

## SLC Land Management Plan workshop: 27 January 2025. DL note.

### Aim:

We want to use the workshop to further shape our advice and develop our understanding of the practicalities linked to delivering land management plans, including what future guidance and templates could include.

LINK views:

*Management plans can play an important role in ensuring landowners are working towards their responsibilities while consulting with their communities and stakeholders. However, some landowners will already have management plans which may have been produced shortly before this became a legal requirement. Where this is the case, legislation should be clear at what point they will need to publish subsequently, and should not be unduly burdensome on organisations with existing plans. For example, some eNGO landowners will already have long-term management plans in place*

*Supported 1000 ha threshold*

---

### **Agenda**

**14:00 Introductions & agenda**

**14:05 SLC Bill Stage 1 advice & next steps**

**14:10 Land Management Plans Advice summary**

**14:15 Feedback/any questions**

**14:25 LMP Key elements: *Guidance and spatial data (30mins)***

**BREAK (5mins)**

**15:00 LMP Key elements: *Content & obligations (45mins)***

**15:45 Summary & conclusions**

**15:55 Close**

---

### **Notes:**

16 people: land managers, NS, SF, SG bill team, NFU, SLE and more.

**Role of LMPs:** consensus and divergence - what works, won't work and how to support development. See short note afterwards of key points. Not a discussion about detail but early discussion around what key questions / issues / changes about working in practice might be.. Formal consultation comes further down line.

## Workshop task

Relevant	Proportionate	Deliverable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Will this help achieve our aims?</li><li>• Is it relevant and accessible to the user?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What information is essential?</li><li>• Where could we go further?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Availability and practicality of gathering data</li><li>• Resource</li></ul>

Stage 1 under scrutiny by NZET committee. See SLC advice. Overall advice aimed at strengthening and simplifying part 1 of Bill. Summary of SLOC advice:

## Land Management Plans

- Mechanism for transparency and disclosure.
- Support collaboration and shared outcomes.
- Not business or operating plan

### Key amendments to Bill:

- Aligning thresholds (1000ha/25% < of an inhabited island)
- Refer to Local Place Plans in LMPs
- Community councils, enterprise agencies, national park authorities and the Crofting Commission should be able to allege a breach
- Include duty for how communities are engaged
- Land and Communities Commissioner to be able to instigate an investigation into a potential breach in the absence of an allegation where there are reasonable grounds to do so.

### Discussion:

Concerns from SLE and NFU on threshold - 1000 too low. Concerns about controversies around level of detail in suggested outline burdensome for SLE and NFUS. Agreed on need to minimise duplication. Need to look at how much data from tenants might be needed / released: LLTNP.

Proportionality and how to assess that.

Keeping up to date: how to do that

### Guidance & template

- Supporting documents key
- Guidance to help set out expectations/minimum standards
- Template ensures consistency and ease
- Stored on a central, online portal

See straw outline in workshop doc: asking What does good look like, how can guidance set out expectations and minimum standards, for users, land owners and communities. Online portal? Where?

## A spatial plan

- Important for transparency and engagement
- Precedent in other areas, allows join up with other local plans

Join up with LPP, DMPs. Is this achievable, what's out there already? LDP, RLUF. Means spatial plans are essential eg Strathard Plan LLTNP.

### Resources shared:

A bookmark to our webpage for our existing Land Management Plans (Long Term Forest Plans) - [Planning our land management | Forestry and Land Scotland](#). We have over 300 existing Land Management Plans (*this is a term we already use*) covering 9% Scotland – these are long term forest plans submitted to Scottish Forestry for approval and checked against the UK Forestry Standard. You can access our plans for consultations and approved plans here.

And resources from Scottish Forestry: [Scottish Forestry - Forest plan resources](#)

Another key driver for (certified) forestry is the UK Woodland Assurance Scheme – a standard for sustainability, against which we are audited. Recently the standard was updated – UKWAS 5, which includes a long chapter on land management planning – another useful reference, and in this latest version picks up more on climate change, carbon and consultation. [UKWAS-5.0-2024.pdf](#) This will give you a sense of what we are already doing on those points.

From a crofting context there would be the opportunity to link with the [Register of Crofts \(ROC\) | Crofting Commission](#) and the [Crofting Register](#)

Register of Crofts (ROC) | Crofting Commission

Register of Crofts (ROC) crofting commission

An increasing amount of spatial information is publicly accessible (e.g. [SpatialData.gov.scot](#)) and it should be possible to utilise this in a way that avoids duplication, maximises accessibility and is useful at the scale and in the context of a single landholding within scope.

<https://www.environment.gov.scot/maps/scotlands-environment-map/>,

### Proportionality:

Traffic light system? Suggestion from SLE. Hamish asked for egs.

Offering maps to help ease burden on land owners esp farmers. NS doing lot of mapping work and can advise.

Set clear minimum standards but start voluntarily: eg Whole Farm Plan not currently designed to be made public and may not be welcomed.

**Balance between voluntary and compulsory:** LMPs as tool to support decision making and demonstrate are being used to limit duplication and burden. LMPs as a disclosure approach? Enabling disclosure on how landowners are approaching issues to build understanding on how a land holding is operating. Distinction between essential and required - need further discussion.

**Central location / portal:** ease of use. Checks on LMPs meet statutory requirements? Where does oversight sit? - slef declaration or more complex? Not yet resolved or clear. So far:

obligation to produce LMP, option to launch breach but no proactive oversight to check - LCC role? Central place might make overall progress on compliance easier. Capacity to allow LMP feedback could help build shared learning on process.

FLS LMPs gather info all to one place: for regulation purposes but means they are complex and can be difficult to find info required. LMPs that are modular allows parts to be updated but keep static elements too with mapped time commitments / deadlines.

**Availability of data: how available is it? Is spatial plan reasonable?** Biodiversity data can be tricky and a lot of mapping is still being built. Although SG ask for data - eg habitat impact assessments but need to see outputs back: at the moment it goes into black hole.

Some kick back against needing to include path management agreements.

Support and advisory functions need thinking about and developing: LMPs need to be something land managers can do themselves and stay as easy and straightforward as possible.

**Section 2: content of LMP:** these are suggestions only from SLC put up to stimulate discussion.

Contracts thinking based on community wealth building principles and builds on Wildlife Scotland Estates plus demonstrating local economic impacts.

Some questions on what the purpose of all this is: and how communities might use it / find it helpful. Around public interest and community wealth building.

Vacant land / vacant crofts id would be helpful. Local stalking opps, local food production also helpful - more transparency helpful. Benefits these offer in terms of collaboration opps. Examples given of Ardtornish Impact Report. Local communities welcome transparency and demonstrating economic impact is key for land owners too. Also useful management tool for land owner. Also builds trust.

Concerns on defining communities and requiring engagement with them: Hamish confirmed communities of place, and communities of interest when needed.

A briefing on definition of communities and community bodies in the Bill drafted by CLS, DTAS and SCA sent to NZ Committee

[Communities and Community Bodies in the Land Reform Bill - SCA, CLS and DTAS briefing.pdf](#)

## Landholding information

- ✓ Location
- ✓ Ownership/governance
- ✓ Jobs and contracts
- ✓ Partnerships, collaboration, and voluntary schemes
- ✓ Boundary map
- ✓ Land uses
- ✓ Areas of reduced or no management control

## Vision and objectives

- ✓ Vision statement
- ✓ Objectives

## Obligations

### Access

- ✓ Core paths map
- ✓ Managing and communicating access issues

### Deer Management

- ✓ Compliance with code of practice
- ✓ Staff policy?

## Obligations

### Climate Change

- ✓ Climate plans
- ✓ Carbon Audits
- ✓ Peatland area, activity and condition
- ✓ Woodland and scrub management activity
- ✓ Trees on farms
- ✓ Management of climate risks
- ✓ Collaboration
- ✓ Emissions reduction
- ✓ Carbon credit schemes

## Biodiversity

- ✓ Biodiversity Plans
- ✓ Management Agreements and Agri-environment
- ✓ Contracts
- ✓ Licenses for the management and control of species
- ✓ Public funding & biodiversity credits
- ✓ Protected areas and habitats

Added in need to include enhancement actions from eg infrastructure and Nature networks - habitat maps may be way to go?

## Community engagement

- ✓ Definition of community in this context
- ✓ Overall approach to community engagement/community engagement plan
- ✓ Changes/significant activities
- ✓ Delivery and support for local place plans and other community plans
- ✓ Site of community significance
- ✓ Role of community in developing the Land Management Plan

## Land Rights and Responsibilities Statement

- ✓ Demonstration of awareness of the LRRS
- ✓ Assessment and monitoring LRRS
- ✓ Social impact

AP: can we offer any member LMPs to help demonstrate what can be done?

### **Summary:**

Support to limit duplication

Spatial mapping welcomed

Demonstrating local economic opps and impact and supporting wider local collaboration

Proportionate plans and user testing through real examples.

Need to acknowledge farming that land owners are expecting this to be light touch but the opps and benefits of economic opp mapping is more involved but also more beneficial but needs careful framing: eg: *For me, there seems to be a growing disparity on what landowners/managers have been told what LMPs, in terms of high-level etc) will be and what they appear to be evolving into.*

See note afterwards from Kathie.