water and waste water treatment works, reservoirs, etc.) in the area.</p> <p>In the event that asset conflicts are identified then early contact should be made with the Highway Authorities and Utilities Committee (HAUC) at Hauc.diversions@scottishwater.co.uk.</p> <p>It should be noted that the proposals will be required to comply with Sewers for Scotland and Water for Scotland 4th Editions 2018, including provision of appropriate clearance distances from Scottish Water assets.</p> <p>Raw Water Quality Adviser</p> <p><i>[08/10/24 - Forest Planner requested clarification regarding presence of assets recorded on FLS GIS dataset.]</i></p> <p><u>Subsequent response 15/11/24:</u></p>	<p>Thanks and noted presence of water pipes as recorded in the FLS GIS database.</p>

Consultee	Date contacted	Response received	Consultee response	FLS response
			<p>Please find the two attachments highlighting the clean water assets.</p> <p>Dependent on the actual location of the proposed properties.</p> <p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4" CI Water main does cross the proposed tree area. Majority of this asset is in the road however there are sections of potential impacy • This 4" CI Water Main run along the field verge <p>The access distance for the 4" CI Water main is 3m. The standoff distance for a 2bar pipe is 2.5m.</p> <p>The actual route and depth of this asset would have to be established either by site investigations or a ground penetrating radar (GPR).</p> <p>All Scottish Water DOMS processes must be adhered to around the Scottish Water asset.</p> <p>Project Manager HAUC Diversions</p>	