



## Appendix II – Land Management Plan Consultation Record

Table 12 – Land Management Plan consultation record.

| Consultee  | Date Contacted    | Date responded              | Comment/Issue Raised | FLS Central Region Response |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Local schools:<br>St Bernadettes<br>Primary; Carron<br>Primary; Ladeside<br>Primary; Kinnaird<br>Primary;<br>Stonehousemuir<br>Primary; Larbert<br>Village Primary;<br>Larbert High School | FLS<br>03/11/2022 | No<br>response<br>received  | N/A                  | N/A                         |
| Other local user<br>groups:<br>Larbert Boys Brigade;<br>Braveheart Walking<br>Group; Under The<br>Trees  | FLS<br>03/11/2022 | No<br>response<br>received  | N/A                  | N/A                         |
| Other local residents<br>and immediate<br>neighbours (including<br>Avant Carron Feld and<br>NHS Forth Valley)  | FLS<br>03/11/2022 | No<br>response<br>received. | N/A                  | N/A                         |

| <b>Consultee</b>  | <b>Date Contacted</b>           | <b>Date responded</b>               | <b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>  | <b>FLS Central Region Response</b>   |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Green Action Trust  | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Councillor William Buchanan, Falkirk Council                                    | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Councillor Jack Redmond, Falkirk Council  | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Councillor Bryan Deakin, Falkirk Council  | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Michael Matheson – MSP, Falkirk West  | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Falkirk Council: Biodiversity Officer; Roads Department; Development Management | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Forth Environment Link  | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received.               | N/A  | N/A  |
| Maggie's Forth Valley   | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | 23/11/2022                          | Site meeting – content with plans and no special requests made.            | Will maintaining ongoing relationships and communication with Maggie's centre.   |
| NHS Forth Valley  | FLS<br>03/11/2022               | No response received                | N/A  | N/A  |
| Falkirk Council Local Authority Access Officer                                  | Scottish Forestry<br>24/10/2022 | Via Scottish Forestry<br>28/11/2022 | Thanks for forwarding the proposed Land Management Plan for Larbert Woods. | Any operations potentially affecting core paths will be identified at the work plan stage and any mitigation implemented as appropriate in conjunction with the Local Authority Access Officer. FLS are working with the |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response  |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|---|--|
|           |                |                | <p>My focus is access (although my background is Forestry) but I'd support the proposed silvicultural operations to improve the management prescription for the woodlands for their long-term sustainability and enhanced diversity too.</p> <p>In terms of access, my main comment would be that the woodlands are a very well used local resource for recreational and educational purposes and form an important part of the local areas Core Path Network too. I would therefore seek to ensure that during silvicultural operations that the path network within the woodland(s) remains "open and free from obstruction" be that through temporary diversions being put in place, where appropriate, during these operations (if H&amp;S requirements require closure of any), to maximise continued public use of the area in a safe and responsible manner.</p> <p>Once approved, I'd be more than happy to meet with Forestry &amp; Land Scotland colleagues on the ground, to consider any temporary path closures/diversion, to accommodate the silvicultural operations. These can be "approved" under a s.11 (temporary closure/diversion) under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003.</p> <p>I'd also support any expansion of or improvements to the path network within the woodlands too, as this would further enhance the visitor experience to Larbert Woodlands</p> | <p>developer on adjacent ground to link new housing developments and greenspace to the woodlands at Larbert via a access new route. Currently there are no further plans to expand surfaced path network but we may undertake additional work if resources become available and would be happy to consider any joint ventures with Falkirk Council and other partners.</p> |

| Consultee                     | Date Contacted   | Date responded  | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| RSPB                          | Scottish Forestry<br>24/10/2022                          | Via Scottish Forestry<br>28/11/2022                             | I've had a look through the Larbert LMP documents and maps, and it all looks OK to me.<br>The removal of non-native conifers and exotics such as the rhododendron, and works to enhance biodiversity features such as the species-rich grassland (once it's properly established) should bring benefits for many species.<br><br>We've no other comments at this time.  | Noted – thank you for your comment.  |
| Historic Environment Scotland | FLS<br>03/11/2022  | 08/11/2022  | Historic Environment Scotland comments where proposals might impact the following designated historic environment assets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• category A listed buildings and their setting</li> <li>• scheduled monuments and their setting</li> <li>• Inventory battlefields</li> <li>• Inventory gardens and designed landscapes</li> <li>• World Heritage Sites</li> </ul> We have assessed the supplied information, and none of the above are affected by the proposed Plan. Therefore, we have <b>no comments</b> to make.  | Noted – thank you for your comment.  |
| NatureScot                    | FLS<br>03/11/2022  | 08/11/2022  | NatureScot has no comment on this proposal.   |  |
| SEPA                          | Scottish Forestry<br>24/10/2022<br><br>FLS<br>03/11/2022 | Via Scottish Forestry<br>28/11/2022<br><br>Direct<br>07/11/2022 | SEPA would raise the following general comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan should maximise opportunities to improve the riparian zone along main rivers, burns and small tributaries to encourage native broadleaf planting and follow the principles as outlined in the Riverwoods Initiative.</li> <li>• Good site planning is required to identify and implement good forestry practice measures required to minimise the risk of environmental pollution. For contractors and site managers, reference should be made to the Forestry &amp; Water Scotland "Know the</li> </ul> | Most of this response is not relevant to the Larbert LMP. However, we have responded to each point in turn below.<br><b>Riparian habitat</b> – not relevant, no watercourses present.<br><b>Environmental pollution</b> – standard UKFS and UKWAS compliance, already mentioned in plan re. management of aquatic vegetation.<br><b>Ground cultivation</b> – minimal planting is proposed in the plan; this guidance is part of standard working/best practice guidance for FLS staff. |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised   | FLS Central Region Response   |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--|---|
|           |                |                | <p>Rules Booklet”, version 2, and it is imperative that all contractors follow the guidance therein. On-site tools (confor.org.uk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In accordance with the published Scottish Forestry "Cultivation of Upland Woodland Creation Sites - Applicants Guide, 2021", the Plan should incorporate low risk ground preparation techniques during new planting and/or restocking to minimise soil and carbon losses to air and water.</li> <li>• SEPA does not hold information on private water supplies [PWS]. It is therefore imperative to contact the Local Authority Environmental Health Department to establish whether they hold any details on any private water supplies in or around your Plan area. All efforts must be made to glean information from homeowners/occupiers on private water supply source areas, header tanks and transfer pipework. If any of these are identified adjacent to or within the proposed area, then great care MUST be taken to protect water quality. All operations must strive to go beyond compliance with best practice to fully protect the entire source area. All source areas must be afforded maximum protection from machinery damage, compaction and pollution from all forest activities, including future operations. This also applies to water transfer pipework. The buffer distances highlighted in the Know the Rules Booklet are minimum distances and greater buffers must be allocated where source areas are extensive or boundaries unknown. Note that the given 50m buffer is a minimum buffer area, and should be exceeded depending on how extensive the supply source area is or if there is any doubt as to the risk of an activity impacting a supply.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Private water supplies</b> – Scottish Water and Falkirk Council have both been consulted. No PWS noted for this site but anyone who has information on PWS within the site should contact FLS immediately.</p> <p><b>Access tracks</b> – not relevant; there is no deep peat and no new access tracks are proposed.</p> <p><b>Cleaning of machinery</b> – this is operational-level information and not relevant for a LMP. Cleaning will be carried out as per UKFS and UKWAS requirements.</p> <p><b>Selection of machinery</b> – this is operational-level information not normally relevant to a LMP and reference to type of machinery and previous experience on similar sites is already given in section 4.3.3.</p> <p><b>Brash and pollution management</b> – noted, as above. Reference to brash availability added to section 4.3.3.</p> <p><b>Fish barriers</b> – not relevant, none identified.</p> <p><b>Disused fords</b> – not relevant, none identified.</p> <p><b>Quarries</b> – not relevant, none proposed.</p> <p><b>Use of tree tubes and guards</b> – part of standard UKFS/UKWAS compliance.</p> <p><b>Waste disposal</b> – part of standard UKFS/UKWAS compliance.</p> |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised   | FLS Central Region Response |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--|-----------------------------|
|           |                |                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the 50m minimum buffer is intended to afford protection to public and private water supplies, the forest planting design is crucial to protect these supplies from water quantity changes due to forest establishment. Whilst low density broadleaf trees are acceptable around the edges of the water supply source area boundary, conifers should be kept back from the source area due to the water scarcity pressures they may place upon the supply.</li> <li>• Any access tracks should ideally avoid areas of shallow and deep peat to avoid disturbance of peatland ecosystem which may also cause pollution.</li> <li>• Prior to site departure, all machinery working within the forest block should be power washed as per good forestry practice to avoid the accidental spread of invasive species. This practice also allows machines to be inspected and repairs identified e.g. oil leaks, tyre wear and metal fatigue. Photographic record of this wash down should be kept for UKWAS audit inspection purposes.</li> <li>• For thinning operations, the right machine for the right job is important in order to complete operations without causing pollution issues on site from using oversized machines.</li> <li>• For some thinning compartments, brash and/or product availability is limited, therefore the ability to move product around the whole site to address pollution mitigation will form a key part of work planning and execution. In addition, having a selection of pipes on site will provide good back up for water management to separate clean water from dirty tracks.</li> </ul> |                             |

| Consultee      | Date Contacted                  | Date responded                      | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response  |
|----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
|                |                                 |                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any fish barriers should be identified such as old impoundments or abandoned weir structures. This would also include old pipe bridges where multiple smooth lined pipes of small diameter covered with a concrete screed are used to cross watercourses. Any identified features should be flagged for upgrade or removal.</li> <li>• If there are any old 'fords' these should be mapped, but only used as follows: intermittent quad bike crossings are acceptable, but heavy forestry machinery traversing watercourses is likely to cause pollution. SEPA would therefore expect to see log bridges as per good forestry practice or culverted water crossings in full compliance with the CAR Regulations <a href="https://www.sepa.org.uk/car_a_practical_guide.pdf">car_a_practical_guide.pdf</a> (sepa.org.uk)</li> <li>• All drainage from quarries and/or borrow pits must be collected and treated via settlement sumps and natural soakaway areas. This potentially highly polluting effluent must not be allowed to drain directly from site to a watercourse.</li> <li>• If the plan is to use tree guard tubes and/or vole guards, then these must come with a tree guard removal plan after the trees are established. Leaving the plastic-based tree/vole guards lying on the landscape is not acceptable and is likely to constitute unauthorised waste disposal. In addition, SEPA fully supports using biodegradable alternatives rather than polypropylene.</li> <li>• All waste materials MUST be removed from site for reuse, recycling or disposal upon work completion.</li> </ul> |  |
| Scottish Water | Scottish Forestry<br>24/10/2022 | Via Scottish Forestry<br>28/11/2022 | Thank you for consulting with Scottish Water regarding the above activity.  | Noted – we have requested plans for Scottish water assets in the area so these can be added to the utilities information on our GIS platforms. We are not aware of |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response   |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|---|---|
|           |                |                | <p><b>Drinking Water Protected Areas</b></p> <p>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><b>Scottish Water Assets</b></p> <p>A review of our records indicates that there are Scottish Water assets in the area. There is a 36" steel potable water trunk main running through the site. Please note, this is a strategic asset for Scottish Water. This should be confirmed however through obtaining plans from our Asset Plan Providers. Details of our Asset Plan Providers are included in the SW list of precautions for assets, which can be found on the activities within our catchments page of our website at <a href="http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/slm">www.scottishwater.co.uk/slm</a>.</p> <p>There are also several sections of private sewer within the site boundary. These pipe will be owned and maintained by the properties they serve.</p> <p>All Scottish Water assets potentially affected by the activity should be identified, with particular consideration being given to access roads and pipe crossings. If necessary, local Scottish Water personnel may be able to visit the site to offer advice. All of Scottish Water's processes, standards and policies in</p> | <p>any private sewage infrastructure within the site but are attempting to obtain further information on this from the Local Authority Environmental Health Department.</p> |



| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------|
|           |                |                | <p>relation to dealing with asset conflicts must be complied with.</p> <p>In the event that asset conflicts are identified then early contact should be made with HAUC Diversions Team via the Development Services portal - <a href="http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/portal">www.scottishwater.co.uk/portal</a> All detailed design proposals relating to the protection of Scottish Water's assets should be submitted to the HAUC for review and written acceptance. Works should not take place on site without prior written acceptance by Scottish Water.</p> <p>Scottish Water have produced a list of precautions for a range of activities. The list of precautions for assets details protection measures to be taken if there are assets in the area. Please note that site specific risks and mitigation measures will require to be assessed and implemented. The document/s and other supporting information can be found on the activities within our catchments page of our website at <a href="http://www.scottishwater.co.uk/slm">www.scottishwater.co.uk/slm</a>.</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>If you have any questions relating to the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> |                             |

| Consultee   | Date Contacted       | Date responded       | Comment/Issue Raised   | FLS Central Region Response          |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| FLS Online Public Consultation Form (13 responses)                                | Opened<br>03/11/2022 | Closed<br>09/12/2022 | Due to their similar nature, all bar one response to Q2 are amalgamated in a single row for simplicity. Individual responses to all other questions are presented on separate rows thereafter.   |                                      |
| Q1: What aspects of the proposed Land Management Plan are you most interested in? |                      |                      | Recreation 31%<br>Wildlife 23%<br>Forestry operations 15%<br>Water Quality 8%<br>Free text: 'Sustainability and Community Development' 8%<br>Other (no specific category) 15%  | Noted.                               |
| Q2: What do you most like about the plan, and why?                                |                      |                      | I think the plan is great.. what I like about the plan is there's no housing mentioned<br>it maintains nature and recreation at the same time,<br>it's important to preserve every bit of nature and parks that you have and make them accessible for all to enjoy<br>Wildlife mentioned<br>Developing and looking after a beautiful wooded area<br>Looking to retain woodland but encourage more native species and support/encourage greater biodiversity<br>Taking care of trees and wildlife<br>Ensure the longevity of the area<br>Pleased that there will continue to be management of the area.<br>Anything that is done to retain and maintain clean and eco friendly woodland areas is beneficial and greatly appreciated<br>It's great to see that the woodland will be managed to ensure the best outcome for both wildlife and visitors is reached.<br>Great to see the woodland being maintained. Is a pleasant very well used area<br>Continued upkeep of the site | Noted – thank you for your comments. |

| Consultee   | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response  |
|---|----------------|----------------|---|--|
|   |                |                | Can't view on mobile; requiring to download so can receive a copy in the post please  | We apologise you were unable to view the plan documents, a hard copy of the plan will be supplied to the address provided and although formal consultation has now concluded we welcome comments or queries on the plan at any time.   |
| Q3: Is there a part of the plan that you would like to see improved, if so how? |                |                | It's too narrow in focus. There probably isn't enough understanding of the importance of the area - historically and to the local community. As such it's about maintenance, rather than an aspirational and progressive look at use of the space. For example, what is going to be done to share the resource with the local community - will schools and local groups be involved? What about economic sustainability such as logs or other potential produce? There's no mention of picnic, community or allotment space. The plan is not easy to read and is therefore pretty inaccessible to most people. It's a restrictive consultation. More needs to be done. It doesn't link with community plans or, indeed, any other Falkirk plans. I lived Locally for most of my life, my mum lives very nearby, my parents were nurses at RSNH, I played in the grounds, I know the area well. There's nothing within this plan that gives me hope for the future, engagement with the Project or faith that my grandchildren will benefit from it. As I say, could be so much better. There must be good examples from other areas? Maybe aim for best practice or be creative and exceed minimal expectations | As detailed in the plan, significant work has been undertaken by FLS, it's predecessor organisation, and numerous partners, including Falkirk Council, to improve this site for recreation, public access and biodiversity over the past decade. As a result, this plan is about maintaining and building on the significant progress that has already been made and ensuring the woodlands continue to provide an attractive setting for recreation and a valuable habitat for wildlife. Numerous local schools and health groups are already involved on the site and will continue to be involved going forward. It is the intention that arisings from the proposed thinning will be sold in order to offset the cost of operations. There are several picnic areas already present, in addition to two 'teaching circles'. The primary purpose of these plans is to act as an overarching strategic management document for the site and as such we accept some aspects may not be easily interpreted by the general public. However, we have made efforts to explain the proposals both within the LMP and on our website. |
|   |                |                | I find it difficult to make any judgement or comments about the maps. It would be easier to comment if there was more commentary about the plans rather than just lined areas on a map.   | We are sorry you found these difficult to interpret. Where appropriate, information displayed on the maps has been included and explained in the plan in line with accessibility requirements; however some information is not appropriate to display in this manner.  |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised   | FLS Central Region Response  |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--|--|
|           |                |                | Stop allowing building houses in the area, as this has devastated the area , the wildlife and the wild area that it washes been destroyed  | FLS have no control over developments outwith our ownership boundary and there are no plans to permit any developments on our site.  |
|           |                |                | I live in Larbert House. A big issue with the Larbert woodland area is that there is insufficient public parking and signage for visitors, who park illegally on the public roads, in Larbert House private parking for residents only, and at Maggies. In addition visitors often camp at the Loch to fish and in most cases leave the area in a disgusting state. Can fishing at the Loch be banned? Please enforce the rule that all dogs must be on a leash to prevent the dogs attacking the wildlife (which I have regrettably witnessed more than once) and dogs defecating whilst their owners (deliberately) walk 50 yards ahead. More dustbins please, especially in the picnic areas where there are tables and benches, and more frequent removal of rubbish because often the dustbins are full which then causes littering | All site visitors are expected to adhere to their obligations as set out under the Scottish Outdoor Access Code. While FLS staff will reinforce this requirement when breaches are observed we do not have the resources to police this site 24/7. With regards to parking there are no plans to create additional facilities at this site but we expect visitors to park responsibly and would encourage active travel and use of public transport. There are no plans to increase number of dustbins as these are resource-intensive and we expect visitors to dispose of waste responsibly in line with the Scottish Outdoor Access Code, including if local bins are full.<br>The approach to managing fishing on FLS land is currently under review within the organisation. Any irresponsible activities or anti-social behaviour should be reported to Police Scotland on 101 or 999 in an emergency. |
|           |                |                | Although not mentioned in the plans, I would like to see fishing on the pond prohibited to help ensure the safety and future of the wildlife who use it. I'd also like to see some further work done to remove the invasive weeds around the island.   | All site visitors are expected to adhere to their obligations as set out under the Scottish Outdoor Access Code. The approach to managing fishing on FLS land is currently under review within the organisation. Any irresponsible activities or anti-social behaviour should be reported to Police Scotland on 101 or 999 in an emergency.<br>As stated in the plan, invasive Rhododendron will be removed and aquatic vegetation will be monitored and managed as appropriate.   |
|           |                |                | The Forestry access is a concern. The site for lumbar storage and Main operational access is one of the most   | We note your concerns, however this access route has been used successfully in previous years. Although  |

| Consultee  | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised   | FLS Central Region Response   |
|--|----------------|----------------|--|---|
|  |                |                | <p>frequented areas by children/schools. It also backs onto a residential area with associated increased risk to the children that play there. There would be increases traffic and noise pollution for nearby residents. Qunitishill drive is busy, is becoming lined by properties and this access is not appropriate for large vehicles. Could you not access from the north? THe NHS has a two lane road accessing a safer non residential area. 56.022687, -3.850849 Or</p> <p>56.024278, -3.852928</p> <p>or this area? Doesn't resolve the quintishill drive congestion but is away from the houses and associated children that play in the log pile area?</p> <p>56.020698, -3.844776</p> | <p>housing and use of the site has increased since then, there are very few alternatives available on this site and, as detailed in the plan, Old Denny Road to the North is not considered suitable as there is restricted access width due to ubiquitous on-street parking. We have previous experience of managing timber harvesting and haulage from numerous urban woodlands within FLS Central Region and believe it will be possible to utilise this area and access route safely and with sensitivity. Detailed proposals for management of this operation will be set out within a Work Plan prior to operations commencing.</p> |
| Q4: Please add any further comments relating to the plan here. |                |                | As I said I'm here twice a day 0600 - 7 or so then again in the afternoon.. I've cleared litter on occasion and am happy to help if I can  | Many thanks for your response and interest in helping out. Please contact us directly at <a href="mailto:enquiries.central@forestryandland.gov.scot">enquiries.central@forestryandland.gov.scot</a> if you are still interested in volunteering at this site.   |
|  |                |                | there need to be public education, rest facility, and other type of location not specifically here but throughout the area   | As mentioned previously, various activities and features are already present on this site.  |
|  |                |                | It is imperative we retain/maintain and responsibly manage as much of our woodland areas. There is too much development on "green" sites and we are losing natural habitat for out indigenous plant and animal species at an alarming rate. These initiatives are crucial if any progress is to.be made to address the devastating impact of climate change  | As stated previously, there are currently no plans to permit development on our land at Larbert.  |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised   | FLS Central Region Response  |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--|--|
|           |                |                | Don't allow any further building if any kind   | As stated previously, there are currently no plans to permit development on our land at Larbert.   |
|           |                |                | Appreciate the plans to ensure the area is supported for the future  | Noted – thank you for your comment.  |
|           |                |                | Thank you for anything and everything you do to maintain and improve the woodland areas which provide a great deal of pleasure to the public that use them   | Noted – thank you for your comment.  |
|           |                |                | As someone who went through the correct and lengthy process, including the provision of my private car insurance details in order to hold a Boys Brigade event in the facility, I am frustrated that other users seem to do as they like. I was given a significant reprimand for my car being partly on the grass when other users park on the grass. Employees from the hospital use the parking bays as all day parking and the fishermen leave litter and of more concern fishing tackle in the pond and on the banks. | As mentioned previously, we expect all site users to act responsibly and in accordance with their obligations under the Scottish Outdoor Access Code. While FLS staff will reinforce this requirement when breaches are observed we do not have the resources to police this site 24/7. The approach to managing fishing on FLS land is currently under review within the organisation. Any irresponsible activities or anti-social behaviour should be reported to Police Scotland on 101 or 999 in an emergency. |
|           |                |                | Although can't view both LMP documents your attached maps that I can view are inaccurate as I live in [address redacted] and it's not shown on any of the maps!  | A hard copy of the plan will be supplied to the address provided. FLS use industry-standard Ordnance Survey base maps and are not responsible for the accuracy of this background mapping.   |
|           |                |                | I'd also like to know that the future of our deer population is safeguarded.   | There are currently no plans to conduct deer control on this site. Any control which is carried out will follow all legal and best-practice requirements.  |
|           |                |                | I live here and enjoy the access to the woodland and appreciate the work you do but would like to see what makes much of the pleasure of a walk around the pond retained   | This plan proposes very minimal changes to the management of land around Larbert Loch and these proposals should improve the amenity value of the area.  |
|           |                |                |  |  |

| Consultee   | Date Contacted    | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response  |
|---|-------------------|----------------|---|--|
| Email response received to FLS Central Region Enquiries | FLS<br>03/11/2022 | 07/12/2022     | <p>I note your Land Management Plan for the above. As a local resident who has walked round the pond/loch and woods for many years I would make the following points -</p> <p>a) Your plan does not appear to take cognisance of the considerable housing development which has taken place on two sides of the pond area. Views of the church etc are now blocked by some of the large houses and clearance of trees/bushes round the pond is only going to give visitors to the pond a view of a housing development – surely not what you are trying to achieve.</p> <p>b) You appear to have unilaterally decided that there should be “Significantly reduced population of <i>Rhododendron</i> within the site”. However, you also state that “Management is sympathetic of historic designed landscape and overall site character is maintained”. Surely these two aims are diametrically opposed. Much of the grounds were deliberately planted and laid out with a range of different species designed to bring colour and diversity to the area. These included bushes and trees that the public could not see anywhere else in the area (long before Garden Centres etc). To preserve and enhance the social and environmental benefits of the site, colour and diversity of plant is essential and <i>rhododendrons</i> in full bloom and Monkey Puzzle trees are very much appreciated by many who walk the site. You undertook considerable clearance of <i>rhododendrons</i> a few years back which left the cleared areas barren and very unattractive and</p> | <p>Thank your comment, we have responded to each point raised below.</p> <p>a) While outwith FLS control, these developments have been considered and site management is and will be adapted accordingly.</p> <p>b) <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> is a highly invasive non-native species and we believe the negative impacts of this particular exotic plant outweigh any residual historical or landscape significance on this site. As such, <i>Rhododendron</i> control brings benefits in terms of public access and overall woodland condition and this has been a long-standing objective of management which was included and actioned in several previous management plans. While we do seek to manage the site with respect to the historical landscape context the landscape, social and environmental context of this site has significantly changed since the grounds were laid out and therefore management practices must reflect this.</p> <p>c) As stated in the plan, FLS will monitor the condition of Larbert Loch, including the proportion of aquatic vegetation to open water, and undertake appropriate management interventions to secure water quality and biodiversity value if necessary. The quantity of aquatic vegetation is not currently considered to be a problem but will be reviewed on an ongoing basis. As stated in our other responses, all visitors are expected to adhere to their obligations as set out under the Scottish Outdoor Access Code and the approach to managing fishing on FLS land is currently</p> |

| Consultee | Date Contacted | Date responded | Comment/Issue Raised  | FLS Central Region Response   |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|---|---|
|           |                |                | <p>did nothing to enhance the social and visual aspects of the site.</p> <p>c) You make little mention of Larbert Loch where reeds and plant now cover much of the actual surface area. This has got much worse over the years and now restricts the space for swans and geese to swim around. Also, every year the swans are harmed by indiscriminate fishing (impaled on hooks or caught up in lines etc. I am sure the SSPCB will corroborate this). There is no control on the numbers who can fish which at times has made it quite intimidating to walk past large groups who on occasions even camp overnight in tents. Is the pond intended for birds and wildlife which are enjoyed by the majority of visitors or for fishermen. If it is for fishermen could you not issue permits as they do for the local river Carron or some other element of control. Allowing the bird life to flourish on the loch free of fishing lines would be a great social and environmental improvement</p> <p>d) With respect, you appear to have decided on the plan for the area and are only now consulting. Why did your not consult with site users during the summer months etc to gauge their thoughts in advance. I regularly see your vehicles on site so your colleagues could have been talking to visitors or handed out questionnaires</p> | <p>under review within the organisation. Any irresponsible activities or anti-social behaviour should be reported to Police Scotland on 101 or 999 in an emergency.</p> <p>d) This plan sets out very minimal management proposals, the majority of which do not require any formal consultation or regulatory approval, and were already set out set in previous plans (which also underwent significant community and stakeholder engagement). As such, this plan essentially acts as a renewal of the previous management plan and was not considered to require more intensive consultation or engagement. However, efforts have still been made to engage with all interested parties prior to submitting this plan for approval from Scottish Forestry and all responses have been duly considered.</p> |
|           |                |                |   |   |



# Appendix III – Monitoring and review

## III/1. Review of previous management plan

Table 13, below, provides a detailed review of the previous management plan and progress against the plan objectives.

Table 13 – Review of previous LMP

| <b>Objective</b>   | <b>Proposed management actions</b>   | <b>Progress to date</b><br>1 – Little or no progress<br>2 – Some progress<br>3 – Progress as per plan  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Develop network of constructed paths, suitable for all abilities use, throughout the property</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct 1.8m Toptrek surfaced paths around the Loch, and throughout the woodland areas suitable for all abilities use.</li> <li>Threshold improvements including the erection of stone gate piers and walls, installation of metal post and bar fencing and bollards, and placement of rumble strips on the entrance surfaces.</li> </ul> | 2 – All abilities (tarmac) path constructed around loch with additional surfaced paths constructed around the woodland area. Stone gate pillars and fencing installed but one side damaged by developers and not yet replaced. Threshold improvements require maintenance and further improvements required in some areas. |
| <b>Develop and deliver promotional and signage strategy</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install signs at all main entrances and waymarkers placed in key locations. The signage will include for name boards and for orientation and interpretation boards.</li> </ul>  | 3 – signage present and maintained in key locations.   |
| <b>Minimise conflict between public and management access, and between public access and operation of hospital</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>  | 3 – no major conflicts reported between FLS operations and public access. Diversions etc. implemented as required.   |
| <b>Convert areas of mixed woodland to native woodland</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thinning of W7 includes removal of all conifers</li> <li>All regeneration of exotic species will be removed from W7.</li> </ul>   | 2 – non-native conifer removal progressed in W7 but needs completed and control of non-native regeneration is required.  |

| Objective  | Proposed management actions  | Progress to date<br>1 – Little or no progress<br>2 – Some progress<br>3 – Progress as per plan  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Improve the biodiversity of the open water feature and its surroundings</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All operations will be carried out in accordance with Forests &amp; Water Guidelines (4th Edition) and other published Best Practice guidance.</li> <li>• Establish meadow/species rich grassland and native woodland planting around loch</li> </ul>                                 | 2 – operations carried out in accordance with guidance and biodiversity value/habitat quality of the loch and surrounding area has been improved. However, the meadow/species rich grassland has failed to establish and has become dominated by ruderal vegetation due to high soil nutrient status. |
| <b>Control invasive exotic species</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motor-manual clearance of <i>Rhododendron</i>, and continued control of the re-growth. Aim to ensure there is no <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> within the site by 2017.</li> </ul>   | 2 – <i>Rhododendron</i> is still present throughout the site although most plants appear young (<5 years old).  |
| <b>Seek partnerships to encourage increased access and opportunities</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>  | 3 – Branching Out, other health projects and seasonal events carried out in partnership with NHS and community groups. Fortnightly volunteer work parties on site run by FLS Community Ranger.  |
| <b>Involve community groups and potential and current site users in development process</b>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>  | 3 – as above. Partnerships with Forth Environment Link, local youth groups etc.   |
| <b>Encourage staff, patients, visitors and local community to make positive use of the woodland to deliver multiple benefits</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of benches and picnic benches, including wheelchair accessible tables.</li> <li>• Creation of an outdoor teaching circle available for use by FES staff and by local primary schools.</li> <li>• [Path construction and sign installation as detailed above.]</li> </ul> | 3 – as above; benches, picnic areas, accessible pathways and interpretation all present.  |

| <b>Objective</b>   | <b>Proposed management actions</b>   | <b>Progress to date</b><br>1 – Little or no progress<br>2 – Some progress<br>3 – Progress as per plan   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Retain and protect features of recognised interest</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove woody vegetation which is threatening the fabric of built features of cultural heritage value.</li> </ul>  | 3 – restoration of part of the ha-ha and estate wall network has been carried out alongside minor work on the Ice House.  |
| <b>Commence programme to resurrect parkland tree landscape</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey and maintenance of existing parkland trees.</li> <li>Grassland maintenance including mowing and reseedling</li> <li>Specimen tree planting within parkland.</li> </ul> | 2 – existing trees maintained in accordance with occupiers liability. Grass mowing carried out as per planned schedule, although some areas of grassland have ‘scrubbed up’ with ruderal vegetation. Specimen tree planting carried out but further planting and maintenance of planted trees is likely to be required. |
| <b>Include cultural heritage within interpretation strategy</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>  | 2 – some included in leaflets and signage but not extensively. Some signage was removed due to safety concerns.   |
| <b>Ensure continued woodland coverage during management programme</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As below – small-scale felling plus restocking.</li> </ul>  | 3 – small-scale clearfelling and successful restocking and establishment has maintained woodland cover throughout plan period.  |
| <b>Ensure that the designed landscape elements are perpetuated</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-instate grass and mowing</li> <li>Tree survey and tree surgery works where required</li> <li>Replacement of parkland trees with appropriate species</li> </ul>             | 2 – tree population in overall good condition, grassland maintenance is helping to maintain the parkland setting but requires some review. Grass areas are not being managed as outlined in original plan maps. Replacement planting of appropriate species has been carried out.                                       |
| <b>Maintain tree productivity through prompt intervention and through use of sound silvicultural practice including Continuous Cover Forestry and sound species selection.</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear felling of 1.36 ha in two compartments</li> <li>Group felling proposed in four compartments [one of which is now outside FLS ownership].</li> </ul>                     | 3 – Good regrowth of planting and natural regeneration is displayed though the felled areas. Species selection appears suitable to the site.  |

| <b>Objective</b>  | <b>Proposed management actions</b>  | <b>Progress to date</b><br><b>1 – Little or no progress</b><br><b>2 – Some progress</b><br><b>3 – Progress as per plan</b>   |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Improve woodland quality through thinning felling, and restocking programme</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinning proposed in five compartments [one of which is now outside FLS ownership].</li> <li>• Removal of windblow.</li> <li>• Outwith of the native woodland area [W7 / management coupe 17001], natural regeneration of any species will be accepted. This will be assessed at the end of each five-year period, and action undertaken to facilitate regeneration if required, including the removal of beech and sycamore in selected areas.</li> <li>• All felling areas will be restocked to ensure that replacement broadleaves are established at 1600 st/ha, and conifers at 2,500 st/ha, by the end of year 5.</li> <li>• Enrichment planting will be undertaken to establish trees and shrubs in small gaps within the existing canopy.</li> <li>• Deer culling is proposed to keep deer numbers in check and individual guards will be used to protect broadleaf restocking and enrichment planting.</li> </ul> | <p>3 – The woodlands are in good condition. Clearfelling has been carried out as planned with very successful regeneration of mixed species (natural and planted). Group felling has only been carried out in a few areas with poorer regeneration levels. Thinning of W7 (management coupe 17001) has resulted in a much reduced overstorey and prolific regeneration of mixed species (natural and planted). No significant areas of windblow apparent on site although sporadic windthrown trees are present and have been promptly cleared (with timber retained on-site). Restocking has largely been successful although further enrichment planting may be required in smaller areas. No records of deer culling are available, however site observation suggests that numbers are not currently limiting regeneration although some browsing of palatable species (e.g. rowan) is evident.</p> |
| <b>Ensure that an approved management plan, with clear management objectives and work programme is developed to deliver timeously on requirements of planning permission (as covered by objectives of other briefs)</b> | N/A   | 3 – management plan developed as required.   |

## III/2. LMP Objective Appraisal, Monitoring & Evaluation

Table 14, below, details how the objectives of this LMP will be monitored and reviewed (for example at the mid-term (5 year) review and (10 year) plan revision and renewal). See also main text – section 1.3.

Table 14 – LMP Objective Appraisal, Monitoring & Evaluation

| <b>LMP Objective</b>  | <b>Assessable criteria</b>            | <b>Appraisal method</b>  | <b>Monitor method</b>  | <b>Monitor where</b>   | <b>Monitor when</b>   | <b>Monitor who</b>   | <b>Record monitoring where</b>   | <b>Evaluation.</b> How does the Appraisal and Monitoring method inform current & future proposals?  |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Maintain accessible, quality urban woodland environments available to users of all abilities; including partnership working to encourage increased access and opportunities.</b> | Use of site                           | Number of visitors using the site, type of use/visitor and visitor experience.           | Site visitor count, visitor survey, feedback from FLS Community Ranger | Onsite   | Mid-term (5 year) review and 10 year plan renewal. On-going Engagement. | Visitor Services team (Community Ranger and VS manager/ Area VS Manager) | Mid-term review template and objective appraisal in 10 year LMP renewal. | By assessing visitor numbers/use, type of use/ type of visitor and visitor experience, the VS team can evaluate the value and use of the site for recreation, health and wellbeing objectives.    |
| <b>Control <i>Rhododendron</i> regeneration to prevent its re-establishment and spread and with a view to eradicating the population.</b>   | <i>Rhododendron</i> presence/ absence | Population of <i>Rhododendron</i> within site, age of plants                             | Site survey  | Onsite   | Mid-term (5 year) review and 10 year plan renewal.                      | Planning Forester  | Mid-term review template and objective appraisal in 10 year LMP renewal. | By assessing the population and age of plants at years 5 and 10 the Planning Forester will be able to make a judgement as to whether control has been carried out and if this was successful.     |
| <b>Maintain the designed landscape character in a sustainable manner.</b>   | Site landscape character              | Age and condition of parkland trees, effectiveness of parkland management, amenity value | Site survey  | Onsite against historic information and recent surveys, aerial photography | Mid-term (5 year) review and 10 year plan renewal.                      | Planning Forester, Landscape Architect.                                  | Mid-term review template and objective appraisal in 10 year LMP renewal. | By assessing the age and condition of parkland trees, effectiveness of management such as grass mowing and amenity value/key landscape elements the Planning Forester and Landscape Architect can |

| <b>LMP Objective</b>   | <b>Assessable criteria</b>                      | <b>Appraisal method</b>   | <b>Monitor method</b>   | <b>Monitor where</b> | <b>Monitor when</b>  | <b>Monitor who</b>                      | <b>Record monitoring where</b>   | <b>Evaluation.</b> How does the Appraisal and Monitoring method inform current & future proposals?  |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|--|---|--|---|
|  |   | and key landscape elements including internal views.  |   |                      |  |   |  | make a judgement as to whether the proposed management is adequately balancing landscape value, management inputs and biodiversity potential.   |
| <b>Reduce risks posed by tree pests and diseases while maintaining woodland character.</b> | Woodland structure, pest and disease outbreaks. | Diversity of tree species and age structure. Presence of pest/disease damage, alignment with specific SF and FLS policies.              | Site survey, mid-term review and LMP renewal meetings, evaluation of main threats against LMP baseline (sections I/2.4.1 and I/5.4). (SCDB query) | Onsite               | Mid-term (5 year) review and 10 year plan renewal. Ad-hoc basis as threats emerge.                                 | Planning Forester                       | Mid-term review template and objective appraisal in 10 year LMP renewal.             | Plan interventions are unlikely to be significant enough to show large changes in the SCDB by year 10. By monitoring the stand structure in terms of species and age class, the Planning Forester will be able to make an informed judgement, backed up by site observations and pest/disease outbreak records as to the resilience of the stand to current and future threats. Alignment with SF and FLS policies will provide additional indication of risk and whether updates are required. |
| <b>Maintain and enhance key habitat features such as LEPO woodland and veteran trees.</b>  | Habitat presence and quality                    | Quantity and quality of deadwood and veteran tree habitats, proximity to nectaring plants, conversion to native woodland (coupe 17001). | Site survey, MTR and LMP renewal meetings   | Onsite, workplans    | Ongoing for each operation (through work plan and 75% meeting). Mid-term (5 year) review and 10 year plan renewal. | Planning Forester, Environment Forester | Work plans, mid-term review template and objective appraisal in 10 year LMP renewal. | Assessing deadwood and veteran tree habitats against known parameters such as species, log size, state of decay, proximity to nectaring plants and volume per hectare will allow the Planning and Environment Foresters to make an informed judgement as to the quality of habitat and biodiversity value provided by these habitat features. The   |

| LMP Objective | Assessable criteria | Appraisal method                                  | Monitor method | Monitor where | Monitor when | Monitor who | Record monitoring where | <b>Evaluation.</b> How does the Appraisal and Monitoring method inform current & future proposals?             |
|---------------|---------------------|---|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|--|
|               |                     | Extent of surface vegetation within Larbert Loch. |                |               |              |             |                         | removal of exotic species from coupe 17001 will indicate if conversion to native woodland has been successful. |