

## 6.0 Tolerance Table

Due to the scale of woodland and the risk of wind blow the standard tolerances for clearance of wind blow have been adjusted:

	Adjustment to felling coupe boundaries (1)	Timing of regeneration	Timing of Restocking	Changes to species	Other	Windthrow clearance (2)	Changes to road lines , tracks or paths (other CE activity)(3)
<b>FC Approval normally not required</b>	0.5 ha or 5% of coupe - whichever is less should there be formal consultation / register?		Up to 2 planting seasons after felling	Change within species group e.g. evergreen conifers; broadleaves		Up to 2ha	EIA implications?
<b>Approval by exchange of letters and map</b>	0.5ha to 2ha or 10% of coupe - whichever is less should there be formal consultation / register?	After 5 years				2ha to 5ha	Additional felling of trees not agreed in plan  Departures of >60m in either direction from centre line of road
<b>Approval by formal plan amendment</b>	2ha or 10% of coupe should there be formal consultation / register?		Over 2 planting seasons after felling	Change from specified native species  Change between species groups		> 7ha	As above, depending on sensitivity

### Notes on Tolerances Table

1. There are circumstances in which changes - of less than 0.5 ha for example - could have a dramatic visual effect. The above model does require a sensible approach to be taken by Forest Enterprise in notifying Forestry Commission when such cases arise. Local staff need to be sensitive to issues which may influence the situation (bearing in mind that small adjustments to felling coupes will not appear on the Public Register).
2. It is important that Forest Enterprise keep the FC informed about wind blow clearance, which can be problematic in cases of public complaint. In some cases a modification of the proposals for the remaining area of the Plan may need to be submitted and approved. Clearance of blow should not require approval but will be needed for related standing trees.
3. It is recognised that roading proposals as marked on Road Plans are necessarily indicative, in that actual roading operations require to take account of features not always apparent at the time of roadline planning. Accordingly some leeway is acceptable to account for this.

## Appendix 1 : Record of consultation

Members of the public and other identified stakeholders were able to view the proposed plan and complete an on line survey which ran from 24/12/14 to 27/2/15. Certain organisations were invited to participate in the survey. In addition, posters giving details of how to participate were displayed at primary access points and also at the post office in Halwill junction. In total 109 people visited the website and 59 people viewed the plan, of these 9 people left responses.

Consultee	Issues Raised	Forest District Response to Issues
English Heritage (Andy Crabb)	A site meeting took place on 18/11/14. The Scheduled Monument sites were visited and existing plans reviewed.	Renew Scheduled Monument Plans in March 2015.
Environment Agency (Richard Knott)	No issues raised.	No response.
Natural England (Catherine Burgess)	Potential for Culm Grassland Restoration – with particular reference to Coupe 72662. Response to the on line survey is included in the summary overleaf.	Revisited coupe 72662 and determined that the published plan is consistent with current policy, meets FC obligations and provides an appropriate balance between meeting our environmental, economic and social objectives.
Butterfly Conservation (Caroline Kelly, Jenny Plackett)	A site meeting took place on 20/10/14 to look at relevant issues. In addition a response to the online consultation was received indicating general support. Response to the on line survey is included in the summary overleaf.	No response.
Devon Historic Environment Team (Bill Horner, Cressida Whitton)	A meeting took place on 10/12/14 to look at relevant issues. Details of agreed proposals are detailed in the text on p-8.	See page 8
Devon Wildlife Trust (Mark Elliot)	A meeting took place on 26/9/14 to look at relevant issues which have been incorporated into the plan.	No response.
Torrige District Council (Bruce Macfarlane)	No issues raised – response to the on line survey is included in the summary overleaf.	No response.
West Devon Borough Council (Georgina Brown)	No issues raised.	No response.
Clawton Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Ashwater Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Bradford & Cookbury Parish council	No issues raised.	No response.
Broadwoodwidge Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Halwill Parish Council	No issues raised – response to the on line survey is included in the summary overleaf.	No response.
Black Torrington Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Holsworthy Hamlets Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Germansweek Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Bratton Clovelly Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Beaworthy Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Northlew Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
Inwardleigh Parish Council	No issues raised.	No response.
1st Holsworthy scouts	No issues raised – response to the on line survey are included in the summary overleaf.	No response.

**Appendix 1 : Record of consultation (cont'd)**

Consultee	Issues Raised	Forest District Response to Issues
4 members of the public responded to the on line consultation.	Two specific issues were raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of circular walking routes.</li> <li>• Concern over clear felling.</li> </ul> Other responses are included in the summary below.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current levels of public access will be maintained. It is hoped that visitor experience will be enhanced through improvement of road and ride corridor network, normally implemented at the time of re-stocking.</li> <li>• Clear felling will continue as detailed in the plan with due consideration to wildlife and users of the woodland. Regeneration of felled areas will be as per plan.</li> </ul>

The on line consultation asked for responses to a series of questions. The results are summarised below.

	Very Important	Important	Insignificant	Very Insignificant	Not Applicable	Not Answered
<b>How important are the following interests to you or your organisation?</b>						
Biodiversity and woodland ecology	67%	33%				
Communities and People (e.g. landscape heritage and culture)	33%	67%				
Climate Change (e.g. carbon capture & flood alleviation)	33%	45%	11%	11%		
Forest Products and Services (e.g. timber, woodfuel, & non timber products)		45%	33%		22%	
Forest Protection (e.g. woodland structure, plant health & soil stability)	22%	56%	11%		11%	
Income & Employment (e.g. game management, timber processing, tourism)		45%	33%		11%	11%
Recreation & Access ( e.g. leases / permissions, trails, facilities)	67%	22%	11%			
	<b>Very Well</b>	<b>Well</b>	<b>OK</b>	<b>Poorly</b>	<b>Very Poorly</b>	<b>Not Answered</b>
<b>How well does the plan address your needs and interests or those of your organisation?</b>	11%	78%	11%			
	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Not Answered</b>			
<b>Do you agree that the plan achieves an appropriate balance of social, economic, and environmental objectives for the woodland?</b>	100%					

**Appendix 2 : Major policy documents and guidelines that inform our planning and operations:**

A Strategy for England's Trees, Woods and Forests  
The UK Woodland Assurance Standard  
The UK Forestry Standard

UK Forestry Standard Guidelines:  
Forests and biodiversity  
Forests and climate change  
Forests and historic environment  
Forests and Landscape  
Forests and people  
Forests and Soil  
Forests and water

National Policies and guidelines

Forest District Strategic Plan  
Design and Management of Environmental Corridors  
Use of Urea for stump treatment in former Peninsula District  
SSSI Management Plan – Whiteleigh Meadows  
SSSI Management Plan – Dunsland  
Scheduled Monument Management Plan – Witherdon  
Scheduled Monument Management Plan – Halwill  
Scheduled Monument Management Plan – Wadland

Local Policies and Guidelines