

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

Issue (include date and raised by)	Applicant's Response	Scottish Forestry Comments	Agreed Mitigation	Status (Open, Closed)	Significance of Impact (High, Medium, Low)
Population & Human Health					
Safety concerns raised regarding Burn Road (Neighbour A: email 23/08/22, email 18/12/22 reference point 2.04 and 2.05.04)	We propose an open ground buffer of at least 10m alongside roads and we will bring the line of tree planting back further to maintain sight lines at junctions, as advised by the road safety review (see report).	6/3/24 -Noted	The initial design was modified following an independent road safety review conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd (October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.	Closed	low
Request to know if Tilhill has received a response from South Lanarkshire Council's roads department. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 1.8)	South Lanarkshire Council's roads department sent an email on 13/12/22. This was communicated with the neighbour during an in-person meeting at their property (26/01/23).	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Safety concerns	An independent road safety review was	6/3/24 -Noted	The initial design was modified	Closed	low

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>raised regarding the A723 road and Burn Road. Concerns about visibility at junctions and driveways. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.05.04, Neighbour B: email 22/08/22)</p>	<p>conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd. Based on the comments made, we have adapted the woodland design to accommodate the required visual splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time. These adaptations to the woodland design have been implemented at East Nethershields/A723, Property B, Burn Road, and Property D. As part of our hedge management, we will contribute to shared hedge trimming to maintain the required visibility at the junctions.</p>		<p>following an independent road safety review conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd (October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.</p>		
<p>Request that line of sight from the currently inactive driveway is not restricted by land use change in the field south of Property B. (Neighbour C: email 18/11/22, Neighbour B: email 22/11/22)</p>	<p>We have exchanged the field to south of this property with another parcel of land, so there will not be trees planted in the field in question.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Request from neighbour to clarify how leaf litter will be monitored and</p>	<p>There are no proposals for a monitoring programme. Leaf litter provides benefits to biodiversity by creating natural habitats for</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>what mitigating measures would be in place. (Neighbour C: email via Office Manager & Parliamentary Assistant 02/02/23)</p>	<p>small mammals and invertebrates.</p>				
<p>Concern about the close proximity of the proposed woodland to dwellings and the perceived sensitivities associated with this. (Neighbour A: email 23/08/22 and 18/12/22 reference point 1.9)</p>	<p>While many woodland creation projects are in upland, remote places, this is an opportunity to create woodland closer to urban development for the use and enjoyment of local people. The forestry grant system recognises the benefits of woodlands close to urban areas by providing additional funding for projects in these areas.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Public access should be ensured for nearby communities, including local equestrian community. (Access Development Officer, Lanarkshire Council, 05/07/2022)</p>	<p>In line with the UK Forestry Standard and the Scottish Outdoor Access Code, we will not restrict access and we will provide pedestrian gates into fenced areas. Forest rides (grassy pathways) will be integrated within the woodland design to enable visitors to move around the woodland.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted – gates should be shown on submission maps</p>	<p>No formal access routes are present on the site however the proposal has been designed with internal rides which can be accessed via self-closing pedestrian gates in the deer fence which will maintain responsible non-motorised access over the site and along existing internal track.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Concern that growing trees next to Property B presents a security risk. Wish for public access to this area to be prohibited for privacy and security reasons. (Neighbour B: email 22/08/22)</p>	<p>Due to the UK Forestry Standard and the Scottish Outdoor Access Code, we cannot restrict public access to the proposed woodland.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted although design no longer includes planting to the south of property B</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Further safety concerns raised regarding the A723 road: if the field south of Property B does not have a deer fence, this field will become a habitat for deer, which could lead to deer crossing the A723 with dangerous implications. (Neighbour C: via email from Office Manager & Parliamentary Assistant 02/02/23)</p>	<p>Our ecologists have advised us that deer cross into open fields as well as wooded areas. We have exchanged the field to south of this property with another parcel of land, so there will not be trees planted in the field in question.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted – although is this field now not being planted ? if so please update</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbouring property operating a haulage business</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -noted</p>	<p>The initial design was modified following an independent road safety review conducted by</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>asked that shorter trees be planted near the road to maintain the visual splay from their driveway. (Neighbour D: email 15/12/22)</p>			<p>Stewart Paton Associates Ltd (October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.</p>		
<p>Concern about the potential excess of leaves blocking drains and increasing skid risk during wet conditions. (Neighbour D: email 15/12/22)</p>	<p>Broadleaf trees are planted and grow adjacent to public roads across the UK; they are often planted alongside new road construction for amenity purposes. We see no reason to deviate from this precedent in this context.</p>	<p>6/3/24 - Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>
<p>Neighbour dissatisfied with the thoroughness of the road safety review because it was undertaken within one hour. (Neighbour E: phone call)</p>	<p>The road safety review was instructed to assess the impact of the design on visibility splays, for which an hour was sufficient for the inspector to gather the necessary information.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

16/12/22)					
Neighbour expressed concerns about leaves on the road could increase skid risk. (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)	Broadleaf trees are planted and grow adjacent to public roads across the UK; they are often planted alongside new road construction for amenity purposes. We see no reason to deviate from this precedent in this context.	6/3/24 -Noted	See above	Closed	low
Neighbour concerned about visibility when leaving Property E when turning East or West onto Burn Road. When these trees reach maturity Burn Road will be constantly in shade during the winter months. (Neighbour E: phone call 16/12/22)	The proposed woodland would not affect the visibility splay of this property's driveway access. At maturity, the trees would increase the shade on Burn Road throughout the year.	6/3/24 -Noted	See above	Closed	low
Timber transport route (Email 15/11/23)	We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.	7/5/24 - Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbours are concerned that planting will affect light availability and	Trees will increase the shade on the road, but we do not regard this as something which should prohibit planting them.	6/3/24 -Noted	The initial design was modified following an independent road safety review conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd	Closed	low

<p>reduce road safety, especially in winter. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.05.09 and Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)</p>			<p>(October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.</p>		
<p>Neighbour request to see pedestrian gate locations. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.04)</p>	<p>Please see the woodland design map.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted please share these maps with final submission 7/5/24 proposal maps detail fencing route and gates which will provide sufficient access provision</p>	<p>No formal access routes are present on the site however the proposal has been designed with internal rides which can be accessed via self-closing pedestrian gates in the deer fence which will maintain responsible non-motorised access over the site and along existing internal track.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>
<p>Neighbour concerned about the negative</p>	<p>An overshadowing assessment was conducted and concluded that the proposal is fully compliant with the</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted However it is noted that the</p>	<p>Initial due diligence responses highlighted concern that the initial design could increase</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

<p>impacts' loss of light from the forest might have on people's wellbeing and has requested that professionals are engaged with to mitigate risk. (Neighbour A: email 23/01/23 and email 11/04/23)</p>	<p>recommendations of BRE's publication, 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (BR209:2022). Please see the Overshadowing Assessment report for further details.</p> <p>(06/05/24) The lower density areas along some boundaries remain part of the final design.</p>	<p>design assessed include a northern edge of planting at 1,100 stems per ha please ensure that the operation plan/ final design include this lower density boundary or if the design does not included this feature details how this change would affect the overshadowing assessment</p> <p>7/6/24 - noted</p>	<p>shading on two domestic properties, Burn Farm and Maiden Lea. The design was modified to include at least 140 m of open ground between Burn Farm and the edge of the woodland.</p> <p>This modified design was then assessed by GIA Surveyors against the Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (BR209:2022). Two assessments were undertaken, one with top heights of all trees being 40 m, then a second with Sitka Spruce having of a top height of 25 m, native trees at 20 m and lower stature tree at 15 m. Both surveys have demonstrated that the proposed design will not affect the Burn Farm in terms of recommendations of BR209 i.e "at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March.."</p> <p>With regards to shadowing at winter solstice, when the trees are 25- 15 m in height</p>		
---	--	--	--	--	--

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

			<p>representing circa 40- 50 year old woodland, no shadowing would occur of Burn Farm. Due to this analysis, no further analysis on any impact on future potential solar panels yields was undertaken.</p> <p>There would be overshadowing if the trees reached 40 m but this analysis is based on deciduous trees being in leaf which would not occur. When bare tree analysis is undertaken it shows that the shadowing impact is greater reduced as sunlight would be only be partially obscured by bare branches. In addition, the revised design no longer included Sitka spruce so with the final species mix of native broadleaves and Scots pine even with 80- 100 years growth trees would be very unlikely to reach 40m in height.</p> <p>The proposed planting south of Maiden Lea has been removed from the design, hence has not been considered above.</p>		
Neighbours are	The woodland is accessible by foot, bicycle	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>wondering where cars will park when people access the woodland. (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23, Neighbour F: email 25/08/23, Neighbour A: email 21/02/2024)</p>	<p>and horseback. We have not received any requests for a car park, but we would consider any proposal for the creation of one.</p>				
<p>Neighbour concerned that the track leading south from Burn Road is a public right of way which provides amenity to walkers, cyclists and horse riders. These users have been significantly inconvenienced by some past behaviours. (Neighbour G: email 12/08/22)</p>	<p>Current rights of access will be maintained. Access to the site will be in line with the UK Forestry Standard and the Scottish Outdoor Access Code. 06/05/24) Fencing plans do not obstruct access.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted please ensure any fencing proposal has sufficient access points to maintain this access 7/5/24 proposal maps detail fencing route and gates which will provide sufficient access provision</p>	<p>No formal access routes are present on the site however the proposal has been designed with internal rides which can be accessed via self-closing pedestrian gates in the deer fence which will maintain responsible non-motorised access over the site and along existing internal track.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>A neighbour believes planting so many trees in close proximity to many</p>	<p>Trees are known for the multiple benefits they offer, and it is for this reason that government policy encourages the planting of trees close to built-up areas. The UK</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required – potential physical / shading / road safety issues from planting on adjacent properties</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>local houses which have been here for over a hundred years, is verging on immoral. Especially considering there is no history of trees being in this area in this period. (Neighbour F: email 25/08/23)</p>	<p>reached its lowest recorded tree cover just over a hundred years ago, which is why the Forestry Commission was established in 1919. Since then, tree cover has increased, but the country is currently failing to meet government tree planting targets (in 2022, 10,500 hectares were planted in Scotland, falling short of its 13,000-hectare target).</p>		<p>have been addressed in the design</p>		
<p>A neighbour is concerned that the commercial trees are close to houses and will disrupt the views that residents have enjoyed for years. (Neighbour F: email 25/08/23)</p>	<p>We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.</p>	<p>6/3/24 please update with current proposal 7/5/24 removal of productive conifer from proposal noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Regarding all access points onto A726: "Any gates required should be positioned not less than 15 metres from the edge of the carriageway and open in</p>	<p>We will follow this specification if we create or update any new access points. When woodland establishment works are underway, we will leave gates unlocked and open to ensure that vehicles can enter the site safely. (06/05/24) Our proposed approach was emailed to the Council on 19/12/2022, but</p>	<p>6/3/24 – noted Have you had a response from council following your email of 19th December 2022 that</p>	<p>The applicant proposes to use existing field access points from the public roads to establish and manage the woodland. The new deer fence and gates will be offset at least 20 m from the road. South Lanarkshire Council have confirmed they are content</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>towards the site.” (Engineering Officer, Roads Transportation and fleet services, South Lanarkshire council: email 13/12/22)</p>	<p>we received no response. We emailed again on 28/03/2023 and 25/04/2023 - still no response.</p> <p>(09/05/24) We emailed the council to update them that no timber extraction would be needed and that existing agricultural access points would be used by light vehicles during establishment and maintenance operations; and that we may add Type 1 to access points to protect the ground.</p> <p>(09/05/24) Response from South Lanarkshire Council: ‘The existing access points on Burn Road, as indicated on the attached plan, (East Nethershields Lot 1 access points), would not require alteration, however, the existing visibility splay of 4.5metres x 215metres, must be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The existing access points on Strathaven Road A726, as indicated on the attached plan, (East Nethershields Lot 2 access points), would not require alteration, however, the existing visibility splay of 4.5metres x 215metres, must be maintained at all times.</p> <p>It should be noted that the access points are not to this Services specification, ie unbound loose material, however, as the access are existing no upgrading works are required at this time. If in the future reports of mud, debris, loose stones are</p>	<p>your proposal/ further details changes their requirements for “all access points on to A726”</p> <p>7/5/24 noted that no further comments provided by council</p> <p>16/7/24 SLC confirmed their responses regarding use of existing access point following public consultation</p>	<p>with the applicant using the existing access points.</p>		
---	---	--	---	--	--

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

	being deposited on the public road, upgrading works may have to be undertaken.'				
Regarding all access points onto A726: "The first 15 metres of the access road should be surfaced, sealed and trapped to prevent any detritus material or water leaving the driveway and entering the public road." (Engineering Officer, Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)	For woodland creation operations, only tractors and light vehicles will be used. We agree to monitor access points during establishment operations to assess if maintenance is required. and We will deal with any debris by brushing if it is required. (19/12/22) (6/5/24) Confirm that this proposal was communicated to the Council on 19/12/22. (09/05/24) Council emailed again and response provided (see above).	6/3/24 Noted any operation not considered maintenance by council would require consent from council 7/5/24 noted that no further comments provided by council	See above	Closed	Low
Regarding all access points onto A726: "The visibility requirements at the access is 4.5metres x 215 metres at 0.9m above road channel level. This would appear achievable however	We have had a road safety review conducted to assess the potential impact of tree planting on the junctions within the site; we have altered our plans accordingly to not reduce the visibility splay.	6/3/24 -Noted	The initial design was modified following an independent road safety review conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd (October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes	Closed	Low

<p>it may require foliage/ fencing to be altered. Any proposed reduction in the above visibility splay must be supported by speed survey." (Engineering Officer, Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)</p>			<p>along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.</p>		
<p>Regarding all access points onto A726: "To comply with Section 95 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 – Deposit of mud/materials from vehicles on the road. A wheel washing facilities to ensure the public road is kept clean must also be provided and be located within the site." (Engineering Officer, Roads,</p>	<p>Tractors and machinery will be largely confined to site and will not be regularly entering and exiting the site onto the public road. We acknowledge our obligation to keep the public road free from dirt, but there is no requirement for wheel washing facilities. We do not anticipate dirt on the public road, but we agree to brushing/sweeping if it is required. Ground preparation operations will be planned for the summer to ensure minimal soil disturbance, which will also minimise soils being deposited on the road.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>No Mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)					
Regarding all access points onto A726: "Sufficient turning facilities should be provided within the site to ensure all construction, delivery and maintenance vehicles can exit the development in forward gear." (Engineering Officer, Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)	We will make sure there is provision for this if there are any access points where easy turning is not currently possible.	6/3/24 Noted	No Mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Regarding all access points onto A726: "The access should be a minimum 7.3 metre wide with 10.5 metre radii." (Engineering Officer, Roads,	We are not proposing any new access routes for establishment, as existing access is sufficient at present. Should additional access be required in the future, then all statutory permissions shall be in place and access will be constructed to an approved specification.	6/3/24 Noted	No Mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)					
Regarding all access points onto A726: "The access road should be a 7.3 metre wide and constructed to industrial standard i.e. capping layer (based on CBRs), 225mm sub-base, 200mm binder course and 45mm surface course, for the first 2m of access road measured from the edge of the carriageway." (Engineering Officer, Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)	As above.	6/3/24 Noted	No Mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Regarding all access points onto A726:	As above.	6/3/24 Noted	No Mitigation required	Closed	N/A

<p>“A delineation flat top kerb should be located 2m from the edge of the carriageway and should be over the full width of the access road.” (Engineering Officer, Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 13/12/22)</p>					
<p>“In relation to the location of the line of tree, Roads would require that these be set back at least 20m from the edge of the road, and should not obscure any existing visibilities splays.” (Engineering Officer, Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services, South Lanarkshire Council: email</p>	<p>10m is the size of road buffer typically seen alongside roads on new woodland creation sites, therefore we propose an open ground buffer of at least 10m alongside roads and we will bring the line of tree planting back further to maintain sight lines at junctions, as advised by the road safety review (see report).</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>The initial design was modified following an independent road safety review conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd (October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

12/05/23)					
Erection of deer fences within 20m of the road will require planning approval (Engineering Officer, Roads Transportation and fleet services, South Lanarkshire Council: email 12/05/23)	Deer fencing will be set back further than 20m from the road.	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
"A field gate was noted on the eastern curved boundary south of Coldstream was noted, please confirm if there is any requirement for pedestrian access from High Coldstream?" (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)	The previous landowner reported that this gate is not used by pedestrians, therefore a requirement for pedestrian access here is not necessary.	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Regarding Landscape survey: "VP 1 - it is unclear how representative	An additional viewpoint has been created to illustrate the view from the dwelling itself, in addition to the view from the track leading to the dwelling which was	7/5/24 - Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>this VP is of the view from Property G itself. Additional information regarding the potential impact/change on this property is requested” (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry, 24/07/23)</p>	<p>illustrated in the initial viewpoint.</p>				
<p>Regarding Landscape survey: “VP10 - the woodland looks very close to road; is it based on correct design?” (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>	<p>Yes, this is based on the correct design. This visualisation is from a viewpoint set far back from the woodland, so it is perhaps challenging to appreciate the distance between the road and tree planting line from this far away.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Regarding Landscape survey: “VP12 - the design appears to have a significant impact of this property. Further consideration of</p>	<p>Due to concerns raised on the impact on this property, we have exchanged this field for another parcel of land, so we no longer plan to plant trees in this area.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>the design in this location is recommended.” (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>					
<p>Regarding Landscape survey: “ Visualisation of VP 7 and 13 would be useful to enable assessment on the potential impact/ change on Burn road. I had incorrectly stated VP 11 rather 13 in the meeting.” (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>	<p>These have been created.</p>	<p>7/5/24 - Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Regarding Landscape survey: “It is noted that no VPs from/on A roads have been provided and while noting comments by landscape advisor regarding</p>	<p>These have been created.</p>	<p>7/5/24 - Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>passing views from the road given the volume of traffic, some representative visualisations would be helpful to enable assessment on the potential impact/ change" (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>					
<p>Private water supply data should be shared with the council's environmental health (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 14/06/23)</p>	<p>This was shared with South Lanarkshire Council in January 2023, and they confirmed that the private supply data we supplied them matches their data.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>A neighbour is concerned about road safety when accessing Property B, Property C, and Property H. Particularly implying that accident rates</p>	<p>We propose an open ground buffer of at least 10m alongside roads and we will bring the line of tree planting back further to maintain sight lines at junctions, as advised by the road safety review (see report).</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>The initial design was modified following an independent road safety review conducted by Stewart Paton Associates Ltd (October 2022). The report recommended the maintenance of the required visibility splay of 215m, or the maximum</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>are already high around East Nethershields and a reduction in line of sight could increase this. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)</p>			<p>available at the present time if less than 215m. These changes along with additional offset of planting from the roads as a result of feedback from South Lanarkshire Council will ensure that the impact from leaf litter and shading will be minimal from the final design.</p>		
<p>A neighbour has described current road conditions as "...treacherous in anything but dry conditions" and is concerned that increased shading and dampness could reduce road safety. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)</p>	<p>We propose an open ground buffer of at least 10m alongside roads and we will bring the line of tree planting back further to maintain sight lines at junctions, as advised by the road safety review (see report).</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>
<p>A neighbour is concerned about access to Property B, Property C, and Property H. They are concerned that trees could increase danger to motorists, cyclists, horse riders, and other road users</p>	<p>We propose an open ground buffer of at least 10m alongside roads and we will bring the line of tree planting back further to maintain sight lines at junctions, as advised by the road safety review (see report). Trees are planted and grow adjacent to public roads across the UK; they are often planted alongside new road construction for amenity purposes. We see no reason to deviate from this precedent in this context.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>low</p>

<p>because of increased dampness, leaf litter, forest debris on the A723, especially on the bends. (Neighbour C: email 28/04/23)</p>					
<p>The Auldhouse and Chapelton Community Council contacted Scottish forestry directly 13/11/23 with following key points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of Agricultural Land from food production. • Increasing land prices, based on grants and money available. • Pricing local farming communities out of the market, excluding them from expansion. • Forestry Creation Scheme is not 	<p>Response provided by Scottish Forestry.</p>	<p>Scottish Forestry replied on 23/11/23 to clarify the process and highlighting that the community council still have an opportunity to comment on the specifics of the project to Tilhill</p>	<p>Mitigation regarding relevant concern such as loss of agricultural land are considered elsewhere in the issues log. While other matter related to policy and as such are not pertinent to the specifics of this proposal</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>subject to the rigours or oversight of a planning application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Lack of or ignoring due process in not entering consultation with the local community until the last minute and they were forced into it (for this scheme specifically).•Whilst the scheme may fulfil a corporate sustainability policy or aim, it must contradict any Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) policy or aspirations the company may have.•The scar on the landscape extraction leaves, despite assurances now, we have no idea who will own or be responsible					
---	--	--	--	--	--

for the land in 25 – 30 years’ time.					
Neighbour A stated that the visualisations are misrepresentative and do not show the trees at full height (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	The visualisations show the trees at 40 years’ old which is the standard stage of maturity that forestry proposals are assessed.	7/5/24 noted Not withstanding the wording in the landscape report it is acknowledged trees would continue to grow after year 40 but this growth would be significantly less than in the first 40 years there for assessing any impacts in the initial period would reasonable. It is also noted the visualisation are of an earlier design which included a spruce element. It is	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

		considered that these visualisations are acceptable to assess the impact of the all native design			
Neighbour A asked, 'Is the 5 m distance from road edge, the planting dimension or distance of fully mature branches?' (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	Trees will be planted at least 10 metres away from the road so that mature branches are 5 metres away from the road.	7/5/24 noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour A asked which road report has informed the design. (He added that he disregards the road safety report which was published by the road surveyor.) (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	We have used the recommendations of the road report which we shared with stakeholders in 2022.	7/5/24 noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Soil					
Small area of deep peat identified in	These areas have been probed and excluded from planting. Low density willow	6/3/24 -Noted - please detail	The site has been surveyed for deep peat (> 50 cm in depth)	Closed	low

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Lot 2 and, in Lot 1, on the north side of Burn Road. (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23; Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>and alder will be planted without ground preparation within 5 metres of areas of deep peat. Please see the soil report for further information.</p>	<p>any proposed buffer between planting and edge of deep peat 7/5/24 noted additional details regarding ground preparation</p>	<p>as part of the soil survey. The peat depth was initially assessed using a grid approach which was then adjusted when deep peat was located to ensure the extent of the deep peat was located. The identified areas were then excluded from the proposed planting. In order to further protect the deep peat no ground preparation will be undertaken within 5m of the deep peat with planting in this buffer area being with low density willow and alder.</p>		
<p>Neighbour who used to own the field across from the entrance to his property and says that in some parts the peat is more than 50cm deep and therefore unsuitable for planting trees. (Neighbour E: emails 20/12/2022 and 01/05/23)</p>	<p>These areas have been probed and excluded from planting. Low density willow and alder will be planted without ground preparation within 5 metres of areas of deep peat. Please see the soil report for further information.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted – please detail any proposed buffer between planting and edge of deep peat 7/5/24 noted additional details regarding ground preparation</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Ground preparation</p>	<p>Ground preparation will comprise</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

methods	continuous mounding across most of the site. Inverted and hinge mounding using an excavator will be used along some borders of the woodland to create a natural, scattered effect. Planting with a manual screef will be used in areas adjacent to more ecologically sensitive ground, i.e. south of the deep peat in the field north of Burn Road, along the calcareous grassland next to Powmillon Burn.				
Water					
Drainage and impact of tree roots on agriculturally drainage and potential cracking drains over time. (Neighbour D: email 15/12/23)	We intend to implement open drainage in areas where water is not draining satisfactorily: in LPID NS/69888/49110 where an existing agricultural drain is faulty. We do not plan to implement open drainage in Lot 2. In areas where poorly draining areas are not problematic, we will create a wet woodland habitat for the benefit of the associated wildlife. Trees are known to help stabilise water storage, so we anticipate surface water issues improving as the woodland becomes more established.	6/3/24 -Noted - please can you indicate where you are proposing implement open drainage 8/5/24 noted that drainage is in relation to existing drainage and is solely in lot 1	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour expressed concern specifically about damage to drainage in the land north of Property C.	We have brought back the line of tree planting in fields 3 and 9 so that there is a buffer of at least 5m between the tree line and fields north of Property C - the area of concern. Furthermore, we will plant smaller broadleaf species along the border of this	6/3/24 -Noted - please include this buffer in operation details or	Planting details included in operation plan	Closed	low

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)	boundary to minimise roots spreading and damaging neighbouring drains.	constraints map 7/5/24 mitigation detailed in ops plan			
Request that access is maintained to clear the drain at the bottom of the field south of Property B. (Neighbour C: email via Office Manager & Parliamentary Assistant 02/02/23)	This is a watercourse and therefore any works should be subject to a licence from the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency. Due to other concerns raised on the impact on this property, we have exchanged this field for another parcel of land, so we no longer plan to plant trees in this field.	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour asked about the impact of tree planting upon the burn northwest of Property G. (Neighbour G: email 12/08/22)	The reduction of agricultural run-off and establishment of broadleaf trees adjacent to the burn will improve the water quality of the burn.	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour asked if drainage might be added to help with current water issues at the bottom of the field near the haulage driveway at Property D.	We have contacted South Lanarkshire Council about opening the manholes either side of the A726. They have committed to cleaning the manholes in this area this financial year (2024-2025) (email dated 01/03/2024). We are confident that once the trees are planted and become more established, they will help to mitigate the	6/3/24 -Noted please can you indicate where you are proposing implement open drainage	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour D: email 15/12/23)	existing surface water issues.6/5/24 There will be no drainage in this part of the site.	8/5/24 noted that drainage is in relation to existing drainage and is solely in lot 1			
Private water supplies. (National Campaigns & Initiatives SEPA: email 20/12/22)	The borehole located at East Nethershields Farm (UPRN: 484136984) will be unaffected by ground level activity. Nevertheless, we have created a 50m buffer around this borehole in which there will be no planting. There is a spring located at Berryhill (UPRN: 484037543) is far away from the planting area, so it should be unaffected. There are no other known private water supplies within or near the site.8/5/24 No trees will be planted in this area. Borehole location is displayed on the hazards and constraints map.	6/3/24 -Noted – please can you provided map of these supplies with your final submission and shown which areas will be directed planted as per stated mitigation and include mitigation on operations plan 8/5/24 noted	There is a borehole located at East Nethershields Farm which will be unaffected by ground level activity nonetheless, no forestry operation will be undertaken within 50 m of the borehole. There is a spring located at Berryhill which is sufficiently far away from the planting area, so it will not be affected. See map - "Nearby private water supplies" for locations. There are no other known private water supplies within or near the site.	Closed	Low
Drainage. There is currently very poor drainage in some	Trees play a vital role slowing down the flow of rainwater, absorbing rainwater and reducing erosion. We expect to see a	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>areas and a neighbour is concerned about increased flooding into neighbouring fields. (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)</p>	<p>reduction in local flooding as the trees become more established.</p>				
<p>Neighbour is concerned that tree planting will negatively affect the function of Victorian era clay drains. He expressed that it is Tilhill's responsibility to adequately take his run-off water (Neighbour G: email 12/08/22)</p>	<p>As above, we can expect to see trees reducing localised flooding as the woodland becomes more established. In the meantime, we intend to implement open drainage in Lot 1 in LPID NS/69888/49110 where an existing agricultural drain is faulty.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted please can you indicate where you are proposing implement open drainage 8/5/24 noted that drainage is in relation to existing drainage and is solely in lot 1</p>	<p>No Mitigation Required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Some of Property C drains into East Nethershields. It is currently the responsibility of each landowner to take their</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>/3/24 -Noted please can you indicate where you are proposing implement open drainage</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>neighbours drainage water and maintain the drains in their own property. How will this be managed in East Nethershields? (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)</p>		<p>8/5/24 noted that drainage is in relation to existing drainage and is solely in lot 1</p>			
Material Assets					
<p>BT lines</p>	<p>We have created a 10m open ground buffer on either side of the BT line.</p>	<p>Please include consideration of BT line 7/5/24 - Noted</p>	<p>No additional Mitigation Required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Impact of forestry machinery on the track that separates the two most westerly blocks south of Burn Road. (Neighbour G: email 12/08/22)</p>	<p>We do not anticipate significant impact on this track during planting. We propose a site meeting to document the current condition of the track prior to planting operations and following completion to identify any remedial works that may be required. We would cover the costs to bring the track back to the recorded condition.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbours have enquired about the maintenance of march fences and hedges. (Neighbour</p>	<p>Shared fences and hedges will be maintained on a 50/50 basis. We anticipate new deer fencing (at our cost). We will include fence and hedge maintenance in our management plan. This will include</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

G: email 12/08/22, and Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)	maintenance of roadside hedges and fences.				
The airstrip on Property G must remain accessible and operable. (Neighbour G: phone call 18/08/22)	The nearest planting edge is over 100m from the airstrip. The new planting edge is positioned behind mature broadleaf trees, therefore there will be no change to the current constraints associated with the airstrip. We do not anticipate this interfering with any craft landing.	6/3/24 -Noted	The airstrip is at least 100 m away from the proposed woodland creation. The design of the proposal has been shared with the owner and no further comments/ concerns were provided. There are already mature broadleaves trees on edge of the airstrip so the proposed planting is not considered to change the existing constraints for the airstrip.	Closed	low
Neighbour request for right of access on the track within the site to be respected. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)	Current rights of access will be maintained.	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation	Closed	N/A
Neighbour request for 24/7 access to East Nethershields lands to retrieve any straying livestock. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)	We have no issue with this, as we do not want any livestock damage to the trees. Please notify us if you require access to retrieve livestock. No ATVs will be permitted due to insurance purposes.	6/3/24 -Noted	No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>A neighbour has requested information regarding the financial implications of organising fencing, hedge cutting etc. on joint boundaries. (Neighbour C: email via Office Manager & Parliamentary Assistant, 02/02/23)</p>	<p>Where maintenance of boundaries is a shared responsibility, this cost will be shared.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Concern over trees shading the Property I's field and reducing grass growth. Also concerned that tree roots would spread and choke agricultural drains under their field. Requested a 30m buffer between trees and Property I boundary. (Neighbour I: email 02/12/22)</p>	<p>We consider that the field shall not be shaded by tree cover in the adjacent field due to the direction of direct sunlight. In response to your concern about agricultural drains, we propose creating a 5m buffer along the fence line, and smaller tree species will be planted within 20m of the fence line.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted Please can you include these details in the operational plan 7/5/24 additional details included in ops plan</p>	<p>No additional Mitigation Required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbour asked what is to be done about the march</p>	<p>There will be a new deer fence erected around much of the site. In areas where there is no deer fence, we will work with</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>fences where there will be no deer fencing. Stated that the fences are in a very poor state at the moment and need to be replaced. (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)</p>	<p>neighbouring landowners to maintain shared fences and hedges on a 50/50 basis.</p>				
<p>Neighbour asked who will be responsible for the cutting of the roadside hedges next to Burn Road. Stated that they have not been cut for two years and are becoming a road hazard. (Neighbour E: in person 05/01/23)</p>	<p>Roadside hedges will be managed so they do not obstruct road users.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbour at Property D stated that access will also be required by the Council to the existing manholes on both sides of the A726. (Neighbour</p>	<p>Current rights of access will be maintained. Access to the site will be in line with the UK Forestry Standard and the Scottish Outdoor Access Code.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>Fence is offset from road so access is maintained</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

D: email 15/12/23)					
Neighbour asked if a landscape assessment and daylight tracking analysis will be carried out to assess the impact of the woodland design on neighbouring properties. The neighbour is concerned that it will have a negative impact on their property. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22 reference point 2.01.06, 2.06.04, 2.06.06, 22/03/23, and 11/04/23)	Landscape and overshadowing assessments have been carried out and visualisations have illustrated the changes to the landscape from key viewpoints; both assessments are supportive of the woodland proposal.	6/3/24 -Noted	Mitigation details else were in issues log	closed	N/A
Neighbour is concerned about trees reducing the daylight entering their property. This neighbour wishes to add solar panels to the roof of their property, so does	An overshadowing assessment was conducted and concluded that the proposal is fully compliant with the recommendations of BRE's publication, 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (BR209:2022). Please see the Overshadowing Assessment report for further details.	6/3/24 -Noted	Mitigation details else were in issues log	closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>not want any additional shade. (Neighbour A: email 23/01/23)</p>					
<p>Neighbours are concerned about the potential fire risk of a forest near their property. (Neighbour A: email 23/01/23; Neighbour E: email 01/05/23; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential implications of climate change for wildfire risk was carried out as part of the 'UK climate change risk assessment'. This shows the forest fire risk index for this region remaining low despite a changing climate. As most fires are started by people, during higher risk conditions, we will erect signs to advise visitors against the use of BBQs or other activities which may increase risk of fire. Our maintenance plans include 5 years of vegetation control, and there are three large areas of open ground (8.13 hectares) which will continue to be grazed. We will monitor vegetation levels and fire risk as part of our ongoing management of the site. The accessibility of the site next to A-roads increases the ability to effectively manage the fire risk within the woodland.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted Please get details in operational plan are correct should design change</p> <p>16/7/24 updated details in ops plan</p>	<p>The site is in a low risk area for wild fire both in the current climate and with future climate models. The risk will be further mitigated by vegetation management during the establishment phase along with the proposed grazing of four areas retained in agriculture (Lot 1 - south of Burn Farm and east of South Sheild Farm, in lot 2 - west of A726 and east of Powmillon Burn). The area east of South Shields Farm was added due to that property having a timber barn in close proximity to the proposed woodland. The site is relatively flat which reduces the risk of rapid spread of a fire should one occur. In addition, the roads, tracks and rides crossing the site provide both fire breaks and good access to manage a fire should one occur. During higher risk conditions, signs would be erected advising against use of</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

			BBQs and other activities which would increase the risk of fires starting.		
Concern raised over the potential damage trees could cause to powerlines if they were to fall. (Neighbour A: email 11/04/23)	A 10m open ground buffer on either side of powerlines has been accommodated in the woodland design. Scottish Power Energy Networks have approved these plans (20/03/23).	6/3/24 Noted	The powerlines have been buffered by 10 m of open ground and Scottish Power have confirmed this buffer is sufficient.	Closed	Low
Neighbour concerned that 10m buffer around powerlines is not enough due to trees growing taller than 10m (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)	A 10m open ground buffer is standard practice and, accordingly, this has been approved by Scottish Power Energy Networks.	6/3/24 Noted 7/5/24 addition noted	See above	Closed	Low
A neighbour has enquired whether no sycamores could be planted near their boundary due to the danger of sycamore poisoning to his valuable ponies and horses (Neighbour C: via email from Office Manager & Parliamentary Assistant 02/02/23)	Planting of sycamore trees is not planned anywhere on this site. If this changes, engagement with the neighbour will commence to ensure sycamores are not planted within an agreed range of their property.	6/3/24 noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>A neighbour owns a pedigree horse stud. They are concerned that loud noises and other triggers from wildlife management on the site might reduce horse safety and welfare. The neighbour has stated that they would be willing to carry out wildlife management on the site to mitigate this issue. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)</p>	<p>We have discussed this with the neighbour and, in the instance that we need wildlife management, we will invite him to submit an application for the work. Any wildlife manager employed by Tilhill to manage the site will have the qualifications and experience to stalk in a manner which is sympathetic of the local context.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbour asked why hedging has been removed from East Nethershields since July 2022. (Neighbour A: email, 17/03/24)</p>	<p>We are not aware of any hedging being removed and we have never had plans to remove any hedging, as it is an important feature of the landscape and a valuable habitat.</p>		<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Cultural Heritage</p>					
<p>Advised to protect three archaeological assets (a farmstead, a cairn</p>	<p>An open ground buffer zone of 10m has been extended around the farmstead and buffer zones of 5m have been extended around the cairn and pump house. A ride</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>A Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment and Walkover Survey was undertaken by Mott Macdonald</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>and a pump house) with buffer zones. The archaeological survey identified 13 less significant archaeological assets but did not recommend buffers for them. (Archaeological survey, 14/06/22)</p>	<p>(grass track) has been incorporated into the design to enable management and public interest access to the cairn in Lot 2. Prior to work commencing, each of the buffer zones established in the design plan will be clearly marked and delineated on the ground to ensure that no planting takes place on these areas.</p>		<p>(June 2022) The report identified three features of significance which will be protected by appropriate buffers; MM06 Nethershields / High Barn Farmstead- 10 m buffer; MM14 Brae Cairn/marker - 5 m and MM16 Cloverhill Pump House - 5m. Two features (MM05 Burn Farmstead and MM04 High Cross Knowe Possible site of cross.) which were highlighted by stakeholders were assessed by the report as not significant therefore did not need buffering; due to the lack of above ground remains and extent of modern ploughing and improvement. West of Scotland Archaeology Service were provided the report and made no specific comments but stated that the proposal to maintain open ground buffers was inline with "general forestry policies" The site has drystone walls present which will be protected by a 5 m buffer from planting.</p>		
<p>Neighbour highlighted location</p>	<p>The archaeological survey judged this asset to be of low significance. This area is being</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>of former farm steading on map from 1912 (Neighbour E: email 20/12/22)</p>	<p>left for grazing anyway.</p>				
<p>A request has been made that all open ground buffer zones around archaeological features are measured from the outer extent of the feature and not a single grid reference (Historic Environment Records Officer: email 05/07/23)</p>	<p>This is integrated into the design.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>“West of Coldstream there is a drystone wall which should be buffered from planting along with existing trees/hedges present”. (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>	<p>Open ground buffers are designed for the following features: 5m for the drystone wall, 5m for existing trees and hedges within new broadleaf woodland, and 10m for existing trees and hedges in the conifer area.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted please clarify the 5 m buffer for existing trees and hedges is in broadleaves planting areas – please include these buffers in the operation plan.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>High Cross Knowe, east of A723, is identified in the HER database as a possible site of a cross. There are no records of physical remains associated with a cross being uncovered at this location. There is a possibility that there are some traces surviving below ground. (Historic Environment Records Officer: email 05/07/23)</p>	<p>The archaeological survey judged the archaeological potential of this asset as low: 'There is no clear evidence of medieval occupation within the study area. High Cross Knowe may have had origins within the medieval period but the evidence for this is weak. Modern, post-improvement ploughing will have impacted upon any evidence of medieval occupation or medieval farming practices.'</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
Landscape					
<p>Neighbour is concerned that the project does not strengthen rural character but believes it will be destroying it. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>The local Landscape Character Assessment outlines that the '[r]ural character of the Plateau Farmland has reduced as tree cover has declined.' Accordingly, the landscape survey explains, 'it is considered that the proposed scheme will strengthen the rural character of the landscape and enclose and screen many of the man-made features in and around the site.'</p>	<p>7/5/24 noted</p>	<p>The proposal consists of two lots, both of which are located within the Plateau Farmland Landscape character type (LCT) (NatureScot 2019) with number of properties overlooking the lots. A landscape report was commissioned to consider impact on the LCT and adjacent properties.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

			<p>While acknowledging the current open nature of the lots and that the proposal would increase native woodland cover, it is considered that the proposal would enhance the landscape character of the area as it would deliver management guidelines detailed in South Lanarkshire Landscape Character assessment (2010) namely "consider the scope for additional woodland planting around settlements, along transport corridors and on the periphery of other visually prominent land uses and activities, with the objective of reducing these features' impact on the wider landscape". In addition, the changes to the LCT would be localised and the majority of the extensive LCT would be unaffected by the proposal.</p> <p>The report also considered the impact of the proposal on adjacent properties and included visualisations of woodland from key viewpoints.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The tree heights used the visualisation were 25m for Sitka spruce, 18m for Scots pine, 15 m for broadleaves and 8 m for shrubs, which were considered to represent circa 40 years of growth . The final design will only have native broadleaves with 5% Scots pine as the Sitka spruce and pure Scots pine areas has been removed. So the final design would have a reduced height at year 40 to what is shown where the Sitka spruce and pure Scots pine areas are present .</p> <p>With Lot 1, the majority of properties either have intervening hedges/ existing trees or farm buildings between them and the proposed woodland creation which greatly reduce the significance of the change to these properties. A single property, Burn Farm, would experience the greatest change in short distance views however to mitigate impact of light/ shading the woodland edge has</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

			<p>been moved circa 140 m from the property with the retained open ground proposed for grazing. There would be some loss of distant views from a number of properties once the woodland matures.</p> <p>With Lot 2, as a result of the report recommendations an increased area of open ground was added on the west side of the road opposite Cloverhill Farm/ Cottage to reduce visual impact to these properties, increasing the distance from the planting to at least 80 m from these properties.</p>		
<p>Neighbour is concerned that the project will enclose and screen historic farms and properties. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>See above.</p>	<p>7/5/24 noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Loss of Property G amenity through the loss of open sweeping views to the north and northwest and northeast over the Clyde Valley from the house. (Neighbour G: email 12/08/22)</p>	<p>The distant views to the north and northeast of the property will be impacted by broadleaf trees. The landscape report explains, 'it is unlikely that any of these effects would be noticeable given the very long, 40-year time span involved in the change' (p.32). The report also found that the proposed design is not sufficiently dominating of a particular property so as to prohibit planting.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted – the current photo include in additional visualisation (viewpoint 1 also shown the current distance views from the garden are obscured by ground form</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Loss of view and sunlight from south of Property B cottage. (Neighbour B: email 22/08/22)</p>	<p>In response to the landscape report's interim recommendations, we have reduced the scale of tree planting in the field to the south of Property B: we now propose a wider gap between the hedge along the A723 and the planting line to retain more of the view and sunlight. Within the first 30m of the property, we propose planting shrub species to create a softer edge to the planting scheme. These changes were approved by the landscape architect. The property's principal view to the southwest would remain unaffected. 8/5/24 This field has been swapped with a neighbouring field, so it will not be planted.</p>	<p>6/3/24 please can you update to reflect your current proposal 8/5/24 - noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Loss of open view to the southwest of Property D and the</p>	<p>In response to the landscape report's interim recommendations, we have removed some of the planting in the field</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>reduced appeal and value of the property. (Neighbour I: email 02/12/22)</p>	<p>opposite Property I. The report explains that 'new planting would be visible at a minimum distance of approximately 85m, on the other side of a busy road and seen through a screen of existing trees not all of which are shown on the visualisation. These, in summer, will themselves provide almost complete screening of the view' (p.31).</p>				
<p>Loss of open views to the west and northwest from Property D. (Neighbour D: email 15/12/22)</p>	<p>In response to the landscape report's interim recommendations, we have removed some of the planting in the field opposite Property D. The report explains that 'new planting would be visible at a minimum distance of approximately 80m, on the other side of a busy road and seen through a partial screen of existing trees' (p.30).</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Comment that alterations referred to in Tilhill's letter dated 11/11/22 do not maintain an open outlook from their property. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference points 2.01.07, 2.02.04, 2.06.03, and 2.06.06, email 22/03/23, email 11/04/23, and</p>	<p>The landscape report identifies the local area's Landscape Character Type (LCT) as 'Plateau Farmland'. While one of the features of this LCT is 'extensive, open, flat or gently undulating landform', another feature is that the 'rural character of the Plateau Farmland has reduced as tree cover has declined and the visual influence of settlements, transport infrastructure and mineral working has increased' (p.5). The proposed woodland design will inevitably alter the openness of the outlook, but it will also enhance the rural character which has reduced due to declining tree cover. In</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted In addition the South Lanarkshire Council Landscape Character Assessment 2010 contains the following guidance:</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

<p>email 08/03/23; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>response to consultation comments and the landscape report's interim recommendations, we have changed the design to provide more open space at key viewpoints.</p>	<p><i>restore the rural landscape character by increasing appropriate tree cover particularly in relation to non-rural landscape elements. Planning policies should aim to prevent further visual intrusions. There may be opportunities for more radical enhancement of the landscape by the creation of a more extensive woodland framework".</i> And specifically about trees</p>			
---	---	--	--	--	--

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

		and woodland management "			
The visual impact of Sitka spruce and forestry operations. (Neighbour A: emails 27/01/23, 22/03/23, and 11/04/23)	We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.	6/3/24 please update based on current proposal 7/5/24 - Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Regarding CCF: "It is unclear how VP SS, LP and Asp would create a CCF mix given significantly different growth rates - further detail regarding this mix are requested" (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry, 24/07/23)	We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.	6/3/24 please can you update to reflect your current proposal 7/5/24 - Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour is concerned that the woodland is not a good fit with the landform. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)	Please see the landscape survey.	7/5/24 - content with the landform analysis – although it is noted there is no strong landform influences on the design	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Neighbour disagrees that the landscape report's assessment that the woodland proposal is a 'good fit with the landform', and cites Scottish Forestry's initial assessment of the proposal in January 2023 as unsuitable. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>We have taken Scottish Forestry's comments on board, and we have changed the design significantly. The landscape report assessed this revised design, not the design which Scottish Forestry commented on in January 2023.</p>	<p>7/5/24 - Noted 16/7/24 The final design is now 100% native and has increased open ground buffer to the roads and properties</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbour A recorded that the landscape report does not assess local amenities and welfare (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).</p>	<p>This is outwith the scope of the application.</p>	<p>7/5/24 agreed</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbour A disagreed with statements made in the landscape survey (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).</p>	<p>The landscape survey was conducted by a qualified landscape architect, whose professional comments we have incorporated into the design.</p>	<p>7/5/24 Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Neighbour A asked further questions about the landscape</p>	<p>The landscape architect has completed his report which satisfies the requirements of this application.</p>	<p>7/5/24 Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

survey report and requested further information about various statements made by the landscape architect (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).					
Neighbour A asked why the location for the productive conifer has been selected (email 03/04/24)	8/5/24 We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.	7/5/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour A stated that the location map in the landscape report should be dismissed if it is used at this scale because it should 'reflect the area being proposed' (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	It is standard industry practice to provide a location map of this scale. The more immediate landscape is considered elsewhere in the report.	7/5/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour A stated that Lot 1 should not be described as moorland in the landscape report (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	The report does not describe Lot 1 as moorland. The only reference to moorland in the report is to the Landscape Character Assessment type of the local area (Plataue Farmland'), which is described to provide the context where the site is located.	7/5/24 Noted – comments Regarding moorland are a quote from NatureScot's Landscape descriptions	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

<p>Neighbour A: 'The historic maps show that this area has not had a large tree cover in its history and the phrase "declining tree cover" misrepresents the majority Lot 1.' (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).</p>	<p>National policy is to increase tree cover due to historic lows in tree cover. The landscape report highlights the declining tree cover due to the over-mature beech hedgerows. It is important to grow the next generation of trees so the landscape is not devoid of trees when these mature trees are no longer present.</p>	<p>7/5/24 Noted – comments Regarding declining tree cover are a quote from NatureScot's Landscape descriptions</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Biodiversity</p>					
<p>A neighbour asked to be able to continue wildlife/pest management on East Nethershields land. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22)</p>	<p>We have discussed this with the neighbour and, in the instance that we need wildlife management, we will invite him to submit an application for the work. Unwarranted wildlife management is not permitted. Any wildlife manager employed by Tilhill to manage the site will have the qualifications and experience to stalk in a manner which is sympathetic of the local context.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>A neighbour has requested engagement regarding wildlife management and specifically controlling of fox abundance. (Neighbour C: email via Office Manager</p>	<p>We have discussed this with the neighbour and, in the instance that we need wildlife management, we will invite him to submit an application for the work. Unwarranted wildlife management is not permitted. Any wildlife manager employed by Tilhill to manage the site will have the qualifications and experience to stalk in a manner which is sympathetic of the local context.</p>	<p>6/3/24 -Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required - matter not relevant to forestry regulation</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>& Parliamentary Assistant 02/02/23)</p>					
<p>Breeding Birds</p>	<p>Breeding bird survey comments: 'The breeding bird assemblage on site is currently of only local conservation value. The woodland creation scheme will benefit bird communities of scrub and woodland, creating habitats for species such as sparrowhawk and goshawk.'</p>	<p>6/3/24 Please include assessment of breeding birds in issues log</p> <p>7/5/24 Comments added</p>	<p>A Brown and Shepherd breeding bird survey was undertaken in 2022 by Carstairs Ecological Consultants and extended to include all species. The bird assemblage recorded was considered to be of local conservation importance with two red listed species (House sparrow (1 pair) and Skylark (2 pairs)) and three amber listed species breeding on site. While the woodland creation will reduce foraging habitat for these species, there would be alternative adjacent open habitat for the recorded species. In addition, proposed woodland creation would benefit species such as sparrowhawk and goshawk.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Vegetation Survey: badger setts.</p>	<p>A buffer zone of 30m has been created around each badger sett. The badger setts will remain outside the line of the deer fence, and badger gates will be added to ensure the badgers can access the woodland. Checks for badgers will occur prior to groundwork to review the status and distribution of setts. Existing setts will</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted please can you include these details in the operational plan</p>	<p>Carstairs Ecological Consultant undertook a badger survey, as part of their Ecological Assessment (August 2022). which located 3 active setts. These setts have been buffered in the design such that there will be no planting or access</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

	have a work exclusion zone around them in accordance with current NatureScot guidance.	7/5/24 included in Ops plan	within 30 m of the sett entrances . The setts will be outwith the deer fence and badger gates will be installed to enable continued access through the fence .		
Ecological assessment - Vegetation Survey: CG10 calcareous grassland of high conservation value lies adjacent to Powmillon Burn.	The CG10 calcareous grassland will be excluded from the woodland design. We will have a 10m open ground buffer of the grasses, followed by a 10m buffer of low-density shrubs and small trees, all of which will be direct planted with no ground preparation. We will fence above the grasses, and we have discussed a grazing regime with the neighbouring farmer to maintain the habitat. A non-grazing period between May and August (inclusive) will be scheduled to allow calcicoles to flower and seed.	6/3/24 Noted	A Phase 1/ NVC assessment was undertaken by Carstairs Ecological Consultants (August 2022). The majority of the site consists of improved grassland, MG6, MG10, MG13. Calcareous grassland (CG10) of high conservation value was located adjacent to Powmillon Burn. This calcareous grassland will be excluded from the woodland design. There will have a 10m open ground buffer of the grassland, followed by a 10m buffer of low-density shrubs and small trees, all of which will be direct planted with no ground preparation. The location of the fence to protect the woodland will enable the CG10 grassland to be grazed while protecting the woodland. The applicant is proposing a grazing regime with the neighbouring farmer to maintain the habitat. A non-	Closed	Low

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

			grazing period between May and August (inclusive) will be scheduled to allow calcicoles to flower and seed. Any tree regeneration will be removed from this habitat.		
Neighbour has requested to control moles within 20 metres of his property boundary. (Neighbour C: phone call 01/03/23)	Moles play a beneficial role in the management of soil. Therefore, we wish to protect moles within our boundary and would not support trapping them.	6/3/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour has asked for ragwort to be controlled to prevent it from spreading into his property and presenting a risk to his horses and other livestock. (Neighbour C: phone call 01/03/23)	We will create a 50m buffer where our land marches with agricultural land, within which ragwort will be topped to prevent flowering. This will be implemented annually in early summer before flower heads mature. We do not wish to eliminate the plant further within our site, as it is a native flower which is an important nectar source and food plant for a range of invertebrate species including 5 Red Data Book and Nationally Scarce species.	6/3/24 Noted please include this commitment in the operational plan 7/5/24 included in Ops plan	Buffer detailed in ops plan	Closed	Low
Neighbour requested clarity on areas to be deer fenced. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference)	Deer fencing is required to protect vulnerable tree species from deer browsing. Where it is uneconomic to deer fence an area due to the size or shape of the field, we will use tree guards to protect vulnerable tree species.	6/3/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

point 2.02.02)					
Neighbour is concerned that any conifer planting on the site reduces value for biodiversity and ecology. (Neighbour C: email 22/06/23)	The proposal is for a fully native scheme which will comprise 95% broadleaf trees and 5% Scots pine. This will be an improvement on the current grazed and compacted soil conditions.	6/3/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
"We note the identification of calcareous grassland, and we recommend the buffer zone is maximised in the planting design in order to ensure the protection of this habitat." (Senior conservation officer, RSPB: email 18/11/22)	The CG10 calcareous grassland will be excluded from the woodland design. We will have a 10m open ground buffer of the grasses, followed by a 10m buffer of low-density shrubs and small trees, all of which will be direct planted with no ground preparation. We will fence above the grasses, and we have discussed a grazing regime with the neighbouring farmer to maintain the habitat. A non-grazing period between May and August (inclusive) will be scheduled to allow calcicoles to flower and seed.	6/3/24 Noted	See above mitigation re this habitat	Closed	Low
There is "an area of interest adjacent to the proposed woodland at NS69228 49729 called Whitefield	The field which adjoins Whitefield Moss contains much deep peat which will not be planted. The small areas within the field which do not contain deep peat will be planted with broadleaf trees which will provide a feathered effect to the edge of	6/3/24 Noted	Habitats Regulations Appraisal undertaken - No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Moss, it supports approx. 19ha of peatland that is located to the south of a larger body of peatland called Waukenwae moss, designated a SSSI and Special Area of Conservation.” (Countryside Ranger, Countryside and Greenspace Service: email 07/07/2022)</p>	<p>this SSSI. Our client would be interested in peatland restoration of this field and neighbouring fields if there was neighbouring interest and consent.</p>				
<p>“The Northern section of the forest plan area near Nethershields is close to Waukenwae Moss Special Area of Conservation designated for its Active Raised Bogs and Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration... In our view, it is unlikely that the</p>	<p>Agreed and noted.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>Habitats Regulations Appraisal undertaken - No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>proposal will have a significant effect on any qualifying interests either directly or indirectly. An appropriate assessment is therefore not required.” (Operations Officer, West Central Scotland, Nature Scot: email 07/07/2022)</p>					
<p>Lower Density Native Broadleaves around the calcareous grassland might be better replaced with an open ground buffer. (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 17/05/23)</p>	<p>We will have a 10m open ground buffer of the grasses, followed by a 10m buffer of low-density shrubs and small trees, all of which will be direct planted with no ground preparation.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>Mitigation detailed in operations plan</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Any tree regeneration that occurs on the calcareous grassland will need</p>	<p>Agreed and noted.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Please can you include this commitment in the ops</p>	<p>Mitigation in ops plan</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>to be removed. (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 17/05/23)</p>		<p>plan 7/5/24 commitment in the ops plan</p>			
<p>Non-native black poplar included in native broadleaf mix. Crab apple, bird cherry and wild cherry may be better options to consider. (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>	<p>We have removed black poplar from the mix and added crab apple, bird cherry and wild cherry.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>A mature hedge is located in a proposed productive conifer block in Lot 1. (Woodland Creation Technical Officer, Scottish Forestry: email 24/07/23)</p>	<p>A 10m open ground buffer will surround this hedge.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted – please can you include this in a constraint map and in ops plan 7/5/24 changes no required as no productive</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

		conifer is now proposed			
Neighbour is concerned of the risk that the woodland creation site offers towards winter wading birds such as lapwings. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)	Please see the ecological survey for details on how the proposal will benefit breeding birds.	7/5/24 noted 16/7/24 – site not suitable for winter wading birds so no survey was required	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour is concerned that the deer fences will act as a deterrent for wildlife across the site. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)	Deer fences are often necessary to allow trees and other vegetation to grow by removing grazing pressure. Badger gates will be installed to enable the free movement of the local badger population. In line with best practice, we will remove the deer fence once it has served its purpose.	7/5/24 noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour states that deer fencing is not in keeping with the landscape character (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	Deer fences are often necessary to allow trees and other vegetation to grow by removing grazing pressure. The fence will be removed once it has served this purpose – in 15 to 20 years' time.	7/5/24 noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Land Use					
The woodland proposal would have a negative impact on the local	The majority of the land within the East Nethershields boundary is Grade 4.1 farmland – land which is capable of growing a narrow range of crops and is	6/3/24 Noted	The total holding consists of 88.5 ha of Grade 4.1, 5.2 ha of Grade 5.1, 1.1 ha of Grade 6.2 and 2.1 ha of Grade 6.3 land as assessed by MacCaulay	Closed	Low

<p>economy by taking land out of agricultural production. Integration with other land uses should be considered. (Senior Agricultural Officer, Rural Payments and Services: emails 19/07/22 and 01/12/22)</p>	<p>primarily used for grazing. The proposed land use change would have a very small impact on local agricultural production (0.45% change to the available agricultural land within 10km, and 0.001% across the available agricultural land in Scotland), and it is in line with the Scottish Government's aim of increasing woodland cover in Scotland from 19% to 21% by 2032 (Forestry Strategy, 2019). It is hoped that this would be an acceptable trade off given the benefits a new woodland would bring to the local area: increased biodiversity, climate mitigation, public amenity and recreation. Furthermore, we are seeking to integrate farming and forestry by 8.13 hectares (20.2 acres) as grazing for local farmers.</p>		<p>Land Use Institute Land Classification for Agriculture (1:50,000 data). The holding was sold on the open market after the owner decided to end their farming career in Scotland. The conversion of the land to woodland would lead to the loss of two local farming jobs (previous owner and his son) although the owner is planning to either establish a new farming business in Northern Ireland or to retire.</p> <p>The holding represents 1% Grade 4.1, 3% Grade 5.1, 1% Grade 6.2 and 0.2 % Grade 6.3 of land available for agriculture within a 10 km buffer of the site. -</p> <p>While noting RPID's responses provided in due diligence, that the proposal would have an adverse impact on local patterns of agriculture, based on the above figures the loss of land for agriculture is not considered significant.</p> <p>The applicant has retained 8.18 ha available for continued agricultural use to support a Young Farmer and existing farmers and exchanged a field with a neighbouring farmer to enable rationalisation of their operations.</p>		
---	---	--	--	--	--

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

			The proposed woodland would lead to continued albeit reduced rural employment during both the establishment and subsequent maintenance phases. However as the farm became available due to retirement/ relocation of the previous owner, this further reduces the direct impact on the local employment from this land use change.		
"We follow the recommendations of the Woodland Expansion Advisory Group report. This revised design will still be classed as a large and on prime agricultural land as described on page 8. The majority of the land proposed for planting is both regionally and locally important for agriculture, and the proposals would have an adverse impact on local	The Woodland Expansion Advisory Group report defines prime agricultural land as Grades 1, 2 and 3.1 using the MacCaulay Land Use Institute Land Classification for Agriculture (page 44). East Nethershields contains no land of this grade. It contains 88.5 ha of Grade 4.1, 5.2 ha of Grade 5.1, 1.1 ha of Grade 6.2 and 2.1 ha of Grade 6.3. Converting 96.92 ha to woodland represents a very small loss of agricultural production. We have retained 8.13 ha for livestock grazing and we have swapped one field with a neighbouring farmer to support their farming operations. Furthermore, the operations associated with the proposals will provide employment, boosting, not negatively impacting, the local rural economy.	6/3/24 Noted – the WEAG assessment submitted does not represent the current proposal as it does not shown the land retained in agriculture based on subsequent stakeholder discussion/ design changes - also in the	See above	Closed	Low

<p>patterns of agriculture. Taking this land out of agriculture would have a negative impact on the local rural economy.” (Senior Agricultural Officer, Rural Payments and Services: email 21/07/22)</p>		<p>table shown LCA within 10 km and in the scheme please can you provide percentages and well as actual areas</p>			
<p>Neighbour does not support agricultural land being taken out of production and believes that land should be offered to neighbouring farmers first. (Neighbour I: email 02/12/23)</p>	<p>While agricultural production is, of course, very important, the need to increase tree cover on a national scale is widely accepted; hence, the Scottish Government’s aim of expanding the country’s tree cover from 19% to 21% by 2032. This policy recognises the need to protect the high conservation areas and priority habitats and that there will be woodland creation projects on areas whose traditional primary land use is agriculture. This land lies within the Central Scotland Green Network and has been designated by the regulator, Scottish Forestry, as having potential for woodland creation; therefore, we believe the proposed woodland is consistent with this policy. Nevertheless, we are seeking to integrate farming and forestry by retaining 8.13 hectares (20.2 acres) as grazing for local farmers.</p>	<p>6/3/24 noted Impact on agricultural production is considered else where in issues log</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Objection to productive forestry and dismay that Tilhill's Regional Manager was unaware that there was going to be any commercial forestry in this woodland development and believed that it was all broadleaf planting. (Neighbour A: email 25/08/22 [this is the email with the dismay about Tilhill management], email 18/12/22 reference points 1.7 and 2.01.03, 2.01.08, 2.02.03, asks for a rationale for incorporating productive forestry within the design, and email 22/12/22 reference point 3, and email 06/02/23; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>The Regional Manager had not had direct control or input into the formulation of this proposal. We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.</p>	<p>7/5/24 Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
---	--	---------------------	-------------------------------	---------------	------------

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Suggestion that woodland creation is more suitable in other less sensitive areas of Scotland, Scottish Governments aims to increase Woodland is not a strong argument for developing areas of high sensitivity where the current landscape amenity may be changed. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.03.01 and Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)</p>	<p>The landscape around East Nethershields is identified as Plateau Farmland – Glasgow & Clyde Valley (NatureScot “Scottish Landscape Character Types Map), a feature of which is listed as limited and declining tree cover. The Forestry and Woodland Strategy for Glasgow City Region (2020) identifies the area as “preferred” for woodland creation. In this way, the local landscape has been highlighted as a desirable place to grow trees.</p>	<p>7/5/24 Noted</p>	<p>No mitigation required</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Request for woodland management objectives to be clarified (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference points 2.01.05 and 2.02.05, and email 22/12/22 reference point 4, and email</p>	<p>These were clarified in the meeting at the neighbour’s house on 26/01/23 and also in the consultation letter dated 21/06/23.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>	<p>No Mitigation required</p>	<p>closed</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

06/02/23)					
Neighbour concerned about changing land use from productive dairy and sheep to trees. (Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)	The majority of the land within the East Nethershields boundary is Grade 4.1 farmland – land which is capable of growing a narrow range of crops and is primarily used for grazing. The proposed land use change would have a very small impact on local agricultural production (0.45% change to the available agricultural land within 10km, and 0.001% across the available agricultural land in Scotland), and it is in line with the Scottish Government's aim of increasing woodland cover in Scotland from 19% to 21% by 2032 (Forestry Strategy, 2019). These minor losses are mitigated by the benefits a new woodland would bring to the local area: increased biodiversity, climate mitigation, public amenity and recreation. Furthermore, we are seeking to integrate farming and forestry by retaining 8.13 hectares (20.2 acres) as grazing for local farmers.	6/3/24 noted Impact on agricultural production is considered else where in issues log	See mitigation details above	Closed	Low
Neighbour concerned that the commercial forestry operational plans could change if the woodland changes ownership before harvest.	Scottish Forestry (the industry regulator) oversees forest management plans and operations, so a change of landowner would not enable a change of plans without the approval of Scottish Forestry.	6/3/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour E: email 01/05/23)					
Neighbour requested to purchase field 11 (2.98 acres) and field 3 (1.21 acres) so that they could maintain grazing adjacent to their property. (Neighbour C: email 11/08/22 and email 18/11/22)	The landowner has exchanged field 11 with the neighbour in question to accommodate this request. Field 3 is retained within the current ownership.	6/3/24 Noted- please can you ensure this change is noted in the relevant maps and sections of the issues log 7/5/24 changes undertaken 16/7/24 changes to fence line after public consultation has enable grazing by this neighbour of 0.88 ha	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour raised concern about planting commercial woodland close to residents.	Neighbours will be informed of forestry operations, which will be conducted in a way that is both sensitive to the landscape and the access rights of residents.	6/3/24 Noted Please update if required	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour F: email 25/08/23)					
Neighbour concerned about changing the land use as the land has been agricultural for over 100 years. (Neighbour F: email 25/08/23)	The government's advisory board, the Committee on Climate Change, has advised that 22% of land in traditional agricultural production should be released for long-term carbon sequestration to meet the government's net zero target (p.30, 'Land use: Policies for a Net Zero UK' (2020) Committee on Climate Change). This land is highlighted in the local tree and woodland strategy as being a preferred location for growing trees.	6/3/24 noted Impact on agricultural production is considered else where in issues log	See mitigation details above	Closed	Low
A neighbour objects to London based property developers buying up farmland in Scotland to offset their carbon emissions to build homes in London, whilst obtaining large grants from the Scottish government paid for by the Scottish tax payer (Neighbour F: email 25/08/23)	Government funding is available to individuals and organisations to carry out actions which meet national policy. Our client is delivering two important policy objectives: the development of housing and public spaces and increasing national tree cover. This woodland will be accredited by the Woodland Carbon Code, which carefully regulates the creation and reporting of new woodlands. Mandatory greenhouse gas emissions reporting guidance (PAS 2060: Specification for the Demonstration of Carbon Neutrality) regulates organisations' claims of carbon neutrality and the use of Woodland Carbon Units gained from creating an accredited woodland.	6/3/24 noted	No mitigation required matter not relevant to forestry regulation	Closed	N/A
A neighbour believes Sitka	We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns	6/3/24 noted	No mitigation required matter not relevant to forestry	Closed	N/A

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>spruce should only be planted in the Scottish hills and not farmland. (Neighbour F: email 25/08/23)</p>	<p>associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.</p>		<p>regulation</p>		
<p>Neighbour is concerned that the site may not be suitable for growing trees. Citing soil type, peat, weather, and water as reasons to be concerned. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>Soil and condition surveys have indicated that with careful species selection, ground preparation and annual maintenance, the site will grow a healthy woodland.</p>	<p>7/5/24 - noted Assessment of suitability of woodland creation proposal is undertaken as part the overall assessment process</p>	<p>The selection of appropriate species/ native woodland types has been informed by the use of site specific Ecological Site classification analysis. The analysis has shown that the site would be suitable for W4, W11, W17 and W18 woodland. The proposed species selection and design reflects this analysis with species mixes being adjusted to reflect local site conditions.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Neighbour feels the historical land use for the site is farming and not woodland and believes that "...reinstating the Caledonian Forest in this location is a complete misrepresentation of the historic landscape...".</p>	<p>Please see the landscape survey report which details the positive impact the woodland will have on the landscape.</p>	<p>7/5/24 - noted</p>	<p>See landscape mitigation above</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>Low</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)					
Neighbour A asked Tilhill to, 'confirm your previous statement that this STR is planned for the sole use of the London Property Developer' (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	The landowner had stated that it would be desirable to be able to use their timber in their own developments. They never stated that this would be its only use. We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.	7/5/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour asked why Scots pine is part of the broadleaf woodland, in what design they will be planted, where they will be located and whether they will be felled (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	Scottish Forestry's grant system allows for 5% of broadleaf woodlands to comprise Scots pine in recognition of their natural occurrence in the Scottish landscape. They will be planted throughout the design in small clusters; they will not be felled.	7/5/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Neighbour asked about how much of the site will not be planted (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	The site is 96.92 ha and 68.55 ha will be planted, leaving 28.37 ha as open ground; 12.1 ha of this open ground will be classed as Designed Open Ground to complement the planted areas and the remaining 16.27 ha will remain as unplanted land, comprising 5.8 ha of deep peat, 8.13 ha of livestock grazing, and 2.34 ha of non-grant aided land managed for biodiversity.	16/7/24 please updated post consultation			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

Neighbour asked for guarantees that the new landowner will continue to own the site and be responsible for the management of the woodland (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	The landowner has no plans to sell the site. It is not possible to guarantee the length of ownership.	7/5/24 Noted	No mitigation required	Closed	N/A
Process					
Neighbour found it difficult to contact Tilhill staff via the telephone numbers listed at the bottom of the initial letter. (Neighbour A: email 23/08/22)	We are sorry that this neighbour struggled to make contact with Tilhill staff via telephone. If Tilhill staff are unable to answer their telephones when stakeholders telephone, if a message is left on the answerphone, then we will endeavour to return your call within two working days.	6/3/24 Noted			
Early consultation documents were issued during the summer holiday. (Neighbour A: email 23/08/22, and Neighbour C: email 22/06/23)	We feel that five weeks is appropriate duration for a consultation even during the summer period.	6/3/24 Noted in addition further opportunity for stakeholder responses was provided in June 2023			
No circulation of Issues Log during scoping consultation	This is a scoping consultation from which it is intended that the Issues Log would be created.	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>(Neighbour A: emails 23/08/22, and email 18/12/22 reference point 1.4)</p>					
<p>Lack of clarity on management objectives, site constraints, potential impacts, road safety, transport access, clear overview of woodland type, sensitivities of site, landscape appraisal, and other requirements of the guidance and standards for woodland creation. (Neighbour A: emails 23/08/22, 18/12/23 reference point 1.8 and 2.01.02, 2.01.05, 9.6, 22/12/22 reference point 1, 2, 4 & 6, and 06/02/23)</p>	<p>This is a scoping consultation to identify the key factors that should be considered within the woodland creation proposal. Responses from stakeholders are to be considered and used to form the proposal, which will outline all these details.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Request for a 'Town Hall Meeting' to share the proposal details and issues</p>	<p>There is no specific requirement within engagement processes for a town hall meeting, but due to local interest, we met with the local community council where</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

recorded within the Issues Log. (Neighbour A: emails 23/08/22, 16/12/22, 18/12/22 reference point 1.5, and 19/12/22)	proposals were presented and discussed at a monthly meeting.				
Request for a full list of all consultees and neighbours engaged and issued with the scoping consultation documents. (Neighbour A: emails 23/08/22, 16/12/22, and 18/12/22 reference points 1.3 and 2.01.04)	It would not be appropriate to share the details of stakeholders with an individual. Scottish Forestry will have sight of all these details when assessing our application.	6/3/24 agreed - Scottish Forestry have reviewed the stakeholder list a			
Complaint that an individual was not provided with an advance copy of the Issues Log. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 1.4)	All documentation was released to stakeholders at the same time to ensure fairness and consistency.	6/3/24 Noted			
Concern about the thoroughness of the neighbour stakeholder information distribution. (Neighbour A:	We distributed letters to properties adjacent to the woodland site. Consulting all road users and the entire local population is not feasible, so we consulted the two local community councils who represent the community's interests.	6/3/24 Noted - Scottish Forestry have been provided with maps showing the			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>emails 23/08/22, 18/12/22 reference point 1.10, 07/01/23, and 23/12/23)</p>	<p>Scottish Forestry have been provided with detailed information concerning who has been contacted about our proposal.</p>	<p>properties who received letters and at which point of the process these letters were received</p>			
<p>Complaint that not all issues raised by neighbours have been recorded in the Issues Log. (Neighbour A: emails 16/12/22, 18/12/22, reference point 1.1, 22/12/22, 06/02/23, 25/02/23, 03/03/23, 06/03/23, 14/03/23, 26/03/26, 19/06/23, 25/07/23; Neighbour E: email 01/05/23; Neighbour C: email 22/06/23)</p>	<p>It is our understanding that the Issues Log comprises matters pertaining to the woodland proposal and not matters of consultation process. We have sought advice from the Scottish Forestry Woodland Officer as to whether matters of process should be included in future versions of the Issues Log. These issues are not typically included in Forestry Grant Scheme Issues Logs, but we have now included issues of process to demonstrate additional transparency.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Agreed</p>			
<p>Complaint that the names and addresses of neighbours were included in the</p>	<p>We acknowledge this error of including these details in the Issues Log. This was reported to Scottish Forestry and Tilhill's Data Protection Officer. We followed all advice given in response to minimise</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

<p>Issues Log that was distributed to other stakeholders. (Neighbour A: emails 16/12/22, 18/12/22 reference points 1.2 and 2.07.04)</p> <p>A request was made to receive a list of all stakeholders who received this information. (Neighbour A: emails 03/02/23 and 06/02/23)</p> <p>Neighbour also concerned that Tilhill have not been able to determine what scale names and addresses have been breached (Neighbour A: email 06/03/23)</p>	<p>impact. All future correspondence will be anonymised accordingly.</p> <p>An anonymised list of stakeholders who received this information was provided to the neighbour who requested this information.</p> <p>The scale of this incident was assessed and reported to Scottish Forestry and Tilhill's Data Protection Officer. We followed all advice given in response to minimise impact. All future correspondence will be anonymised accordingly.</p>				
<p>Complaint that the initial scoping information was not clearly communicated as being a scoping consultation. (Neighbour A: email</p>	<p>This point was clarified with the complainant in subsequent information, and the following consultation documentation was clearly titled 'formal consultation'.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted although Scottish Forestry would consider this stage of the</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>18/12/22 reference point 1.6)</p>		<p>process to be stakeholder engagement or due diligence</p>			
<p>Complaint that insufficient time has been allowed for the consultation. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22, 10/01/23, and 25/02/23)</p>	<p>The consultation period of four weeks is consistent with public consultation practice.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted in addition further opportunity for stakeholder responses was provided in June 2023</p>			
<p>Neighbour commented that he is unable to understand the changes made to the design, to which are referred in Tilhill’s letter dated 11/11/22, because he had not received previous versions of the design. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22, reference point 2.01.07, and 26/03/23)</p>	<p>The map issued at this stage of the consultation highlighted that stakeholder comments had been incorporated into the design. Earlier designs were not shared publicly as they were part of an iterative design process in which maps were in draft format and not for distribution.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Request to view all reports conducted in relation to the woodland proposal. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22, reference point 2.01.07)</p>	<p>All surveys and reports are now publicly accessible on the Tilhill public consultation webpage: https://www.tilhill.com/east-nethershields/</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour felt misled by the amount of commercial woodland being proposed. Stating the information was not clear in the initial letter, map, and after a phone call on 23/08/2022 and after a site visit in spring 2023. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22, reference point 1.7 and 2.01.03, 22/12/22 reference points 2 & 3, and 11/04/23)</p>	<p>The nature of the scoping stage of the application process is that the design changes in response to stakeholder input and therefore the exact proportions of productive and non-productive elements is subject to change. Having received stakeholder comments and survey information, we have submitted a final design as part of our application. This should clarify the final species composition and objectives of the woodland.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted along with the change in composition of the proposal as the agent has worked through the issues</p>			
<p>Neighbour concerned that this woodland creation project is not normal due to high</p>	<p>While many woodland creation projects are rural places, this is an opportunity to create woodland closer to urban development for the use and enjoyment of local people. The forestry grant system recognises the</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>number of neighbouring dwellings. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22, and 25/07/23; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>benefits of woodlands close to urban areas by providing additional funding for projects in these areas. Other examples of initiatives to plant trees close to urban areas include the Clyde Climate Forest, the Northern Forest (in and around Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield and Hull) and the National Forest (near Birmingham).</p>				
<p>Neighbour requested information on benefits to the local area for access to nature, employment, public amenity, recreation, and sustainable timber supply. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/11 reference point 2.03.02)</p>	<p>Rides (grass tracks) within the woodland design will enable visitors to access the site more freely than the current access, which is limited due to agricultural activity. The site will employ forestry workers for five years of establishment and maintenance works, which will be followed by ongoing maintenance in years to come; all of these works will be managed by the local Tilhill forestry team. The amenity of trees is widely regarded – the value of which has been estimated in research such as this: https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/research/estimating-amenity-values-of-street-trees-and-woodland-views-a-methodological-review/</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted Depending on final design these response may need amending re productivity</p>			
<p>Neighbour commented that he was surprised that Tilhill did not manage to obtain information on livestock location.</p>	<p>The information needed to increase the detail of our analysis would have required information pertaining to the type of livestock kept on each grade of agricultural land within 10km of East Nethershields. Unfortunately, the agricultural census does</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted This approach is the same as other similar agricultural assessments</p>			<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>(Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.03.03)</p>	<p>not go into this level of detail, so we were unable to conduct a more detailed analysis than the one outlined in the agricultural report.</p>				
<p>Neighbour requested contact information for the Council Officer who conducted the road safety review dated 12/10/22. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.05.01)</p>	<p>Scottish Forestry will review our consultation process as part of our application. This will include details of stakeholders consulted; it is not appropriate to share this information with other stakeholders.</p>	<p>6/3/24 agreed</p>			
<p>Neighbour has requested the road safety review brief/ instruction provide by Tilhill to Stewart Paton Associates (Neighbour A: 18/12/22 reference point 2.05.02)</p>	<p>As above; this information is for Scottish Forestry to review.</p>	<p>6/3/24 agreed</p>			
<p>Neighbour concerned that the road safety review was conducted during low traffic times (10:30 – 11:30), the review did not assess all road safety concerns, and that 1 hour would not be a robust enough</p>	<p>The road safety review was instructed to assess the impact of the design on visibility splays, for which an hour was sufficient for the inspector to gather the necessary information.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

review. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.05.03)					
Neighbour concerned that road safety review does not refer to Plot 2 location. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.05.10)	The woodland design at East Nethershields affects one residential junction where we have ensured the visibility splay requirement of 215m. A road safety review was not needed to help us achieve this requirement in this part of the site.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour concerned that the Issues Log received in November 2022 did not include all the issues raised. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.01)	It is our understanding that the Issues Log comprises matters pertaining to the woodland proposal and not matters of consultation process. We have sought advice from the Scottish Forestry Woodland Officer as to whether matters of process should be included in future versions of the Issues Log. These issues are not typically included in Forestry Grant Scheme Issues Logs, but we have now included issues of process to demonstrate additional transparency.	6/3/24 agreed			
Tilhill's response to the road safety issue raised by a neighbour did not satisfy the neighbour. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.02)	We believe we have addressed the road safety issues by employing a road safety surveyor to assess the areas of concern, and by presenting these concerns and our mitigations to the Council's roads department and Scottish Forestry.	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>Neighbour does not believe their issues are being effectively dealt with by Tilhill. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.03)</p>	<p>We strive to address issues as effectively and professionally as possible, and we welcome feedback if stakeholders feel that if anything has been addressed satisfactorily so we can continue to improve our service.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested survey evidence to support Tilhill's statement that there will not be a noticeable increase in public access to field 11. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.04)</p>	<p>No longer relevant as field 11 has been exchanged for a different parcel of land.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested information on what areas of soil have been probed. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.05)</p>	<p>Please see the soil survey for details.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested a detailed method statement on the management and cultivation of the commercial woodland including HGV access, forest road design, a</p>	<p>Details of the woodland establishment, maintenance and future operations are outlined in our application which is publicly available on the Public Register.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted Please update if required depending on final design</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

calendar of events for commercial woodland management including planting and felling. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.07, 9.6, 22/03/23, and 11/04/23)					
Neighbour requested plans for maintaining fencing and hedges on Burn Road (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 2.06.07)	All external hedges will be cut every three years to maintain habitat through increased flowering and better form. Roadside hedges will be monitored during forest management visits. Additional maintenance will be carried out outside of the three-year management plan if needed to ensure road visibility.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour asked if the landowner will be applying for grant support for the woodland's development. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 3.01)	Yes, this application process is seeking to gain funding from the Forestry Grant Scheme.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour is asked if the FCS officer has been part of the distribution of the consultation	No Scottish Forestry officer was part of the distribution of consultation information, but a Scottish Forestry Technical Officer was contacted about consultee details in July 2022 and the local Woodland Officer has	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

information. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 3.02)	been involved in this case since December 2022.				
Neighbour asked which stakeholders, local organisations, and community groups the FCS officer recommended be included in the consultation and if Tilhill have followed their advice. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 3.03)	This information is for Scottish Forestry to review as part of the application process.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour asked if there had been a site visit with the FCS Officer. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22, reference point 9.4)	Not at the time of this query, but one was conducted in January 2023.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour enquired if there was going to be a site visit with key consultees. (Neighbour A: email 18/12/22 reference point 9.5)	The site visit with the Woodland Officer is the key consultee site visit expected from Scottish Forestry as part of the application process.	6/3/24 Noted It would be for stakeholders /consultees to undertake their own visits should they wish to do so to			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

		inform their responses			
Neighbour requested a draft landscape appraisal. (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22 reference point 9.7, and 22/12/22 reference point 7.)	A landscape survey was conducted (see report for details).	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour considered "...communication through the Issue Log has very limited value, misleading, and is not compliant with the requirements of the woodland application process." (Neighbour A: email 25/02/23)	Scottish Forestry will review our communication through the Issues Log as part of the application review.	6/3/24 agreed - the current issues log provides significant details in relation to detailing individual issues and stakeholder who have raised them			
Neighbour requested further details on the size of the mature woodland to allow their concerns to be fully assessed and mitigated. (Neighbour A: email 22/03/23)	Please see the woodland design map to see the size of the woodland.	6/3/24 Noted the landscape report also provides details on final tree heights used for visualisations			
Neighbour was	This stage of the consultation had ended,	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>disappointed that Tilhill was discontinuing conversation regarding matters already discussed up to 24/03/23. (Neighbour A: email 26/03/23)</p>	<p>and our staff needed time to review the comments received and adapt plans accordingly.</p>				
<p>Neighbour felt disrespected that Tilhill did not provide the name of the landscape architect visiting their property. (Neighbour A: email 26/03/23)</p>	<p>Tilhill provided this information (27/03/23).</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour was concerned that the process has not been transparent (Neighbour A: emails 18/12/22, 07/01/23, 06/01/23, 14/03/23, 26/03/23, 27/03/23, and 11/04/23)</p>	<p>We have shared all surveys and the Issues Log with stakeholders. We have written to neighbours for comments on three occasions, met with certain neighbours at their properties several times, and we have attended a community council meeting.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested guidance information provided to the person conducting the landscape</p>	<p>This information is for Scottish Forestry to review as part of the application process.</p>	<p>6/3/24 agreed</p>			

<p>assessment. Specifically requesting the version and dates of documentation. (Neighbour A: emails 27/03/23, 11/04/23, 24/05/23, 08/03/23)</p>					
<p>Regarding the landscape assessment, a neighbour requested clarification on what is meant by the term "visual receptors". (Neighbour A: emails 27/03/23, and 11/04/23)</p>	<p>The components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the proposal.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested the location of viewpoints being considered under the landscape assessment. (Neighbour A: email 27/03/23)</p>	<p>Please see the landscape report for details.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour stated that three properties at Lot 1 were visited by the landscape architect</p>	<p>The landscape architect took into consideration the views from all properties neighbouring the site but visited the residents of properties where specific concern had been raised.</p>				

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).					
Regarding the landscape assessment, a neighbour requested what is meant by "landscape constraints and potentials". (Neighbour A: emails 27/03/23, and 11/04/23)	Constraints are elements that reduce functionality or aesthetics. Opportunities are elements in or near the site that offer a positive addition or emphasis to the landscape. Please see the landscape report for further details.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour requested information on what is included in a landform analysis, specifically if it includes daylight/sunlight analysis. (Neighbour A: emails 27/03/23, and 08/03/23)	Please see the landscape report for details. A separate overshadowing assessment was conducted (see report for details).	6/3/24 Noted			
Regarding the landscape analysis, a neighbour requested what is meant by the term "landscape fit". (Neighbour A: emails 27/03/23, and 11/04/23)	Landscape fit is what is judged to suit or complement the current landscape character.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour requested access to	Please see the landscape report for details.	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>the Landscape Assessment and Statement and imagery as part of the due diligence stage. (Neighbour A: email 27/03/23)</p>					
<p>Neighbour enquired if the landscape assessment will include analysis of historical/ existing land use, access, road safety, human welfare and mental health, fire risk, effects on other land/ assets, effects on adjacent renewables, views following cultivation, risk to utility assets. (Neighbour A: emails 27/03/23, and 11/04/23)</p>	<p>Please see the landscape report for the scope of the survey.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested access to maps prior to them being released to the public for consultation. (Neighbour A: email 27/03/23)</p>	<p>We aim to release documentation to stakeholders at the same time to ensure fairness and consistency.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour</p>	<p>The landscape architect received all official</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>concerned that the Landscape Architect did not have a full briefing on all the issues before conducting the landscape analysis. (Neighbour A: email 11/04/23)</p>	<p>documentation relating to the woodland proposal prior to conducting his survey. He also met with neighbours who had raised landscape concerns so he could gain a full understanding of the local context.</p>				
<p>Tilhill have not distributed the Issues Log for stakeholders to review and agree that all the issues raised to date have now been included for response and mitigation. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)</p>	<p>We had been updating and reviewing the Issues Log between consultation periods. It was subsequently distributed to stakeholders in the next stage of consultation in June 2023, and it is available again, now, as part of our application.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested to receive a list of people in the community with whom Tilhill have communicated. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)</p>	<p>This information is sensitive and not for general circulation. Scottish Forestry will review this information as part of the application process.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour requested to know when Tilhill is meeting with the Community Council. (Neighbour A:</p>	<p>This information was for the Community Council to advertise to its members.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

25/05/23)					
Neighbour requested to meet the landowner. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)	Tilhill is employed to represent the landowner.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour complained that they have not received responses from Tilhill to emails since March. (Neighbour A: 24/05/23)	At this stage of the consultation, it was agreed with Scottish Forestry that they would be better placed to respond to issues raised by this neighbour (see email to Neighbour A dated 24/03/2023).	6/3/24 Noted Due to a change of SF staff the reason for this decision is not clear as normally it is the agent/ applicant who engages with stakeholders during this stage of the process			
Neighbour complained that they have not received answers to all the issues they have raised since December. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)	It has taken us considerable time to review and respond to each of these issues, which are now addressed in this latest version of the Issues Log.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour requested documentation in relation to	The referenced guidance, the UK Forestry Standard, is publicly available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publicatio	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

landscape design guidance, which was referred to by the landscape architect when visiting Property A. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)	ns/the-uk-forestry-standard				
Neighbour requested to know when stakeholders would receive the landscape report and visualisations. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)	At the time of this request, we did not know the exact timescale for the landscape architect to complete his report. The report and visualisations were shared with stakeholders at the next stage of the consultation in June 2023.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour complained that Tilhill have not been transparent with regards to the list of documents issued to stakeholders. (Neighbour A: 25/05/23)	Key information and surveys have been distributed directly to stakeholders as well as being made publicly available on the consultation webpage (https://www.tilhill.com/east-nethershields/) This information is for Scottish Forestry to review as part of the application process.	6/3/24 Noted			
Neighbour requested the latest version of the Issues Log. (Neighbour A: 19/06/23)	We had been updating and reviewing the Issues Log between consultation periods. It was subsequently distributed to stakeholders in the next stage of consultation on 21st June 2023, and it is available again, now, as part of our application.	6/3/24 Noted			
All residents of the	We have consulted Chapelton and	6/3/24 Noted			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>village of Chapelton have not been informed of the proposal. (Neighbour A: email 25/07/23)</p>	<p>Auldhouse and Strathaven Community Councils whose purpose is to represent their communities.</p>	<p>- The use of a community council to communicate to wider residents not directly affect by a proposal is an approach often taken</p>			
<p>Neighbour raised concerns that the landscape architect will visit the property outwith the morning and early afternoon when they believe the significant impact on his property will occur. (Neighbour A: email 08/03/23)</p>	<p>The overshadowing assessment assessed the impact that the woodland would have at different times of day throughout the year.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour stated that Tilhill had not responded to the concerns he raised. (Neighbour E: email 25/05/23)</p>	<p>We were still reviewing issues and adapting the plan accordingly in between the consultation periods. Responses and further information were provided the following month in June 2023.</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			
<p>Neighbour concerned about the lack of communication from Tilhill.</p>	<p>We were still reviewing issues and adapting the plan accordingly in between the consultation periods. Responses and further information were provided the</p>	<p>6/3/24 Noted</p>			

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

(Neighbour E: email 18/06/23)	following month in June 2023.				
Neighbour requested access to updated issues log. (Neighbour A: email 16/01/2024)	The issues log will be publicly available when the application is submitted to the Public Register.				
Neighbour highlighted that they believe other parties have been approached about the use of the land adjacent to their property while they have been excluded. (Neighbour A: email 16/01/24; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)	The area of land in question is to remain in agricultural use. The landowner wishes to provide this land as an opportunity to a for a young farmer to graze livestock. Accordingly, the local Young Farmers group have been contacted.				
Neighbour enquired why images were presented showing trees the height of what they would be predicted to be after 40 years of growth. They went on to enquire if Tilhill will correct this misrepresentation. (Neighbour A: email 16/01/24)	The visualisations show the trees at 40 years' old which is the standard stage of maturity that forestry proposals are assessed.				
Neighbour asked for	The height of the trees presented at 40				

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>evidence of this tree height at 40 years' time. (Neighbour A: email 16/01/24)</p>	<p>years' time is an estimate agreed between Tilhill and Scottish Forestry based on professional silvicultural knowledge and the performance of trees within the local area.</p>				
<p>Neighbour A asked, 'Based on your comments under N.B. are you stating that the trees in this location may not grow to their full potential due to a number of "influences". If so, can you please provide evidence of how this has been reflected and calculated in the carbon model being used by yourself and SF?' (Neighbour A: email 16/01/24)</p>	<p>Yield class (the growth potential of a species on a site), not tree height, is not used for carbon calculations. Conservative estimates for each species' yield class have been incorporated into the carbon calculator. The carbon stock of the woodland will be verified by the Woodland Carbon Code. For further information, please see https://woodlandcarboncode.org.uk/.</p>				
<p>Neighbour A asked, 'With all the knowledge and confidence you have with this woodland location, why is there such a caveat on the success of this woodland growing to its design maturity?'</p>	<p>We have no reason to doubt the woodland will grow to its design maturity.</p>				

(Neighbour A: email 16/01/24)					
Neighbour enquired when they will be issued with the latest copy of the issues log. (Neighbour A: email 31/01/24; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)	The issues log will be publicly available when the application is submitted to the Public Register.				
Neighbour enquired if Tilhill will reissue the Landscape Report correcting the misrepresentation in tree size. (Neighbour A: email 31/01/24)	The visualisations show the trees at 40 years' old which is the standard stage of maturity that forestry proposals are assessed.				
Neighbour asked when an application for forest tracks/ roads will be submitted to SLC Planning Authority. (Neighbour A: email 31/01/24)	We do not intend to build a forest road, but we will add Type 1 stone to key access points and tracks to protect the ground. We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.				
Neighbour asked for information about access points and forest roads (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).	Access points and rides are indicated on the design map. We do not intend to build a forest road.				
Neighbour	We will update neighbours on a timeline of				

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>requesting a timeline of events for the future of this application. (Neighbour A: email 31/01/24)</p>	<p>operations if the application is approved. It is not possible to provide an accurate timeline until this point.</p>				
<p>Neighbour enquired whether there will be further engagement with the three community groups that border the woodland creation site. (Neighbour A: email 31/01/24)</p>	<p>The application will be available for all to comment when it is submitted to the Public Register.</p>				
<p>Neighbour made a request "With regards to the information you have been issuing to others within the farming community, can you please advise when the key Stakeholders are going to be issued with this information? Also, are you planning to contact your neighbours to have the same discussion on the use of the land directly</p>	<p>The area of land in question is to remain in agricultural use. The landowner wishes to provide this land as an opportunity to a for a young farmer to graze livestock. Accordingly, the local Young Farmers group have been contacted.</p>				

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

adjacent to their properties.” (Neighbour A: email 31/01/24)					
Neighbour has requested evidence of the amount of carbon that the woodland creation project will sequester. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)	The woodland will be accredited by the Woodland Carbon Code. This standard will independently verify the carbon units. For further information, please see: https://woodlandcarboncode.org.uk/standard-and-guidance				
Neighbour requested a full biodiversity report and evidence of the increased biodiversity expected as a result of the woodland. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)	Please see the ecology report which is publicly available at https://www.tilhill.com/east-nethershields/				
Neighbour has requested a report on the impact on people and animals due to a potential increase in midges due to the woodland creation. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)	This is not a requirement for Forestry Grant Scheme applications.				
Neighbour has asked Tilhill what	This is not a requirement for Forestry Grant				

<p>percentage of local residents want trees in this greenspace. They request that Tilhill provides evidence to support this figure. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>Scheme applications.</p>				
<p>Neighbour has enquired what proportion of Scottish timber will be provided from the commercial conifer planted on the site. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>We will not be including a productive timber crop due to safety concerns associated with the access point considered for timber extraction.</p>				
<p>Neighbour is concerned that the Landscape Architect views it acceptable to ignore neighbours, stakeholders, and community concerns. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>The landscape architect visited the site and took particular note of viewpoints highlighted by neighbours. He has provided a professional assessment of the proposal.</p>				
<p>Neighbour is concerned that the webpage has withheld information that</p>	<p>All surveys are available on our website: https://www.tilhill.com/east-nethershields/</p>				

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

<p>highlights the significant negative impact the project will cause. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>					
<p>Neighbour is concerned that the issues log released in June 2023 is a complete misrepresentation of the issues and is concerned that it did not comply with official process. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>The issues log has been a live document since the first engagement with stakeholders in July 2022. The final version, which will contain all issues raised to date, will be made available on the Public Register. Scottish Forestry also has access to all stakeholder correspondence for additional transparency.</p>				
<p>Neighbour is concerned by the naming of the landscape report as "Final Landscape Report" when they highlight that this was the first landscape report. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24)</p>	<p>The landscape architect provided interim recommendations on a previous design. The final report was written on an updated design.</p>				
<p>Neighbour is unhappy with the final result of the landscape report and believes that it</p>	<p>The landscape architect visited the site and took particular note of viewpoints highlighted by neighbours. He has provided a professional assessment of the proposal.</p>				

<p>does not consider all issues faced by neighbours. (Neighbour A: email 21/02/24; Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>					
<p>Neighbour A notes there has been no contact from any representative of the new landowner (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)</p>	<p>Tilhill is employed to represent the landowner.</p>				
<p>Neighbour asks for evidence of changes made to design in response to comments (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24).</p>	<p>Neighbours will shortly receive a map which will explain these changes once the application is on the Public Register, where the design will be available for all to comment.</p>				
<p>Neighbour A states that Tilhill's consultation webpage is a 'clear attempt to seek support of the woodland proposal should be discarded and removed from the case history' because, 'the limited information misrepresents facts and misleads those</p>	<p>All surveys and the issues log are available on our website to increase transparency and engagement with the application process.</p>				

Property Name: East Nethershields BRN:

who access this information.' (Neighbour A: email 03/04/24)					
--	--	--	--	--	--