

# APPENDIX 4 - Consultation Record

## Citizen Space Consultation 9th June to 7th July 2017



Consultee Name	Consultee Comment	FC Response
<b>STATUTORY</b>		
Devon CC	No Response	-
Natural England	No Response	-
Environment Agency	No Response	-
Historic England	A good plan for this important site. Only minor comment to make is that the monument is not Saxon in date as stated but medieval.	Scheduled Monument Plan corrected accordingly.
Torridge District Council	No Response	-
North Devon District Council	No Response	-
Mid Devon District Council	No Response	-
Satterleigh, Warkleigh & Chittlehamholt CP	No Response	-
St. Giles in the Wood CP	No Response	-
Ashreigney CP	No Response	-
Winkleigh CP	No Response	-
Chawleigh CP	No Response	-
Wembworthy CP	No Response	-
Eggesford CP	No Response	-
Bratton Fleming CP	No Response	-
Arlington CP	No Response	-
Kentisbury CP	No Response	-
Trentishoe CP	No Response	-
Parracombe CP	No Response	-
<b>NGOs</b>		
North Devon Biosphere	No Response	-
South West Water	SWW's particular interest is Wistlandpound. Measures to prevent run off into the reservoir from felled areas are essential. Preserving the willow and alder fringe along the feeder streams is welcomed. Planting of native broadleaves along the stream banks and the fringe of the reservoir should be included in the plan.	<p>During and post felling operations sites will be managed in accordance with UK Forestry Standard, Forestry and Water, Operational Guidance and Page 35.</p> <p>Pages 35 and 38 also outline the management of riparian coupes in general and specifically for Wistlandpound, including the planting and regeneration of broadleaved trees.</p> <p>The fringe area around the reservoir is not managed by FC, but by South West Lakes Trust.</p>
RPSB	No Response	-
South West Lakes Trust	No Response	-
Calvert Trust	No Response	-
Lynton & Barnstaple Railway Trust	No Response	-



Consultee Name	Consultee Comment	FC Response
<b>OTHER STAKEHOLDERS</b>		
Eggesford Gardens	No Response	-
Grazing Tenants	No Response	-
Winkleigh Lessor	No Response	-
Wistlandpound Neighbour	No Response	-
Member of the public	A dog bin would be an asset in car park	Comment passed to Community Ranger, North Devon Beat.
Member of the public	Inadequate control of dogs, especially the faeces they leave behind	Comment passed to Community Ranger, North Devon Beat.
Member of the public	<p>Why is Winkleigh Wood not listed as open access? It's marked as such on the OS maps and is widely used. I know it's leasehold, but isn't it still open to everyone?</p> <p>On recreation, the growing village of Winkleigh would benefit hugely from permissive path access to the Western edge of the wood. I recognise the FC cannot simply arrange this since there is one (only one!) intervening field between the wood and land with public access ( via the sports field). However, I would love to see walking access that avoids Eggesford Road recognised as an ambition for recreational use in Winkleigh Wood - perhaps the FC could support this idea in principle at least? This is an issue that has been discussed in the village for several years.</p> <p>On tree diseases - will you be planning proactive steps to maintain diversity and so resist future disease, for example replanting ash with resistant strains, or at least replanting (any species) with some genetic diversity rather than trees all from one source/nursery? Relying on natural regeneration may not be enough.</p>	<p>The rights of access are de facto according to the terms of lease. The OS map is a misrepresentation of the facts which has been acknowledged by OS but not corrected.</p> <p>Any new points of access into Winkleigh wood would need to be agreed between FC and landowner as an additional condition of the lease. Agreement cannot be guaranteed and would only be considered if the intervening field was willing to permit access across as well. Until the latter of these issues has been addressed FC will not be pursuing this. Comment has been passed to Community Ranger, North Devon Beat.</p> <p>Resistant genetic strains of ash are yet to have been found, research is ongoing. Once there is consensus within the profession then this may be considered an option. Reliance on natural regeneration is not advocated, and this has been made more explicit on pages 21-23 and 38 where enrichment with NVC type species is proposed.</p>
Member of the public	<p>We live backing onto Challices Plantation on a north facing slope. The height of the trees in the plantation means that we don't see the sun from late autumn til about March.</p> <p>Is there some scope for thinning adjacent to our boundary (and our neighbours) to improve light and quality of life for us ?</p>	Comment passed to Forester, North Devon Beat to be considered for the next thinning intervention at Challice's. This is dependent on tree stability and safety.
Member of the public	<p>Firstly I would like to commend you on the zeal with which you have advertised this plan and request for comments. There is a fault with the index Recreation and Public Access is p29 not p39.</p> <p>Sadly this document is written for those whose understanding of forestry management is far greater than mine accordingly there are areas' which I struggle with?</p> <p>My major interests are with the Taw Valley, so Heywood, Eggesford etc. My concerns are with;</p> <p>Holding back run off; the River Taw is extremely flashy and likely to flood.</p>	<p>Fault corrected on Contents Page, page 3.</p> <p>Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>The Public Forest Estate is managed in line with UK Forest Standard and Best Practice to minimise runoff and maximise water storage. This is outlined on page 35</p>
Member of the public	Unless I have missed something the plan does not seem to specify when felling and replanting will take place in specific woods. Can the public users of these forests/woods be assured that at no time will we lose the whole of a wood eg Heywood, but just a part of that wood would be felled?	Approved felling for Plan period is outlined on pages 21-23. The Plan does not advocate or propose the clearfelling of the 'whole of a wood'. Heywood is to be managed through thinning towards native broadleaf cover.



<p>Member of the public</p>	<p>We agree that the plan for the forests seems generally well balanced and we support most of its objectives. We welcome the move towards a more sensitive forest management regime and we support the proposals to recognise the historical importance of the Eggesford Forest. We are also generally pleased to see that areas of coniferous planting are being retained (although, as set out below, we believe their siting needs better consideration).</p> <p>However, we are concerned to see proposals for clear felling, including in the longer term (2032 onwards), particularly in the Eastern Eggesford Forest sector (such as the blocks adjoining West Hill Farm and Homeland Wood). The plan provides little detail about these proposals. We therefore hope that these can be re-considered.</p> <p>We are concerned that the plan for clear felling in these two areas does not appear to have taken account of the steepness of the terrain and the instability of the ground. In the past, areas of these woods have been over-thinned, resulting in significant areas of windblow which have taken many years to recover.</p> <p>There has been no landscape character assessment of the impact of clear felling such areas, which are visible from regionally promoted trails - such as the Ridge and Valley walk - and public rights of way.</p> <p>We believe that these sectors would be better - and more sustainably - managed by thinning and re-stocking with native species - either through planting or natural regeneration. We would caution particularly against the clear felling of the sector leading to West Hill which sits on the skyline, and where the steep ground is especially prone to erosion.</p> <p>We are also concerned at the proposals to replant both these sectors with conifers. We support the continued planting and maintenance of conifers in the sections of Eggesford Wood which sit lower in the valley, recognising their importance in terms of the Forestry Commission itself and the need for areas of commercial planting. By retaining these lower in the valley their impact on the landscape and particularly the skyline is reduced.</p> <p>However, for the two sectors mentioned, we think it would be more appropriate - especially as they were historically deciduous woodland - for them to be re-stocked with native deciduous species, rather than conifers. Given the position of these sites and high visibility in the landscape from public rights of way, the visual impact of clear felling such sites will be considerable. It does not appear that this impact has been assessed. We believe it would be more appropriate for alternative and less invasive clearance methods to be used, such as thinning and regeneration.</p> <p>In terms of re-stocking, we note that historically both these sites were planted with deciduous woodland. The plan should provide for re-stocking which fits with the context of a landscape which would have been largely dominated by native deciduous woodland, and should properly do so again.</p> <p>We believe therefore that this part of the plan needs re-assessing so that the proposals provide for more sustainable solutions, which will not lead to extensive tree felling and consequent soil loss, and which provide for less dramatic changes in the landscape, as well as re-planting in a way which fits the historic and landscape character of the area.</p>	<p>The 'we' the respondent is representing is not clear.</p> <p>The proposals for the 'eastern Eggesford sector' (and all other areas) is outlined throughout the Plan, notably Parts 3 and 4. Approval of clearfelling within this document only covers the next 10 years (2017-27).</p> <p>Of 'eastern Eggesford' (around 80ha), only 25% (20ha) will be managed through clear felling. Any clearfells planned in this part of the Plan area are not for at least another 20 years and therefore not approved in this Plan. Those which are planned in the future are on the flatter sites or where crops are not of a condition to be extended through prolonged thinning interventions.</p> <p>Any future clearfelling planned in this part of the Plan area will need go through the same detailed process as that for 2017-2027 proposals, including detailed landscape analysis. That said, the proposed coupes for the forthcoming decades do meet with good landscape design principles and practice and consider landscape character and impact, as well as slope stability.</p> <p>With the majority of the area (75%) managed through thinning and CCF the occasional clearance and creation of transient habitat will benefit the views out and ecological value of the forest.</p> <p>Much of this area is registered ancient woodland and will be managed through thinning towards native cover using broadleaf natural regeneration. The specifics of this is outlined on page 17.</p> <p>The majority of areas not registered as ancient woodland are also managed through thinning towards conifer continuous cover forestry. This specifics of this is outlined on page 19.</p> <p>The areas of ancient woodland are to be managed towards native cover as explained as key Forest Plan objective, in line with national policy and specified on page 17.</p> <p>The mature Douglas fir in the lower valley are not to going be clearfelled and instead retained in the long term as described on page 19.</p> <p>In areas which were historically broadleaved the objective is to restore broadleaf cover, in line with Broadleaf and Ancient Woodland Restoration Policy. Across the Plan area there will be 13ha of additional native broadleaf through planting in the next 10 years.</p>
-----------------------------	---	--