

## Amendments to Newborough Forest Management Plan Draft v0.9

The following comments (in the left-hand column below) were received as part of the consultation process over version 0.9 of the draft management plan.

The comments (in the right-hand column) alongside each of these comments records what has been done with that comment, and if appropriate how the comment has been incorporated into the final version of the Newborough Forest Management Plan (FINAL version 1.0).

Ref	Comment received as part of the consultation process	How the comment has been dealt with in the revised plan
1	The science review should be brought to a speedy conclusion.	This is outwith FCW control. CCW is presently defining terms of reference for the arbitration panel and will then establish the panel.
2	The plan needs to include a section on the action that will be undertaken following conclusion of the science review. If areas aren't to be clearfelled will these be thinned instead?	The plan now clearly says that it is inappropriate to speculate on the outcome of the science review. It does acknowledge that a further revision of the plan may be necessary in due course.
3	The delay in the science review is delaying the delivery of management activity on the ground.	Having a plan now in place means that work can recommence, in particular the thinning work that is needed to open up the canopy and reduce the incidence of red band needle blight.
4	The plan plus annex leads to some confusion. Explain the status of the latter.	The annex contains too much detail and is inappropriate to include within the main plan. The main plan has been updated to explain this. The annex will still be available on request.
5	The proposed areas of clearfelling – although much smaller than originally suggested – should not be mentioned in the plan at this stage.	These are included only to give an indication of the context of any felling. The plan has been updated to explain clearly that these coupes are not intended in any way to prejudice the outcome of the review.
6	Areas of forest should not be referred to as dune habitat in need of mobilisation but as non-qualifying <i>conifer woodland</i> habitat within the SAC.	This point has been highlighted within the plan so that the arbitration panel can check the wording of the N2K form.
7	The dunes would need to be described as being in unfavourable conservation status and the forest to be the cause before any clearfelling can be allowed.	This point has been highlighted within the plan so that the arbitration panel can check this further.
8	The plan should not refer to the dune habitats as being in unfavourable conservation status.	This point has been highlighted within the plan so that the arbitration panel can check this further.
9	The limited hydrological experiment should be kept completely separate	The plan has been updated to reflect this distinction between the

	from the 100m felling swathe along the boundary with the warren.	two potential operations.
10	Felling along the warren boundary for landscaping can only be done if there is compensatory planting elsewhere.	The NLP recommendations paper expressed concern that felling here shouldn't result in reduction in the forest by stealth. The sensitivity of any felling here is reflected in the updated plan.
11	The plan does not refer to the relationship of the forest with the shore and the sea and its importance in providing shelter for the beach.	The plan has been updated accordingly.
12	Acknowledge the importance of the forest in stemming the loss of biodiversity (linking this in with the national targets to be achieved by 2010).	The plan has been updated accordingly.
13	The forest itself shouldn't be a feature, rather it should be one of the factors affecting the management of the SAC feature	This would be a fundamental change too difficult to incorporate at this point so the text has been updated to make reference to this comment.
14	The transition from other nearby habitats to forest should be improved	It is acknowledged in the plan that the links to other habitats is poor. The scope of taking action here is beyond the scope of the plan but is highlighted so that further action can be considered as a separate piece of work.
15	No proposal should be implemented if it is shown to have a significant negative impact on wildlife	Acknowledged.
16	Although detailed some species and micro-habitats are not explicitly mentioned in the plan (e.g. fungi). Access routes and the felling of certain trees can affect the distribution of a population	Acknowledged. This is perhaps too great a level of detail to be included in the main plan. It might be more appropriate for particular detail on specific coupes to be included in the much more detailed coupe plans.
17	The NLP habitats & species task & finish group gave further consideration to the wide range of species within the forest and warren.	Comments as above. The NLP recommendations have been incorporated into the MP as far as possible and referenced.
18	The ownership details should include who owns Llanddwyn Island and the beach between the high and low water marks.	The plan has been updated accordingly.
19	Not all of the forest is within the AONB. The area to the north-east of the A4080 is outside this.	Acknowledged.
20	EPS, especially bat species, should be noted as factors of the forest.	The plan has been updated accordingly.
21	Several of the recreation developments will require planning permission from IoACC.	The plan has been updated accordingly.
22	Mention needs to be made of	The plan has been updated

	IoACC's coastal footpath strategy for economic regeneration.	accordingly.
23	The underplanting in Zone 5 should take place before any felling in Zone 1 to provide protection from the wind.	This point is acknowledged and is suggested in the plan. Any felling in Zone 1 needs to be reconsidered once the science review has concluded.
24	Underplanting should not be restricted to Zone 5 but should take place throughout the whole forest.	This should be considered further as a possible plan amendment in due course.
25	There does not appear to be any differentiation between the species to be planted and the percentages of broadleaves and conifers to be encouraged.	Different parts of the forest will require different species planting mixes; also natural regeneration will be expected to feature to different degrees of intensity. The plan reflects this uncertainty.
26	Squirrel numbers are set low in the plan at only 80.	If this is low and a more suitable number can be supplied then the plan can be updated accordingly.
27	Some scraping should be done (of areas of about 300m <sup>2</sup> in size) to maintain open areas to favour pioneer and secondary species.	There are no plans at present to carry out any ground scarification work. This point will need to be explored further with CCW in due course. The plan reflects the current practice of encouraging open ground using grazing animals.
28	Rides and glades also need urgent management to restore biodiversity	Acknowledged.
29	Clarify what is proposed for the marine dispersal of shore dock seed	At present there is no possibility of marine dispersal of shore dock seed. This point has therefore been removed from the plan.
30	The well sites (visible from the plastic pipes protruding above ground level) that are used for measuring water levels need to be mentioned so they aren't damaged during harvesting operations	The plan has been updated accordingly.
31	November is not the best time of year for a public consultation.	It has been necessary to press on to get a suitable plan in place to allow thinning operations to start this winter and not to miss another season, but point taken, a longer period would have been preferable.
32	Too short a time period for public consultation	Comments as above. As long a time as possible has been granted with the draft plan being in the public domain from 28 September 2010 and comments being accepted up to 5 November 2010.

John Browne  
District Forester Planning, Coed y Mynydd Forest District,  
Forestry Commission Wales  
11 November 2011