

Summary Comments submitted to Scottish Woodland Ltd and Forestry Scotland In april 2020.

We received acknowledgement from the latter but not the former.

This is on Page 12 of the document which is published in full on our website.

Rhu and Shandon Community Council would hope to see the following points addressed in the proposal brought forward for public consultation. **The Community Council expect the community consultation to take place before the final application for planting is submitted to Scottish Forestry and for it to reflect the views of the community.** This document is our preliminary assessment of the information provided thus far (four EIA reports) and other matters on which no detailed information has been provided.

The Community Council does not object in principle to the afforestation proposals but will object if certain matters such as transport, flooding and issues mentioned below are not satisfactorily addressed and mitigated. At the present time the Community Council neither supports nor objects to the proposals. The Community Council's final view will be forthcoming following the community consultation exercise when we have received the comments from residents and when the issues identified on which further information is required has been received.

1. Public consultation by Scottish Woodlands in accordance with CONFOR guidelines in advance of submission of final afforestation proposal.
2. Additional environmental impact assessment (all disciplines) is required for the proposed new access track of Drumfad Farm / Luss Estates land from Highlandman's Road to the A818.
3. Pier Road and Station Road, Rhu are not acceptable as access or exit routes for afforestation or timber extraction.
4. A field survey and report on Habitat, Vegetation, Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and Peat is required for the Stuckenduff parcel.
5. Proposed afforestation area should be reduced and improved grass pasture on the lower slopes on Letrault Farm (deemed 'sensitive' in the A&B C Woodland and Forestry Strategy) should not be planted along with the unimproved land on the lower slopes. Further, that planting to the railway line would be oppressive and an adverse impact on general amenity. The CC are of the view the forestry planting should be restricted to unimproved moorland. Afforestation should be restricted to above the main head dyke at 200m on line with the west boundary of the Stuckenduff parcel.
6. Scarce Breeding Raptor Survey – our independent review suggests a single year of observation may be insufficient to reach a valid conclusion.
7. Planting plan showing areas of native broadleaf and new tracks / forest walks and mountain bike trails and community benefits is required, including details for public access.
8. Proposal for the new track across Luss Estates land and the 18th century designed landscape and impact on Highlandman's Road and the Three Lochs Way (core paths) is required.
9. Has consideration been given to using the railway for future extraction of timber? Could the Strategic Timber Transport Scheme (SSTS) provide funding to support this?
<https://forestry.gov.scot/forestry-business/timber-transport/strategic-timber-transport-scheme>
10. The forest would be visually prominent from Rosneath and the forest would also impact views from Rhu and Shandon and the views currently enjoyed from the hill. Visualisations of the forest and the visual impact are requested.
11. The CC would like to see the existing pockets of semi-native woodland and vegetation linked together by new diverse broadleaf planting and the creation of wildlife corridors within the monoculture of conifer plantation. All stands of native / semi native woodland should be preserved and all large areas of native bluebells preserved. Details of the planting plans are required.
12. The archaeological survey is incomplete and should include all field boundaries (excluding modern fences) and identify suitable crossing areas where the boundaries are already degraded. Additional survey may be required to record features that were missed. More detailed archaeological mitigation proposals are required. This information should be included in the revised proposal for public consultation.
13. Watercourse management and flooding further downhill needs to be assessed and a report with mitigation measures produced.