

Glen Tanar Estate

Forest Plan

Scoping Report



**Glen Tanar Estate, Brooks House, Glen Tanar, Aboyne, AB34 5LS Tel: 013398 86451
E-mail: info@glentanar.co.uk**

Glen Tanar Estate Forest Plan Scoping Process

1. Introduction

1.1 Name of Property

This scoping report is concerned with the property of Glen Tanar Estate, Aboyne, Aberdeenshire

1.2 SRDP Proposal Number

RDC-RP/365861/038/0036/3658610/S/001

1.3 Main Location Code

1.4 Forest Plan Area

The Forest Plan will cover an area of 3859 ha. Not all of this area is established woodland. A proportion is open ground within and on the fringes of the woodland. It should be noted that an additional area of 185.4 ha, owned by Scottish Natural Heritage is located with the Glen Tanar Native Pinewood. This area owned by SNH is not directly covered by this report.

1.5 Arrangement for Scoping Process

Two scoping meetings were held in March 2009. A drop-in session for members of the general public was held at the Victory Hall in the village of Aboyne on Saturday 21 March from 10am to 3pm. Display boards showed the maps of the outline proposals along with explanatory text and illustrative photographs. Members of the estate staff were present to answer questions and take responses. A member of the staff of Forestry Commission Scotland was also present.

Adverts were placed in the Public Notices section of the Press and Journal and the Deeside Piper announcing the drop-in session one week and three days before the event. Press releases were also issued and both publications ran a small article publicising the meeting during the two weeks before the date.

Letters were sent to selected local residents who had specialist knowledge of woodland ecology and who had expressed an interest in the management of the estate woodlands in the past. Local organisations who had used Glen Tanar estate as a base for their activities in the recent past were also notified by e-mail.

Following the scoping meeting the display boards were available to the public in the Braeloigne Visitor Centre at Glen Tanar for a further two weeks when the opportunity was also given to leave written or verbal comments

A formal meeting for statutory bodies and representatives of organisations was held in the Victory Hall on Monday 23 March. This meeting was chaired by Dan Cadle of Forestry Commission Scotland. Written invitations to the meeting were issued three weeks beforehand. The full list of invitees is included in Appendix 1.

Along with the written invitation, participants were sent maps of:

- Deer Management situation
- Constraints, including wildlife sensitive areas
- Access and recreation
- Potential disturbance zones along estate tracks
- Thinning proposals
- Potential areas to be felled and re-stocked
- Concept map

Following the Scoping Meetings all invitees, including those who were unable to attend, were given until the 30 March to submit written comments.

2. Participants

2.1 Attendees at Formal Meeting

Name	Organisation	Address	
Michael Bruce	Owner Glen Tanar Estate	Brooks House Glen Tanar Aboyne Aberdeenshire AB34 5EU Tel: 013398 86451	
Colin McClean	Wildlife Manager Glen Tanar Estate	as above	
Mike Fifield	Head Forester Glen Tanar Estate	as above	
Eric Baird	Head Ranger Glen Tanar Charitable Trust	Braeloine Visitor Centre Glen Tanar Aboyne Aberdeenshire AB34 5EU Tel: 013398 86072	
Irvine Ross	Forestry Consultant to Glen Tanar Estate	The Ross Partnership Bearfold Ordie Aboyne AB34 5LS Tel 013398 81651	
Dan Cadle	Forestry Commission Scotland	Grampian Conservancy Ordiquhill Portsoy Road HUNTLY Aberdeenshire AB54 4SJ Tel: 01466 794542	
Gavin Legge	Forestry Commission Scotland	as above	
Maggie Laws	Scottish Natural Heritage	17 Rubislaw Terrace Aberdeen AB10 1XE Tel : 01224 642863	
Will Boyd Wallis	Cairngorms National Park Authority	14 The Square Grantown-on-Spey PH26 3HG Tel : 01479 873535	
Moira Gregg	Archaeologist Aberdeenshire Council	Woodhill House, Westburn Road, Aberdeen. AB16 5GB Tel: 01224 664723	
Mary McLeod	Environmental Planner Aberdeenshire Council	Viewmount Arduthie Road Stonehaven AB3 2DQ Tel : 01569 768293	
Tim Poole	Capercaillie Project Officer	RSPB Scotland Etive House Beechwood Park Inverness IV2 3BW Tel: 01463 715000	

Craig Christie	Scottish Water	??	
Simon Williams	Head Forester Dunecht Estate	Dunecht Estate Office Dunecht Westhill Aberdeenshire AB32 7AW Tel: 01330 860223	
Rab Patterson	Head Keeper Dunecht Estate, Birse	as above	

2.2 Correspondents

Written responses were received from the following

Name	Organisation	Address	Correspondence References
David Jenkins		Whitewalls Barclay Park Aboyne AB34 5JF	3
Ian Francis	RSPB	10 Albyn Terrace Aberdeen AB10 1YP	2
Zoe Griffin	SEPA	142 Sinclair Road Torry Aberdeen Ab11 9PR	1
Iain E Mackenzie	James Jones & Sons Ltd	Burnroot Sawmill Dinnet Aboyne AB34 5PN	4

Copies of the letter received are contained in Appendix 4

2.3 Drop-in Consultation Session

A number of comments were received in verbal or short note form at the Drop-in Consultation Session These are summarised in Appendix 1

3. Key Issues

3.1 General

In general terms the Forest is considered sensitive, particularly because of the native pinewood which carries SPA, SAC, SSSI & NNR designations. A large number of the issues concerned the conservation of the pinewoods and the populations of woodland grouse and other wildlife. The management of the woodland deer populations and the perimeter deer fences was also raised. The estate is also popular with walkers and mountain bikers and attract a large number of visitors, many making several repeat visits per year. Issues were raised concerning access, integration with forestry operations and disturbance to wildlife. As

the Water of Tanar and the River Dee are designated as an SAC the matter of water quality was also important to consultees.

As the majority of the woodland lies with the Cairngorms National Park issues of conservation of the visual amenity of the forest and open land were considered important. Conservation of the archaeological heritage and the cultural landscape were also highlighted.

The importance of Glen Tanar role as a timber producer was also mentioned with indications that this supported the local economy including investment in timber processing and employment.

3.2 Key Issues

The key features highlighted during scoping were

- Wildlife and biodiversity including deer management
- Maintenance and improvement of water quality
- Maintenance of landscape, visual amenity and recreation facilities
- The production of good quality timber on a consistent basis

A list of all the issues that were identified from the two Scoping Meetings and written responses are presented in the table below together with the measures that could be taken to address them.

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
		commencing timber harvesting. Adjust schedule if necessary	
	Impact on proposals for predator control	Plan for effective predator control by legal methods Restrict use of snares to avoid accidental capture of woodland grouse Consider use of hounds to control foxes	
	Impact on proposals for ground vegetation management	Plan to continue heather swiping and burning where possible Consider grazing by cattle	Burning can be problematic because of need for sufficient trained staff at critical times Would require fencing which could be detrimental to woodland grouse. No supplementary feeding is allowed in the NNR under the terms of the Reserve Agreement so cattle welfare might be limiting factor. Cost may also be prohibitive
	Impact on proposals for thinning	Aim to maintain sufficient overhead cover and shade to encourage blaeberry in ground flora and deter heather (<i>Calluna vulgaris</i>) Vary thinning intensity in native pinewood to enhance habitat diversity	
	Impact on felling programme	Aim to maintain continuity of	

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
		<p>canopy cover (habitat networks) linking commercial plantations, native pinewood and woodland on neighbouring properties</p> <p>Aim to avoid dramatic change around known leks</p> <p>Utilise low impact silvicultural systems where practicable</p>	
	Impact on restocking	Minimise the use of deer fencing and mark all essential fences where there is a possibility of bird strike	
	impact on wet land management	Survey and select suitable areas for reinstatement of bog by blocking drains	
	Impact on visitor management	<p>Aim to reduce disturbance around lek sites and in brood areas by careful planning of footpath network</p> <p>Continue efforts to educate dog owners by seasonal posters and personal contact by ranger service</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat for crossbills 	Impact of restocking programme	<p>Restock plantation areas with Scots pine where the site is suitable</p> <p>Incorporate larch in species mix when restocking</p> <p>Consider restocking with Norway</p>	<p>Given the current spread of Red Band Needle Blight the use of lodgepole pine will not be considered.</p> <p>Current advice from Forest</p>

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
		spruce in suitable locations	Research on climate change is to confine spruce species to sites that will remain moist in drought conditions. Norway spruce is also particularly vulnerable to bark stripping by red deer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife habitat requirements will be dynamic and not fixed in any one location (as implied by constraints map) 	Impact on habitat management plans	Develop set of criteria to guide habitat management and forestry operations planning	
Deer Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for perimeter deer fencing 	Impact on Deer Management Plan	<p>Include plan for phased replacement of aging fences</p> <p>Continue cooperation with neighbours through local Deer Management Group</p>	Deer fencing is required to control the difference in deer density between ground to the west and regenerating forest and agricultural land to the east and north.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location of perimeter deer fence 	<p>Impact on deer management plan.</p> <p>Impact on woodland expansion plan</p>	<p>Assess whether current alignment of perimeter fence is most appropriate</p> <p>assess potential for expansion of native pinewood into protected areas</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enclose deer in fenced areas in winter (DJ) 	Impact on Deer management Plan	<i>Assess costs, benefits and practicalities of this technique.</i>	
Conservation of Native Pinewood			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of non-native trees 	Impact on felling plan	Plan for phased removal of non-natives over 20 year period. Plan to remove Sitka spruce in the first phase.	It is recognised that larch and Norway spruce are important food sources for crossbills

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of non-native trees after felling 	impact on restocking plan	<p>Plan to replace larch with Scots pine as sites should be suitable. On wetter sites plan to block drains where possible and replace with open wet ground/bog pine/willow/alder.</p> <p>Plan to incorporate larch/spruce in plantations close to native pinewood.</p>	It is recognised that larch is important spring food for Capercaillie. Ensure larch is present in commercial plantations adjacent to the native pinewood
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set aside area for non-intervention management 	Impact on felling/thinning/ground vegetation management plans	The area of the native pinewood considered suitable for timber harvesting is likely to be reduced as indicated in the new Reserve Management Plan	<p>Perhaps best described as minimal intervention management as deer control cannot be isolated from the rest of the forest.</p> <p>The area belonging to SNH has historically been managed as a minimal intervention zone</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of woodland up the valleys of the Water of Tanar and tributaries 	Impact on restocking plan and moorland management plan	<p>Balance the expansion of the woodland area against the habitat value of the heather moorland</p> <p>Identify suitable areas for woodland expansion</p>	<p>The list of species in the Glen Tanar SPA designation includes hen harrier. The retention of moorland is a priority objective for the SPA and the SAC and for the estate.</p> <p>Where opportunities are identified expansion by regeneration can be encouraged by prescribed burning on the forest edge</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuity of deadwood 	Impact on harvesting and thinning plan	<p>Retain all standing dead timber</p> <p>Leave high stumps when thinning younger stands of pine in the</p>	

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
		Native Pinewood	
Water			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forestry activities may impact on water quality 	Impact on harvesting/restocking plans	<p>Estate will notify take account of location of water supplies in planning harvesting operations</p> <p>Estate will notify Scottish Water of any forestry activities in the Aboyne water supply catchment and SW will monitor water quality</p> <p>Open space to be maintained around springs/collection points</p> <p>Continue to remove conifers from riparian zones and replace with native broadleaves/open space</p> <p>Control regeneration of unwanted species</p> <p>Follow Forests and Water Guidelines in all operations</p>	<p>update harvesting constraints map with latest data on public water supplies.</p> <p>Ensure maps of estate water supplies are fully up to date</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Framework Directive – aim is to achieve “good” ecological status by 2015. The Water of Tanar currently classified as “moderate” 	Impact on all forestry activities including road maintenance	<p>Follow Forests and Water Guidelines in all operations</p> <p>Notify SEPA of all operations covered by the Controlled Activities Regulations (2005)</p>	SEPA suggest that this low grading is potentially due to modifications to the watercourse such as culverting. However there are no culverts on the main stream of the Tanar. Clarify with SEPA the criteria used and the parameters

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Road construction 	impact on timber harvesting and recreation	Follow Forests and Water Guidelines and CAR regulation in all maintenance operations	It is considered unlikely that there will be any necessity to construct significant lengths of new forestry roads as the woodlands already have adequate access.
Archaeology			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological dataset held by Estate is incomplete 	Impact on all forestry activities	Estate will co-operate with Aberdeenshire Council to ensure it has the most recent data from the Scottish Monument Records Estate will obtain survey records from the amateur archaeological team who have been active in the estate in recent years.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of archaeological remains 	Impact on all forestry activities	Archaeological sites to be marked and pointed out to operators before work commences. Sites to be kept clear of tree growth in accordance with the guidelines in the UK Forestry Standards and the UWKWA guidelines Where possible utilise archaeological sites as deer greens in deer management plans	
Site Designations			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of significance of Site of Interest to Natural Science in 	Impact on all forestry activities	Estate will follow up and assess the accuracy and relevance of the SINS designations and incorporate	

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
concept plan		in forestry planning	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LBAP Lists 	Impact on all forestry activities	Estate will follow up and assess the accuracy and relevance of the LBAP lists and incorporate in forestry planning	
Landscape			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impact of tree harvesting on the landscape 	Impact on harvesting plan	<p>Prepare landscape perspectives of proposed felling. Amend proposals to mitigate visual impact if necessary. Mitigate visual impact from well used footpaths and tracks and on particular vistas and panoramas</p> <p>Utilise Low Impact Silvicultural systems where practicable</p> <p>Avoid concentrations of felled areas in one part of the woodland</p> <p>Follow guidelines in UK Forestry Standard</p> <p>Incorporate information from historic land use assessment data and CNPA landscape assessment</p>	
Recreation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for access during forestry operations 	Impact on all forestry operations	<p>Provide adequate warning of proposed operations</p> <p>Erect and maintain adequate signage during period of operations</p>	maintain regular liaison with ranger service

Main Issues	Impact on Planning/Management	Measures to be Taken	Notes
		<p>Co-operate with local access officer where core paths affected</p> <p>Signpost alternative routes where practicable</p> <p>Provide adequate gates/styles at fence crossings</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mountain bike trails 	Impact on all forestry operations	<p>Provide information on trail leaflets?</p> <p>Consider high level circular cycle routes?</p>	Most paths are currently multi-functional, therefore open to cyclists. Assess potential disturbance to wildlife and to deer management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance to wildlife 	Impact on recreation management	<p>Continue to Implement pro-active visitor management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal posters and zoning Signposted trails to avoid wildlife sensitive areas <p>Incorporate results of recent research into disturbance by walkers and dogs into visitor management plan.</p>	The implications of this are currently being explored via the local Access Forum
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve visitor experience 	Impact on recreation management	Incorporate viable suggestions for visitor/ranger service interaction, health walks, Nordic walking, guided walks, trail guides etc.	more appropriate to GTCT Ranger Service work programmes. The current programme incorporates these elements but remains open to continuous review.

Appendix 1
Written and Verbal Responses from Public Meeting
Saturday 21 March

COMMENT	SOURCE
Happy to see such a lovely area cared for so well, and with future generations of outdoor enthusiasts having woodlands and nature to enjoy.	1
Reinstate bogs by blocking drains.	2
Remove Sitka spruce in old forest.	2
Amend thinning/felling plans to maintain canopy continuity e.g. between Craigendinnie and old forest.	2
'Constraints' (wildlife) will be dynamic (not static as shown) and should be accompanied by criteria.	2
Aim to maintain heather/blueberry core in part-grazed (neither over- nor under-grazed) state.	2
Minimise fences, and mark fences.	2
Estimate financial benefit of wildlife/aesthetics during commercial planning (aesthetics vs. timber).	2
My views are generally very positive.	3
A very good balance between environmental and economic impact on the Estate, although I would like to see introduction of native woods.	3
Education of dog walkers (especially locals) regarding their impact on environment and enjoyment for other users.	3
Consider landscape when finalising clearfell areas.	4
Why only 'consider' removal of non-native conifers?	4
More all-ability trails e.g. from Car Park to Chapel	4
More Health Walks, Nordic Walking.	4
Produce Trail Guides	4
Would 'Wildlife Watching' tours in partnership with Wild Scotland businesses be considered?	4
More 'accompanied' walks.	5
The larch at Knockie plantation are important for species such as crossbills.	6
A variety of tree species including non-natives are important to maintain a balance of food sources for these animals(e.g. crossbills)- some should be left available or replanted.	6
Do it!!!	7
More intensive deer management needed, e.g. fence in over winter. Previously, deer were managed for trees: now, should manage deer for quality. (cf David Jenkins' book)	8
Plan lacks vision: should be clear vision founded on need to both protect and expand Caledonian forest.	9
No plan to set aside specific area for natural processes free of any intervention.	9
No plan to expand semi-natural forest .S.W up the glen.	9
Develop (Cal. Forest)habitat linkages with neighbouring estates.	9
Commercial forestry, recreation (inc. aesthetic landscape issues), ecology (inc. management for particular spp), and education- all valid objectives.	9
Welcome proposed expansion eastward through regen on and around slopes of Baudy Meg: could expand to establish habitat linkage to Forest of Birse (whilst still retaining firebreak)	9
Other areas of expansion through regeneration are welcome.	9
Lack of expansion up Glen Tanar, Water of Gairney, and Water of Allachy, is huge missed opportunity. (supports broadleaves along Tanar, but disappointed no plans to expand pinewood in this direction).	9

Recognition of obstacle to expansion posed by deer density: suggests reduction in numbers on adjacent estate(s), failing which, re-alignment of deer fence (rather than simply maintenance and renewal).	9
Recognition of muirburn as obstacle to expansion by regeneration: proposes gradual moving of burned area further south to allow expansion. (nonetheless sympathetic to burning as habitat improver for capercaillie and black grouse)	9
Whilst recognising environmental and commercial benefits of muirburn for grouse, asserts that expansion of 'rare and nationally important forest ' should take priority.	9
Long term strategy should protect and extend habitat linkages to Dinnet, Glen Muick, and Balmoral.	9
Within or adjacent to semi-natural forest, plantations should be progressively restructured to 'blend' with semi-natural woodland. Interventions to achieve this could include: selective felling, heather swiping, burning, removal of non-native spp.	9
Part of the semi-natural forest should be designated a 'non-intervention zone', and natural processes left to their own course. (cf. 'several overseas national parks')	9
Recognises need to thin for commercial reasons, however suggests retention of some unthinned areas for (unspecified) biodiversity reasons.	9
Suggests areas felled within existing forest not replanted, except with appropriate broadleaved trees: rather left to regenerate. (this within NNR, e.g. when Sitka removed)	9
Supports removal of conifers from streamsides, and replacement by native broadleaved trees.	9
Continue comprehensive monitoring of impact of management practices, inc. browsing.	9
Supports continuation of informal recreational use and 'excellent educational use' of Estate.	9
Pleased that no additional tracks proposed.	9
Would like landscaping or reinstatement (means removal?) of existing tracks on open ground to reduce visual impact.	9
Burning up line of track accentuates visibility and should be avoided.	9
When thinning, seek opportunity for 'viewpoints', esp. on Firmounth.	9
Use selective felling (rather than clearfell) in areas of greatest visual impact.	9
'Fingering' in felled areas to prevent harsh straight lines in landscape. (not clear if this when clearing or when replanting?)	9
Plantations to south of Bridge of Ess, to Fairy Loch: either more 'phased' felling or selective felling to limit impact on 'walking experience' (not clear if this aesthetic experience or simply access)	9
Plantations along Firmounth, adjacent to Knockie, and near Loch, need particularly sensitive management because: near to semi-natural forest, and in 'honey-pot' area for visitors. So, avoid wholesale clear felling, regen if possible or replant with Scots pine.	9
Because of visual impact between Braeloine and Knockie Viewpoint, suggests retaining S. pine and birches on lower area, but removing larch. (Not clear, but could mean on Knockie, to west of track between Chapel and Viewpoint)	9
Leave at least some screening trees alongside popular paths.	9
Wants future update and discussion on plan.	9
Would like more 'hides' in Ballaterach, Cambus O'May, Glen Tanar.	10
More 'hands-on' work experience between schools and local estates.	10
A detailed map of all the roads and tracks on the estate would be	11

helpful. (not clear if this means during the consultation, or elsewhen)	
A 'junior ranger' area on the blog, linked to John Muir Trust, etc.	11
Ask young people how they would like estate to be used in future (local and regional).	11
Consider seasonal closing of some areas for capercaillie breeding season.	11
Show overlay of 'disturbance' map with breeding/lekking sites to show how tracks cut through or near (sensitive) sites.	11

SOURCE DATA AS GIVEN

CODE	SOURCE	AFFILIATION
1	Mrs Joanna Strachan	
2	Dr. Robert Moss	
3	Anon	
4	Alan Melrose	COAT; walkdeeside; C and DDMO; A'bshire Council
5	Judy Toes	Aboyne res.
6	Anon.	
7	Anon	
8	Prof David Jenkins	
9	Steve Green	Aboyne resident; Director, JMT
10	Anonymous comments on map	
11	Anonymous comments on map	

Appendix 2
Notes from Scoping Meeting
Monday 23 March

GLEN TANAR FOREST SCOPING: Agency/Major Stakeholders Meeting, 23rd March 2009

Present

Dan Cadle(FCS)(Chairing), Irvine Ross (GTE), Will Boyd Wallis(CNPA), Moira Greig(Ab Council), Mary Mcleod(Ab Council), Michael Bruce(GTE), Eric Baird(GTCT), Gavin Legge(FCS), Tim Paul(CAPER), Simon Williams(Dunecht Estate), Rab Paterson(Birse), Colin MacClean(GTE), Mike Fifield(GTE), Maggie Laws(SNH), Craig Christie(Scottish Water).

Intro and Welcome(DC)

Outline d context: scoping report leading to 20 year forest plan.

Updated on previous public meeting.

Outline (IR)

Described proposals, invited comments until 31st March, referred to subsequent display in Braeloine.

Issues Discussion

ISSUE	TOPIC	RESPONSE
Wildlife/Biodiversity	Capercaillie numbers	Numbers low, 5 males observed, probably around 20 birds in total. Causes of the decline attributed to climate change, disturbance, predation, field layer unsuitability; and combinations thereof.
	Succession, e.g. on march to the east of GT, with Birse, of heather to pine, makes predator control more difficult.	Predator control would be important management activity, for both commercial and biodiversity reasons.
	The use of hounds for predator control.	Extent and dispersed structure of woodland would make this difficult. Negative P.R. impact recognised; however, GT open to possibility.
	Actions to improve understorey?	Grazing, burning and swiping possible. Grazing problematic: cattle lost condition in previously (Could use different breeds?); needs stockman, and fencing(bad for capercaillie), so is high cost operation; browsing by deer precluded as objectives include pine regeneration. Swiping difficult, because of rough ground. Burning viable but problematic: staffing issue, timing (limited 'windows' of opportunity).
Designations	Review of SINS, for geomorphology, etc.	GT will follow up and assess accuracy and relevance.
	LBAP spp lists.	GT will follow up and assess accuracy and relevance.
	Archaeology data sets incomplete.	GTE will co-ordinate with MG on this to resolve issues of accuracy and completeness.
	Management actions on archaeological sites	GT agreed to ensure removal of trees in/close to sites. However, potential conflict with biodiversity interest recognised.
Landscape	Historic land use assessment maps	FC info on this.

	Cultural landscape	General statement of principles required
	CNPA work on landscape (Matthew Hawkins)	Noted.
	Generic Issue for all designations	Integrate data sets, ensure consistency with policy contexts, at both site and landscape scale.
	Consider visual impact of/in final plan	Agreed
Deer Management	Deer fences: repaired or removed?	Need for some form of fencing: differential deer density across GT, and between GTE and neighbours
	Deer fences: where?	App 25sq.km in S.W., otherwise impact on GT. Some neighbours are/have managed to reduce deer density, so less need in that direction.
Water	'opening up watercourses'?	Means removing streamside conifers, replacing with either riparian broadleaved trees, or leaving open. (welcomed)
	Forest activities may impact on water quality.	GT will notify relevant authority, who may then sample.
	In long term, SW is not to use GT source.	Noted.
	GT needs map of springs/supplies.	SW has supplied.
	GT needs SW contacts	Elaine.Pirie@scottishwater.co.uk (Graham Stevens/Brian Henderson local contacts)
	Was clearance needed around collection points?	Yes: to facilitate access, also to reduce transpiration from supply in summer
Recreation	Is there access plan for when forest operations occur.	Yes: code compliant measures introduced
	What about access through fences on paths?	Access to be provided on paths at key access points.
	Impact of disturbance (e.g. on capercaillie).	Problem recognised, support for pro-active visitor management, e.g. zoning.
'Forestry' operations	Are woodlands certified?	Yes, FSC certification.
	Spruce in NNR: is retention compatible with designation? (although favoured by capercaillie)	Intention is to remove: request for guidance on timing/replacement spp.
	Spruce: what fills the gap?	Bog pine, spruce on bog, leave open: all viable options.
	Planned mix of pine and non-natives good for biodiversity.	Noted.
	Felling/Thinning	
	Will shelterwoods be replanted or	Range of options to promote succession, including scarify, kill bracken, replant.

	regenerated?	Before final scheme, need to assess site issues, e.g. browsing pressure, and strategic issues e.g. wildfire hazard.
	Vehicle access and loading: are new facilities needed?	Not much.
	If capercaillie site, what management considerations will be applied?	Avoid lek. Identify other elements of habitat, e.g feeding sites.

Appendix 3
Letters Received

(scans to be added)