APPENDIX 4 - Consultation Record

Consultation conducted via Citizen Space between 23rd April and 29th May

Consultee Name	Consultee Comment	FC Response
STATUTORY		
Cornwall CC	No Response	N/A
Natural England	Thank you for inviting us to comment on the Forest Plan. Apologies for the delay in responding. I have no major comments to make as I think it reflects well the various discussions we have had about the management of the SSSI sections covered by the plan. We welcome the commitment to felling the various areas of non-native conifers within the SSSI and associated riparian corridors where they are creating heavy shade, to maintain the network of small open areas and flushes which are a key part of the woodland mosaic within the SSSI, and to manage invasive weeds within the river corridor. Natural regeneration of oaks seems to be sparse in many areas and therefore the selective reduction of sycamore and beech in the understorey to favour the regeneration of oaks, and deer control is also welcomed. We would like to emphasise the threat posed by Tolmiea menziesii (Piggyback plant) which is becoming increasingly widespread in the catchment, particularly in wetter areas, at Grogley, Dunmere and Helland. It is highly invasive, outcompeting native ground flora, and difficult to control. Newquay College have recently run some control trials for us to try and determine the best way of controlling the species and I will share this information. This together with widespread Himalayan Balsam and Monbretia are a significant threat to the condition of the SSSI woodland. One other thing to mention is that although the SSSI citation refers to the fact that the woods are dominated by sessile oak Quercus petraea, an NVC survey carried out in 2014, noted that the majority of oaks appeared in the surveyor's view to be common oaks Q. robur or in some cases possibly hybrids. I would be interested in your views on this and the selection of oak species used for restocking within SSSI areas to naturally regenerate following removal of conifers is a good approach, but suggest that any regeneration be monitored and managed to try and maximise the extent of notfifed woodland communities (listed below) as appropriate to the local conditions.	Acknowledged SSSI Management on Page 17 prethen following monitoring and treated Natural regeneration of local predeforest source. Where planting is repedunculate. This will be dependent climate change. Prescriptions remain flexible to allow management.
Environment Agency	No Response	N/A
Historic England	No Response	N/A
Blisland Parish Council	No Response	N/A
Egloshayle Parish Council	No Response	N/A
Helland Parish Council	No Response	N/A
Lanivet Parish Council	No Response	N/A
St. Breock Parish Council	No Response	N/A
St. Mabyn Parish Council	No Response	N/A

prescribes mapping in Year 1 of invasive species and reatment on an annual basis.

edominantly sessile oak will be favoured as future required sessile oak will be preferred over dant on site suitability, with provenances minded of

allow site conditions to allow specific and dynamic

a 11	
Consultee	Name

Consultee Comment

FC Response

OTHERS

UTHERS			
Bodmin Anglers Association	No Response	N/A	
Colquite Estate	No Response	N/A	
Pencarrow Estate	No Response	N/A	
Helligan Estate	No Response	N/A	
Member of Public	Outlands House in Eastwood called into the depot just now. He had seen our signs regarding the Camel Valley forest plan. He had a couple of concerns/ comments. There is a leat that comes down through are wood and into his property. It used to drive a waterwheel powering a corn mill. He plans at some stage to reinstate the waterwheel. Therefore he requested we keep the leat clear of debris during any felling works. Apparently we have blocked it previously. He also wanted to remind us of his water extraction on our land. Obviously concerned that our plans and work do not damage this in anyway. As an aside, he also mentioned that he used to have notice from the Camel Valley Motor Club of the	Comments and notes to be held or Permissions Schedules to ensure p	
Member of Public	There has been a huge drop in wildlife numbers across the UK over the past 40 years, particularly pollinating insects as well as other invertebrates, and the birds and other species which feed on them, and that whereas current farming practices are responsible for this situation, Forestry Commission woodlands offer a mainly pesticide-free habitat that is becoming less dominated by introduced conifers. I feel this positive contribution could be made even better by aiming for even more tree diversity, particularly encouraging tree species beneficial to pollinating insects. For this reason I am glad to see willows and sycamores are already present in large numbers, but it would be good to see more limes (Tilia), wild cherry, wild crab-apple, rowan, and wild service-tree, for instance. Secondly, if global warming continues as expected, then despite the fact we are waking up to the dangers of introducing trees willy-nilly from around the world, I believe it would be a sensible precaution for the Forestry Commission to think about very careful trials of trees from closely-related habitats further south, i.e. species which already coexist with mixed oak/ash/beech (etc) woodlands in France and cooler parts of Spain – a precautionary diversity, in case another major tree disease or two leaves UK woodlands bereft	Comments noted. Species choice is and NVC classification. However th recognised and referenced within t considered when sourcing stock wit consented by Natural England with	

on file and then input into Operational Plan and points are considered.

e is made as appropriate to the SSSI designation the need to provision for resilient forests is n the Plan. Provenance of native planting stock is with southern Europe origins being favoured when *i*thin the SSSI.