



# MAVISBANK POLICIES LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PLAN

## Consultation Report



## Contents

### **Section 1** **page 3**

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Background

### **Section 2** **page 6**

2.1 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan?

2.2 How the findings of the environmental assessment have informed the finalised plan?

### **Section 3** **page 15**

3.1 How have the opinions of the public and other stakeholders have been taken into account?

### **Section 4** **page 18**

4.1 Reasons for adopting the finalised plan in light of other reasonable alternatives

4.2 Which option did we choose and why?

### **Section 5** **page 20**

5.1 Monitoring and Next steps

## Appendix 1

Analysis Report

## Section 1

---

### 1.1 Introduction

Mavisbank House, an 18<sup>th</sup> century country villa and its grounds, is situated on the north side of the valley of the River North Esk between the villages of Loanhead and Polton in Midlothian. The house and the surrounding grounds, known as policies, are in a dilapidated state. In recent years the house and its policies have been the subject of various studies and proposals which have attracted national and international attention. This includes featuring in the BBC's Restoration series in 2003. Scottish Ministers do not own the building but since the 1980s Historic Scotland has had close involvement with the site, using emergency powers under the [Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979](#) to install scaffolding to prevent the building's collapse, erecting a security fence around the house and undertaking some basic maintenance.

In accordance with good conservation practice Historic Scotland wish to have an appropriate management framework in place to guide future work to the policies. Following stakeholder engagement during 2010 we have now adopted a management plan. Part of this stakeholder engagement included a public consultation on a series of issues and options.

### 1.2 Background to the consultation

Between 23 September and 5 November 2010 Historic Scotland undertook a 6 week public consultation on an Issues and Options Paper which sought the views of local residents and the wider community, including businesses, organisations and other parties with an interest in the site. The consultation invited views on a range of issues and options for consideration by Historic Scotland in the preparation of a Mavisbank Policies Management Plan. The adopted plan is available at:

[www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicscotlandsea](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicscotlandsea)

Hard copies can be requested from:

Historic Scotland, Longmore House, Salisbury Place Edinburgh EH9 1SH.

## Analysis Report

An Analysis Report which compares the number of participants with the distribution list, summarises the written responses, analyses the views expressed and sets out some key issues raised through the consultation process, is attached to this consultation report in Appendix 1.

## Overview of the SEA process

A strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Issues and Options Paper was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the [Environmental Assessment \(Scotland\) Act 2005](#). As part of this process a screening and scoping exercise took place in July and August 2010 respectively. The Consultation Authorities<sup>1</sup> responded to these reports and their comments were taken into consideration. As part of the development of the plan the Issues and Options Paper set out various scenarios and actions. An Environmental Report was prepared alongside this to support its development and to highlight the likely environmental effects of the various options considered.

## Consultation Report Objectives

This report outlines what has been taken forward into the final Management Plan and why. Any changes, in light of the consultation responses and other relevant information, to those proposed actions and scenarios that were put forward in the Issues and Options Paper are summarised and any factual errors that were raised have been corrected.

The purpose of this report is also to set out the information that is a statutory requirement of the SEA legislation<sup>2</sup> for the post adoption stage in the process. It explains how the findings of the environmental assessment have informed the finalised plan, and how the opinions expressed on the environmental assessment have been taken into account in finalising the plan. It also identifies measures proposed to monitor the environmental effects of the plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scottish Environment Protection Agency & Scottish Natural Heritage

<sup>2</sup> (Section 18(3) of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005)

## Report Structure

**Section 2** of this report explains how the assessment findings, including those set out in the Environmental Report, have been taken into account in the finalised plan. **Section 3** describes how the opinions of the public and other stakeholders have been taken into account. **Section 4** sets out the reasons for choosing the preferred option, in light of reasonable alternatives considered within the SEA process. Finally, **Section 5** sets out the final steps for taking forward the plan and includes a framework for monitoring its significant environmental effects.

The following table identifies the information which is required at post adoption stage and where it can be found within this report:

**Table 1: SEA Post Adoption Statement**

Information Required by the SEA Act	Section of the Consultation Report
How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan	2
How the environmental report has been taken into account	2
How the opinions expressed during the consultation period have been taken into account	3
Transboundary consultations	Not applicable
Reasons for adopting the finalised plan in light of other reasonable alternatives	4
Monitoring of significant environmental effects	5

## Section 2

---

### Key Environmental Issues

#### 2.1 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan?

This section identifies the key environmental issues raised during the consultation, including the Environmental Report, and explains how the views and information have been taken into account in the Management Plan. Key environmental issues raised are taken to mean those that called for substantial changes, additions to the plan, or those that were a common concern or suggestion raised by respondents.

#### Key Environmental Issue 1 Cultural and Natural Heritage:

A key issue that was raised amongst those who responded to the consultation was how to balance the needs of this outstanding significant historic site and landscape with the needs of the natural heritage of the site, in order to provide an appropriate context for both cultural and natural heritage management and conservation.

An additional concern was that the site should not be promoted as a major tourist destination, and that there should be a balance towards protecting both the cultural and natural assets of the site using a low key approach.

There was recognition that the house is an important cultural heritage asset that required stabilising but not at the detriment of the natural heritage that surrounds it. A common suggestion was to concentrate on the area around house (stabilising the house<sup>3</sup>) and surrounding landscape/nearest to the house allowing for a subtle low-key approach for any physical works in the landscape with minimum intervention on the natural environment further away from the house.

Another main concern was that was not enough involvement of natural conservation bodies for managing the site – suggesting that their expertise and involvement could make an important contribution to achieving the objective of how to protect both the

---

<sup>3</sup> Issues relating to the consolidation of the house are outwith the scope of the plan

cultural and natural heritage of the site. Overall, the responses received concerning Key Issue 1 comprised mainly of suggestions and provided more information on the site rather than calling for substantial changes to management actions. However, a number of respondents also suggested that it would be beneficial to encourage and promote links to local voluntary groups and tap into local expertise and knowledge which would help ensure that the balance is maintained. Some respondents felt that there should be a move to involve nature conservation bodies in the management of the site and/or for the site to be designated as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) as a means of allowing for getting the balance better for the management of the site's natural heritage.

**How have these issues, concerns and/or suggestions been taken into account/what are the additions to the plan?**

The main issues and concerns stated above will be addressed through the actions contained in Management Plan (Scenario 1, the Preferred Option) which promotes a low-key approach (opening up the lawn area in front of the house, clearing old trees and stabilising some elements of the buildings) and will contain recommendations for the surveying of these areas before any physical works will occur to avoid any damage to species or habitats. This low-key approach seeks to promote the better understanding of the landscape design and allow for the protection of it in the long term.

Concerns regarding the call for improvements in respect to liaison with local people/voluntary/natural heritage bodies will be addressed in the Management Plan which promotes and allows for community engagement through small-scale management operations, raising awareness of the historic importance of the site and biodiversity enhancement projects such as putting up bird and bat boxes and working with local schools. It also includes provision for Ecological Surveys to ensure a better understanding for species and habitats on the site which will ensure a positive impact on that will be required before any physical works and could help promote some liaison with natural heritage bodies.

## **Key Environmental Issue 2 Land and Water Management**

A number of respondents felt that for Key Issue 2 there was a definite need to focus on resolving the drainage issues on the site which were seen as a safety issue as well as preventing access to parts of the site.

A main concern was that although some drainage would be beneficial, it should only occur in areas that helped to improve safety and access and not at the expense of the natural environment; so some sensitive areas remaining un-drained in order to benefit wetland species and habitats.

*How have these issues, concerns and/or suggestions been taken into account/what are the additions to the plan?*

The main issues and concerns stated above will be addressed through the actions contained in Management Plan (Scenario 1, the Preferred Option) which contains actions to manage drainage and identify sources of drainage problems, but provides mitigation measures through appropriate survey and processes to ensure that there are minimal impacts on the natural environment.

## **Key Environmental Issue 3 Access and Recreation**

Some responses were concerned with the provision of better access being balanced with not compromising or detracting from (or causing damage) to the cultural and natural heritage of the site. Access and the promotion of recreation within the site should not be detrimental to those areas of the site that are sensitive or unsafe and clear signage and restricted areas should also be provided.

Another recurring issue with the lack of clear signage. Several respondents felt that the concerns for this key issue revolved around the lack of provision of clear signage around and within the site. Others felt that resolving the ownership and access issues in relation to separate private ownership of access drives and the house itself were required to be addressed first in order to plan for the long term future of the site.

Some respondents stated that walking and cycling and provision for horse-riding friendly surfaces and gates into the site could be promoted. Further signage could be used to guide visitors along routes.

It was suggested by some that the improvement of paths within the site, concentrating on provision of better access to the site on existing access points particularly in relation to Kevock Road, the A768 (and the adjacent field), linking up to the wider Midlothian Path networks would help improve access. The river path was stated as an example of a path that was particularly in need of upgrading (although this is outside the scope of the Management Plan as it is out with the ownership boundary of the policy area owned by Historic Scotland) and linking up with paths along eastern perimeter of former walled garden, and a circular route around the site would also be beneficial.

*How have these issues, concerns and/or suggestions been taken into account/what are the additions to the plan?*

The Management Plan contains actions that aim to improve and resolve some of the concerns raised in the consultation responses including provision of clearer signage and better defined routes, avoiding sensitive sites and dangerous areas. These actions range from providing wooden post signs to direct users along existing recognised routes, and repairs to waterlogged/muddy paths. Good path management provided in the plan should help avoid sensitive natural heritage areas by encouraging visitors to keep to paths and avoid trampling on sensitive areas. The plan also includes actions for exposing and restoring some lost footpaths. There is provision within the plan to work in partnership with Midlothian Council, the Esk Valley Trust and other local groups to strengthen the path network.

## **2.2 How the findings of the environmental assessment have informed the finalised plan**

### **Key Findings from the Environmental Report**

The Environmental Report was published for a 6 week period of consultation alongside the Issues and Options Paper. There were three options/scenarios presented in this document along with alternative ways of implementing each scenario. The Environmental Report explained the significant environmental effects that could arise as

a result of each of them. A total of **twenty one** responses were received from a range of respondents, including the SEA Consultation Authorities, Midlothian Council, environmental bodies, various community and amenity groups and individuals. Although not everyone chose to comment on the findings of the Environmental Report, of those that did respond the comments were generally supportive of the SEA and its findings. Given the environmental assessment was embedded within the options paper there is a great deal of cross over between the planning and environmental issues. However, specific comments upon the Environmental Report included positive views from SEPA and SNH, for example, regarding the scope and level of detail included within the assessment.

The environmental assessment found that options/scenarios 1 and 2 were likely to have positive effects across all environmental parameters with significant positive environmental effects likely to arise for cultural heritage, population and human health topics. Scenario 2 had slightly greater positive effects for cultural heritage as a result of repairing rather than stabilising structures. Both scenario 1 and 2 found some minor negative effects for biodiversity as a result of works which may disturb existing habitats. There is a greater risk for minor impacts with scenario 2 due to more physical interventions. However, it is felt that these negative effects will be offset by objectives in the finalised plan which aim to gain a better understanding of the habitats and species present on the site and by adopting appropriate management processes.

While Scenario 3 was found to also be likely to have positive effects for population due to improved access and enjoyment of the site, the uncertainty surrounding the historical evolution of the landscape means that the results for cultural heritage and landscape are largely unknown. The assessment found that effects upon biodiversity are more likely to be negative with this scenario because of the intrusive nature of the proposed interventions.

One of the key aims of the SEA process is to influence and inform the finalised plan by integrating environmental considerations into the plan and taking account of the environmental assessment. The SEA ensured that the key environmental challenges that

arose as the Issues and Options paper was developed were recognised at an early stage and have been taken into account as far as possible. Table 2 below summarises the key environmental effects identified during the assessment for the preferred scenario, and explains the ways in which these findings have informed the finalised version of the plan.

**Table 2: Summary of the key environmental effects for preferred scenario 1**

Topic	Potential effects of the preferred Scenario 1	Implications for the finalised Management Plan
Biodiversity, flora and fauna	<p>Minor negatives identified where actions to secure landscape and make it safe or restore may affect existing species and habitats.</p> <p>Significant positive effects for increasing our knowledge of species and habitats and the promotion of natural heritage on the site.</p>	<p>Ensure monitoring and adherence to appropriate procedures when carrying out physical works, e.g avoid strimming during nesting season.</p> <p>Positive effects for biodiversity will arise through better understanding of the site through ecological surveys which will be required for physical works.</p>
Population & Human Health	<p>Significant positive effects on population and health by increasing physical and educational access to the site and promoting access and making it safer by clearing hazards.</p>	<p>Increased access will promote physical health and awareness of the importance of the site from both a cultural and natural heritage perspective. The plan will ensure introduction of interpretation boards strategically placed and clearer signage to ensure safe and non intrusive access to sensitive areas.</p>
Climatic Factors	<p>Neutral effects were identified as overall there were only a few potential opportunities to make physical interventions such as stabilising buildings or improving drainage that could be used as adaptation measures.</p>	<p>The plan will ensure that it considers taking account of the effects of climate change by introducing adaptation measures where possible (for those few opportunities that can be identified).</p>
Cultural Heritage and Landscape	<p>Significant positive effects were identified for most of the objectives relating to the protection and management of cultural heritage.</p> <p>Interpretation and community engagement would further help to raise awareness of the site's importance and avoid damage by the public.</p>	<p>The finalised plan contains actions to improve the protection and management and access to the site. Aspects of this also include commitment to increase knowledge of the site by providing interpretation boards and clearer signage at strategic points around the site. It is intended that community engagement will be part of this process.</p>

## Representations on the Environmental Report

The Environmental Report was embedded within the Issues and Options Paper and asked two key questions for each of the three options/scenarios that were presented. The analysis below summarises views in relation to each of these questions.

**SEA Question 1: Do you agree with the findings of the environmental assessment (Annexes A and B)? Have we identified key issues associated with these actions/proposals? If not please specify.**

In total 12 responses out of 21 who responded to the consultation chose to comment on the question on the environmental assessment findings. Many of these respondents were generally positive about the findings of the environmental assessment, stating that they felt the key issues had been covered.

Out of these 12, 8 respondents stated that they were generally happy with the environmental assessment, with 5 out of these 8 providing advice and comments including further information, sources of evidence (for baseline and updates/review of Plans, Programmes and Strategies (PPS) etc) which have been taken into account in the finalised plan.

SNH and SEPA were content with our approach to the environmental assessment and supported the findings outlined in the Environmental Report.

Four respondents did not agree with the findings. Two of these did not consider that the biodiversity/natural heritage elements of the site had been adequately investigated and provided further information and review for baseline and relevant plans & policies that should be considered in the finalised plan. A further response considered the environmental assessment to be too complicated and another one considered that the assessment had been carried out from a historic designed landscape standpoint.

Table 3 below summarises these views and sets out Historic Scotland's response to them.

**Table 3: Summary of views in response to QER1 and response**

View expressed	HS Response/comments
<p>Nothing should be done to the detriment of the natural environmental features of the site. The environmental assessment did not provide an adequate view of the natural environmental features of the site. Recommend a thorough environmental survey and audit before any decision is taken on the scenarios.</p>	<p>It is important for a strategic environmental assessment to take place at an appropriate level. We consider that the level of information gathered is sufficient to broadly predict the likely effects and reach a view on the proposals under consideration. However, we do agree that further detailed surveys and audits will be helpful in specific areas during the implementation of the plan and before undertaking certain activities. The finalised plan will contain measures to ensure that all potential impacts on the natural environment will be assessed before any physical works are carried out. An objective is included within the preferred scenario 1 to undertake ecological surveys for all protected species on the site.</p>
<p>The study has been done from a historic designed landscape standpoint. An equivalent study for natural heritage standpoint would have come up with different scenarios.</p>	<p>The nature of the SEA process is to ensure that all aspects of the environment that are scoped into the assessment are considered equally and that the potential impacts of the plan on the environment are set out clearly in the Environmental Report as the plan is being prepared and implemented. Analysis of assessment results concluded that the preferred scenario 1 would have the least impact on biodiversity within the site and that significant positive effects were identified. For those potential negative impacts that have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed to help reduce, offset or avoid the impacts.</p>
<p>Why has the SEA given the natural heritage environment a priority when the subject is a cultural heritage designation?</p>	<p>The intention of SEA is to provide an consistent, systematic and methodical approach to ensure that information on the significant environmental effects of any plan are taken into account and considered during the planning and implementation of a plan. In doing so, its purpose is to give consideration to all aspects of the environment which could be significantly affected (negatively or positively). It was therefore important for all relevant issues to be considered during the SEA process and in particular, test where environmental issues may be in conflict with each other. We took that view that the natural heritage does play an important role in the site and that it was correct to consider effects on issues such as biodiversity alongside all other environmental interests.</p>
<p>The status of the site as a local designated wild life site, local biodiversity site and candidate Local Nature Reserve (LNR) is not acknowledged.</p>	<p>Noted. This information was helpful. The finalised plan will make note of these designations and the potential as a candidate as a LNR.</p>
<p>Further surveys and research undertaken on the site over the years have been omitted.</p>	<p>Noted. The finalised plan will refer to these studies.</p>

**SEA Question 2: Do you have any comments on the mitigation measures set out in Annex A?**

A total of 5 responses were received for mitigation measures. In general they welcomed the comprehensive nature of the mitigation that was proposed. Table 4 below summarises these views and sets out Historic Scotland’s response to them.

**Table 4: Summary of views in response to QER2 and response**

View	Response
Consents are needed for <i>all</i> tree work within the Mavisbank Conservation Area.	The Mavisbank Conservation Area Character Appraisal Additional Controls para 6 contains reference to this. Before carrying out any tree work within the conservation area prior written notice of 6 weeks must be given to Midlothian Council, detailing the nature of the work and identifying the trees. The finalised plan will make note of this.

## Section 3

---

### 3.1 How the opinions expressed during the consultation period have been taken into account

In answer to the questions put in the Issues and Options Paper, respondents also raised a range of non environmental issues which have been taken into account in the finalised plan. This section of the Consultation Report explains how these opinions expressed by the public and stakeholders during the consultation process have been taken into account in the finalised version of the plan.

#### Other Key Issues

##### Key Issue 1 – Promotion and Interpretation of the site

A key issue that was expressed concerned the method in which the site could be promoted, suggesting a low-key approach would be the most appropriate, that did not over promote the site, and preserving the ‘as found’ environment as far as possible.

*How have these issues, concerns and/or suggestions been taken into account/what are the additions to the plan?*

The plan will seek to promote the site through better access, community engagement and liaison with local groups and voluntary bodies. Using on-site interpretation boards and links with other natural and cultural heritage sites in the area will also help promote, and encourage appropriate and sustainable use of the site by locals and visitors. The plan will take into account the above concerns and will recognise the unique nature of the site, balancing the need for necessary maintenance works which require to be carried out to safeguard the designed landscape from permanent loss of features with the natural environment.

##### Key Issue 2 – Funding and Resources

Funding and resources issues were a common key concern raised by respondents to the consultation, some of which were concerned with the availability of funding for those physical works contained within Annex A of the Issues and Options Paper, and particularly in light of the current economic climate. However, several responses made

suggestions for the possibility of small amounts of extra funding that could be tapped into through various funding bodies and could be used in particular for small-scale initiatives on the site which would also be of benefit to the local community.

*How have these issues, concerns and/or suggestions been taken into account/what are the additions to the plan?*

Funding and resource availability will be one of the main factors affecting the implementation of the Management Plan. The nature of the current UK and Scottish and local economies and public sector funding will mean that the Management Plan will have to implement a maintenance programme of minimal restorative works. However, the plan will ensure that all avenues for potential funding sources are considered and recognises the potential benefits that this has for bringing in local community groups and voluntary labour which may also be a way of encouraging untapped expertise.

### **Key Issue 3 – Significant Cultural Heritage Value of the Mavisbank House**

Some respondents felt that the consultation did not fully demonstrate the significant cultural heritage value of the house and that key information and research about Mavisbank House had been omitted. Others expressed concerns that the House was not included in the Management Plan and that the report was invalidated due to the lack of discussion and inclusion of Mavisbank House from the Issues and Options Paper.

*How have these issues, concerns and/or suggestions been taken into account/what are the additions to the plan?*

The Issues and Options Paper did not discuss measures to manage Mavisbank House which is not owned by Scottish Ministers, and has an ongoing history of complex ownership and access issues. Instead, the Issues and Options Paper was a consultation process to open up to the public the various key issues and options for consideration by Historic Scotland to help inform the various scenarios and actions to be taken into the finalised Management Plan for the Policies that surround Mavisbank House.

Although the plan will concentrate on the management of the Policies and will recognise the outstanding cultural significance and importance of the Policies, the various actions taken into the Management Plan should help provide a catalyst for re-associating the house with the grounds and wider landscape setting. The plan will also include references to key information for the studies, reports and research that has been carried out previously.

## Section 4

---

### 4.1 Reasons for adopting the finalised plan in light of other reasonable alternatives

The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 requires Responsible Authorities to explain the reasons for selecting their preferred approach to a plan or Policy, in the light of the reasonable alternatives. This section outlines the reasons for adopting the preferred scenario into plan in light of other reasonable alternatives.

*What were the options for the plan?*

There were 3 scenarios put forward in the Issues and Options Paper and a list of questions also accompanied each scenario.

**Scenario 1 – As Found Approach** – provides a minimum of works and interventions to avoid loss of the historic landscape features. Scenario 1 was found to have generally positive effects for all the environmental parameters with significant positive effects arising for the cultural and population topics as a result of works to improve public access and safety at the site and to repair and protect historic landscape elements. Minor negative effects were predicted for the natural environment as a result of planned physical works but can be mitigated through appropriate ecological surveys and ensuring proper licences and procedures are in place.

**Scenario 2 – Lower Level Restoration Approach** – this goes further than Scenario 1, by partially restoring historic landscape features, notably tree lines and vistas. Scenario 2 was found to have generally positive effects for all the environmental parameters as with Scenario 1, but goes further as a result of actions such as repairing, and restoring elements of the landscape and path networks. Minor negative effects that were predicted for the natural environment as a result of planned physical works were predicted as a greater risk in Scenario 2 which proposes more physical interventions.

**Scenario 3 – Formal Landscape Approach** – to restore the formal landscape as it was in the time of James Clerk 2<sup>nd</sup> Baronet 1722-1755. Scenario 3 was found to have more

positive effects for the population due to increased access and enjoyment of the site, but the uncertainty surrounding the historic evolution of the landscape means that with this scenario the impacts for cultural heritage and landscape of the Policies are largely unknown. Due to the intrusive nature of the physical works proposed there were also significant negatives predicted for biodiversity.

In the Issues and Options Paper we asked *'Which Scenario you best consider represents your preferred one and why?'*

18 out of 21 who responded to the consultation, answered this question, of which 14 supported Scenario 1, 2 supported Scenario 2 and 2 supported a combination of Scenario 1 and 2.

#### **4.2 Which option did we choose and why?**

Based on the environmental assessment it would appear that Scenario 2 offers the opportunity to not just secure, but repair and enhance the landscape with some minor negatives for the natural environment predicted. However, following analysis of the environmental assessment and review of consultation responses, the preferred option that is taken forward has had to balance the environmental implications along with the social and economic conditions of the site. In the short term the implications of a lack of funding may entail that only the minimum of works can be undertaken to avoid further loss and secure the cultural significance of the site. Taking all this into account and given that Scenario 1 was the preferred option of those who responded to the consultation, Historic Scotland proposes to take forward Scenario 1 as the preferred option into the finalised plan.

## Section 5

---

### 5.1 Environmental Monitoring and Next Steps

The final stage of the SEA process is to monitor the environmental effects of the Management Plan. Each of the actions in the form of maintenance works included in the finalised Management Plan has an associated indicator or target that will be used to measure progress. This will also involve updating any environmental baseline information used in the environmental assessment and/or filling any gaps that have been identified during the SEA. An annual monitoring report will be prepared to describe the progress made through these actions.

**Table 3: Monitoring Framework**

Maintenance Works	Zone	Visits	Season	Indicator
Annual strimming of grassland/wildflower vegetation	Front Lawn, Mound	1 visit per year	Autumn	Vegetation growth to be strimmed.
Annual survey of old trees	All woodland areas: Game Larder Woods, North House Woods, South Bank Woods, North Drive Woods, Axis Woods, Dovecot Woods.	1 visit per year	Summer	Condition survey of key old trees to be carried out, and emergency tree surgery as required.
Clearance of debris on structures.	All	1 visit per year	Winter	Clearance of debris during winter.
Inspections and repairs to paths (where H&S hazard)	All	1 visit per year	None specified	Inspection of path condition and remedial works as identified.
Hydrology inspections and emergency repair works	All	Annual for first 4 years then once every 5 years	None specified	Inspections to be carried out for full site to identify any hydrology problems. Invasive excavations by trenching and localised excavations may need to be carried out to identify sources of drainage problems. Remedial works to underground pipework/chambers etc should be carried out when identified.
Monitoring of ground movement along South Drive and above East Drive.	South Drive, Dovecot	Annual for first 4 years after drainage repairs then once every 5 years	None specified	Monitoring of possible ground movement along South Drive, and above East Drive; method to be selected to allow continued future monitoring.

Maintenance Works	Zone	Visits	Season	Indicator
Inspections for buildings and structures	All	Annual , with provision for 1 extra visit per year to respond to severe weather events	None specified	All buildings and structures to be inspected for safety and signs of damage/deterioration. Inspections also to be carried out after severe weather events. Remedial works should be carried out when identified.
Fencing inspection	All	1 visit per year	None specified	All fences and field boundaries to be inspected for safety and signs of damage/deterioration. Remedial works should be carried out when identified.
Inspection of Interpretation panels and waymarkers	All	1 visit per year	None specified	Inspection of panels and waymarkers and remedial work as identified.
Grazing regime review	All	Annual for first 4 years then once every 5 years	None specified	Regular review of grazing regimes to ensure that grazing is not causing further damage to site.
Species surveys	All	Surveys to be updated every 5 years	Appropriate to species	Ecological surveys of protected species found on site to be updated every 5 years to gather information about the changing ecology of the site, and to provide up to date information when other works are required.

Maintenance Works	Zone	Visits	Season	Indicator
Control invasive species	All	1 visit per 5 years after initial eradication period (minimum 3 years)	July to September	Control and destroy all invasive species on all areas of site.
Control of coppiced material along allees	Front Park, Axis Woods, Dovecot Woods (central allee), North Drive Woods, Upper Field (side allees).	1 visit per 5 years	Avoid bird nesting season (1 March- 31 July)	Regrowth from coppiced trees to be cut back again along allees to retain vistas.
Control of scrub (allees)	Front Park, Axis Woods, Dovecot Woods (central allee), North Drive Woods, Upper Field (side allees).	1 visit per 5 years	Avoid bird nesting season (1 March- 31 July)	Scrub control to be carried out along allee lines.

The finalised Management Plan will be due for review in 2016.



Historic Scotland  
Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh EH9 1SH

Phone 0131 668 8600  
Email [hs.conservationgroup@scotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hs.conservationgroup@scotland.gsi.gov.uk)

Website [www.historic-scotland.gov.uk](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright 2011



# MAVISBANK POLICIES LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PLAN

## Appendix 1 - Analysis Report



---

Section 1: Acknowledgements	page 2
Section 2: Executive Summary	page 2
Section 3: Introduction	page 2
Section 4: Responses	page 4
Section 5: Findings	pages 5 - 2 2

## Section 1: Acknowledgements

1. Historic Scotland is pleased to announce the findings of the consultation on Historic Scotland's Mavisbank Policies Landscape Management Plan . We would like to thank all those who responded to the public consultation with written comments.

## Section 2: Executive Summary

2. Between 23 September and 5 November 2010 Historic Scotland ran a 6 week public consultation on an Issues and Options Paper which sought the views of local residents and the wider community, including businesses, organisations and other parties with an interest in the site.
3. A strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Issues and Options Paper was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the [Environmental Assessment \(Scotland\) Act 2005](#) and an Environmental Report was included in the Issues and Options Paper.

Twenty-one responses were received.

## Section 3: Introduction

### Background to the Consultation

4. The consultation on Historic Scotland's Mavisbank Policies Landscape Management Plan commenced on the 23 September 2010 and the consultation period closed on the 5 November. It is available at:

<http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicscotlandsea>

5. The consultation invited views on the Issues and Options Paper, which set out a range of issues and options for consideration by Historic Scotland.

### Report Objectives

6. The objective of this report is to analyse and report on the responses made to the consultation on Historic Scotland's Mavisbank Policies Landscape Management Plan. In doing so, this document fulfils the requirement for an Analysis Report set out in the Scottish Government's good practice guidance on consultation and engagement.
7. The report does not set out Scottish Ministers' comments on or responses to those suggestions. It is as far as possible an objective account of who responded and the issues that were raised. The inclusion of a comment or suggestion does not imply that any contribution is accepted as accurately characterising the actual policy position or what actions may be taken forward by Scottish Ministers in adopting and implementing the management plan.

8. Copies of this report can be downloaded from:

[www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicscotlandsea](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/historicscotlandsea)

Printouts may be requested from:

Historic Scotland  
Longmore House  
Salisbury Place  
Edinburgh EH9 1SH

## Methodology

9. The response data were recorded, organised and summarised on a spreadsheet. A record was made of the key themes and issues raised. A frequency count was made of the overall number of responses by interest group and of the responses to each question. A qualitative analysis was then carried out using this framework. The summarised data for each question were reviewed and key themes and views were identified.
10. The findings of this report are specific to the consultation exercise and do not necessarily reflect the weight or range of views within the population as a whole.

## Distribution and advertising

11. This consultation was advertised in the Midlothian Advertiser on 23 September 2010. The consultation documents were publicised through Historic Scotland's 'current consultations' webpage and paper copies were issued upon request. 39 stakeholders and organisations were also notified by email and letter at the beginning of the consultation period.

## Section 4: Responses

### Introduction

12. The following statistical analysis sets out the number of organisations and individuals who responded to the consultation document in writing by interest group/sector and compares them to the numbers who were notified about the consultation exercise. The consultation asked 15 questions. A breakdown of the responses to the questions is provided within Section 5 of this report.
13. Written responses from consultees who agreed that their submissions be made public are available at:  
[www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/closedconsultations.htm](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/closedconsultations.htm)
14. Copies of responses can be provided by post. Charges for photocopies are made on a cost-recovery basis. To request copies by post, enquire about charges or make an appointment to view responses, please contact the above address.

## Breakdown of Responses

### Responses by interest group/sector

15. A total of 21 separate responses were received to the consultation. A breakdown of responses by interest group/sector is provided in Table 1 below. Some organisations returned responses from more than one area of their organisation. In these cases the respondent type is recorded only once in the table.

**Table 1: Responses by interest group/sector**

Respondent Type	Number	% of all respondent types
Private individual	7	37
Heritage interest group	3	16
Environmental interest group	4	21
Amenity group	1	5
Private sector	1	5
Public body	3	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: Some organisations returned responses from more than one area of their organisation. In these cases the respondent group/sector is recorded only once in the table.

**Table 2: Responses by interest group/sector relative to distribution list**

Respondent Type	Invited	Invited Responded	% Return	Uninvited Responded
Private individual	16	3	19	4
Local authority	1	1	100	n/a
Heritage body	7	5	71	0
Environmental interest group	7	4	57	0
Amenity group	2	0	0	1
Private sector	1	0	0	1
Public body	5	2	40	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6</b>

## Section 5: Findings

16. The Issues and Options paper asked 15 questions all of which invited the respondents' views. A total of 13 out of the 15 questions related to the Issues and Options surrounding the Management Plan itself and 2 further questions related to the Environmental Report. Respondents were encouraged to use a Response Form as it provided a section for 'permissions' to publish comments publically and also provided a space beneath each of the questions that could either be filled out electronically or by hand. The Response Form was used by 15 out of 21 respondents. 6 respondents chose to make general comments separately. 1 respondent made comments on the Response Form and also added further comments separately. Quotes taken from the consultation responses are shown in *italics*.

### Questions answered in separate general comments

#### Key comments

17. Altogether a total of 7 respondents made general comments. Out of these, 6 respondents chose to record their responses separately and did not use the response form and 1 respondent responded both on the response form and also made additional separate comments.

18. 1 respondent stated their preferred option was scenario 2, this respondent also responded on both the response form and made general comments and so their preferred option was included only once in the figures above to prevent double counting. 4 respondents stated that Scenario 1 was their preferred option. 1 respondent stated they preferred Scenario 1 and 2 and 1 respondent did not specify a preferred option.

19. All 7 respondents provided a variety of suggestions and comments. The key themes that were discussed concerned topics such as resolving ownership and access issues, local residents and key stakeholder involvement, emphasis on resolving drainage issues, raising awareness of previous research, the site's designation status and community engagement.

20. 2 out of the 7 general comments welcomed the document and supported plans to improve management and access to the site.

*“ We warmly support your plans to improve management and access. ”*

*“ We are pleased to respond to your paper on behalf of Lasswade and District Civic Society on behalf of our 400 members. ”*

*“We are delighted to see action to address the deterioration of a landscape of cultural and environmental benefit. It has been sad to see a jewel in Midlothian’s crown deteriorate while it has been in public ownership. ”*

21. 3 out of the 7 general comments were not content with the Issues and Options paper and raised various concerns such as the omission of previous research and information already available such as reference to Mavisbank House and Policies Conservation Plan (2004) and Mavisbank Access Plan 2004 (both produced by Edinburgh and the Lothians Greenspace Trust and Mavisbank Trust.

*“In addition, we request that you include the information contained in the following documents produced by ELGT and the Mavisbank Trust in your considerations, all of which have been made available to Historic Scotland previously: Mavisbank Feasibility Study 2002; Mavisbank House and Policies Conservation Plan 2004; Mavisbank Audience Development Plan 2004; Mavisbank Access Plan 2004; Mavisbank Ecology Report 2004; Mavisbank Woodland Management Report 2004; Mavisbank Feasibility Study - Community Consultation Report 2002; and Mavisbank Development Proposals - Community Consultation Report 2006. ”*

Consultees were also concerned with the omission of Mavisbank House from the consultation process and that the cultural heritage of the site was not adequately stated in the Issues and Options Paper. [HS comment: The Management Plan specifically excludes Mavisbank House from the process that has been undertaken.]

### Resolving ownership and access issues

*“...the house and access drives are in separate private ownership presents one of the main difficulties of the site. A future plan for the publicly owned landscape cannot be considered in isolation for the reasons stated above. Therefore, the issues of ownership and access must be resolved in order to plan for the longer term management of the site. ”*

22. 1 response out of the 7 general comments supported and agreed with the findings of the environmental assessment’s Environmental Report.

23. Another questioned why biodiversity had been given priority in the environmental assessment.

*“As a separate matter we do not understand why within the SEA, priority has been given to bio-diversity. Mavisbank is in the care of Historic Scotland because of its cultural heritage value. ”*

24. 2 respondents offered access to modest funds that could be used to fund small-scale cultural and/or environmental projects on the site.

**Breakdown of Responses to each consultation questions**

Question 1 How could the management plan encourage further research to help fill in the knowledge gaps about the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	12 (57%)	4 (19%)	5 (24%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

**Key Comments**

25. Respondents suggested that full use should be made of considerable research and expertise already available:

“ After this amount of time, I think we can have enough information to work with to make a start on some of the work required to minimise further degradation of the features on the site. ”

“ Considerable research has already been undertaken over the years on Mavisbank House, its policies and designed landscape. Full use should be made of this considerable resource when developing and refining the management plan. No comment on further research. ”

26. Other respondents suggested the use of a website based resource which allows for making existing research available for people to access and contribute pieces of research.

“ There appears to be plenty of useful information in the plan if people that are interested get to know it’s available. Potential for establishing a wiki or similar on the H-S website where people could add information they uncover. ”

“ By having a website giving the background to the project and inviting people to contribute pieces of knowledge that they may have or are prepared to research. ”

27. 3 respondents suggested that liaison with local residents and groups for advice and expertise should be encouraged, with some groups offering their help and advice.

28. 2 respondents suggested that an independent management committee should draw up the management plan and should include representatives from both local and national natural heritage bodies.

“ The plan should be drawn up by a management committee who should have strong expert representation from local and national (Scottish) nature-conservation bodies, not just SNH. ”

“ The team implementing the Management Plan should include representatives of independent bodies expert in all aspects of the natural-heritage interest ”

*of the site, e.g SWT, ENHS, RSFS and should be able to call on advice from other specialist groups (e.g the local Bat Group) as required. Local representation is also important. ””*

29. 1 respondent suggested that the management plan should recognise the relevant references to Mavisbank Estate’s wild life site (non-statutory) status as listed in the adopted Midlothian Local Plan (2006).

Question 2 How could the management plan best achieve a balance between the needs of nature conservation and cultural heritage?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	10 (48%)	5 (24%)	6 (28%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key Comments

30. 2 respondents made suggestions that the best balance could be achieved by allowing the site to become a local nature reserve (LNR). One of these also noted that the site was a candidate LNR site:

*“ By recognising that this is a competent and 4 year old LNR proposal and that such an LNR designation, (where a normal way to proceed would be for HS to sign a management lease for Midlothian Council to manage the policies site ‘owned’ by HS and set up a formal legal LNR under statute for Local authorities), would precisely engender the ability to have balance between natural and cultural heritage AND be significantly more likely to attract the clearly missing funding for appropriate management of the policies. ””*

*“ The policies have developed into a unique and diverse mosaic of natural and semi natural habitats, with a wide range of plant and animal communities. It would be best if the main area were to be managed as a nature reserve and any eventual reconstruction of the historic designed landscape be limited to the area around the house itself. This might best be achieved if HS were to transfer responsibility for the main part of the policies to a nature conservation body, either governmental or in the voluntary sector. ””*

31. Other respondents considered that the site had deteriorated to such an extent that nature had now overtaken the original designed landscape. They felt that balance could be best achieved by concentrating any reconstruction of the designed landscape in the area around the house, restricting access appropriately, whilst concentrating on the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity of outer areas of the site.

*“ Balance can be achieved by applying different levels of management to different parts of the site. The area closest to (and most visible from) the house should be more*

*comprehensively restored. This would include the avenues of trees, the lochan (surely an inappropriate word for the lowlands!), and the relatively open spaces between them. These areas would have the highest density of visitors, and therefore would need more and more substantial, paths. More remote areas would have little or no intrusive management, and little or no formal public access. ””*

*”” It should be acknowledged that nature has to some extent superseded the original planned landscape. The latter is still evident but not in its original state. Apart from the area immediately surrounding the house conservation of the natural regeneration should now be the priority and no major works which may disturb this should be carried out. ””*

32. Another key theme put forward considered the issue of permitting access and how this should be balanced between the needs of the site (nature conservation and cultural heritage).

*”” Restricting access appropriately (i.e. not encouraging visitors focussed on inappropriate activities). ””*

*”” If possible, stabilise the building. Limit access to being foot traffic. Provide an outline guide for visitors. Leave something to their imagination. ””*

33. 1 respondent welcomed the proposals to manage the woodlands and historic trees.

*”” We are encouraged by proposals to manage the woodlands, plant new trees and manage historic trees all within the context of the designed landscape. ””*

<b>Question 3</b> How could the management plan encourage partners and other stakeholders to get more involved in the conservation of the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	11 (52%)	4 (19%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key Comments

34. 1 respondent who answered this question suggested that much better communication between HS and all stakeholders was desirable.

*”” Much better communication between HS and all stakeholders e.g. suitable meetings with neighbours and relevant local societies, and demonstrating much greater sensitivity to interests of local stakeholders such as immediate neighbours and local societies. ””*

35. 2 respondents who answered suggested that the plan could encourage partners and other stakeholders to get more involved in the conservation of the site by

encouraging voluntary groups and local residents to provide practical help in maintaining the site.

“Local residents’ organisations (e.g. Lasswade Civic Society) provide practical help in maintaining local sites, including the footpath along the River Esk. Local residents could also lend their time/expertise...”

“...make links to existing voluntary groups, e.g. those known to Midlothian council ranger service. There will be a long term need to manage the site, e.g. path maintenance and managing invasive species, but there are plenty of people who are more than happy to get involved with this if there is a bit of organisation.”

36. 1 respondent suggested consideration of staging workshops to which all stakeholders would be invited. Another respondent suggested that better access to the site should be given to all user groups including horse riders.

37. 2 respondents considered that Historic Scotland could concentrate on stabilising the house and surrounding area, which would allow for others to take over responsibility of the grounds through an environmental body with the long term aim of designating it as a LNR, with the benefits being both financial as well as being the ideal way to encourage partnership amongst the stakeholders.

“Historic Scotland should devote its efforts and resources to doing what it can to stabilise the structure of the House and to restoring the area directly surrounding it. Responsibility for the grounds should be transferred to SNH and /or the Local Authority with the aim of designating it a Local Nature Reserve. This would have the added advantage of producing more benefit for less cost than any of the scenarios proposed here.”

“The LNR process is the ideal way to encourage partners and other local stakeholders to get more involved in the management plan writing, implementation and fundraising for such a site.”

Question 4 How can the management plan balance the water management of the site with the needs of natural heritage?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	10 (48%)	5 (24%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key Comments

38. 8 respondents submitted similar key comments for this question focused around the need for drainage to help improve access but not at the expense of the natural environment. In particular respondents indicated the area around the pond/lochan and the wetlands towards the eastern end of the site should not be drained.

“Some parts of the land should remain un-drained. The benefit to wildlife of this rare habitat is enormous.”

“Improving access will require some drainage to facilitate the Construction of the necessary footpaths. Otherwise water management [drainage?] should be undertaken only if needed to protect or enhance species or habitats, not for the benefit of visitors. It is important that the lochan and other wetlands should not be disturbed.”

“Sensitive areas within the site need proper drainage to help protect them. Such drainage would also prevent surface water reaching the adjacent river-path to allow practical public access from this core path.”

“Proper drainage within the site is required to help protect sensitive areas, and prevent surface water reaching the adjacent river-path to allow practical public access from this route.”

39. 1 respondent considered that a detailed survey should be undertaken.

“...to identify the most sensitive and valuable areas of wetland vegetation to be taken into consideration when designing and implementing any proposed drainage improvements.”

<b>Question 5</b> How can the management plan maintain the balance between sustainable tourism and the protection of the site's attributes in the promotion of access and recreation across the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	13 (62%)	2 (10%)	6 (28%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

## Key Comments

40. In response to Question 5 a total of 8 responses were concerned about balancing the needs of better access without the loss of tranquillity, peace and damage to the site and were in favour of the balance being towards the latter (i.e. protecting the site's attributes) and using a low key approach.

“*The balance should be towards the latter. Pedestrian access should be improved but the site should be very much a place in which to wander without excessive guidance in the form of defined paths or signage. The site should be more akin to a nature reserve. Visitor numbers should not be a measure of success and there should not be considered anything wrong with a fair amount of mud...*”

“*It should be self evident that this site's particular significance is in relation to cultural heritage, and, insofar as it has now so developed, its natural heritage significance. It should not be compromised by aiming to provide play park or other mass entertainment facilities, which would detract from and cause damage to, the cultural and natural heritage value.*”

“*The policies should not be promoted as a tourist destination as this would conflict with Scenario 1 and inevitably increase site management, transport and parking issues; which would have a detrimental effect on the natural environment and the amenity of the neighbouring communities at Kevock, Loanhead and Polton. Midlothian is well served by town and country parks for recreation. If the policies are to be opened for the benefit of the wider community, specifically those interested in wildlife and the history of Mavisbank, a low-key approach to public access should be adopted linking the site with existing and proposed footpaths.*”

41. 2 responses were concerned with the clarity of signage and improvement of paths within the site.

“*Clear signage showing how to enter the site. Clear signage showing that all user groups including horse riders can enter the site. Clear signage within the site showing all users around the existing paths. Ultimately well constructed paths that are NOT made from tarmac or any other form of asphalt.*”

“*Fences or other barriers to restrict or prevent access to sensitive or dangerous areas that also have signs explaining why access is restricted.*”

“*A well designed path network that respects the designed landscape in*

*order that the impacts of the environment including natural, landscape and cultural heritage are taken into account. ”*

42. 2 responses suggested that the involvement of nature conservation bodies or managing the site as a nature reserve would ensure better management of access to the site.

*“ Nature conservation bodies have considerable experience in determining the extent to which access and human pressure can be sustained in natural habitats like these, and so their involvement is important for this purpose. ”*

*“ By becoming an LNR management plan with first priority natural heritage protection and enhancement alongside people, access and cultural interpretation where appropriate. ”*

Question 6 How can the management plan improve accessibility within the site and connectivity outwith the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	12 (57%)	2 (10%)	7 (33%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key Comments

43. 7 responses included comments on the provision of better access to the site by concentrating on existing access points around the site, particularly in relation to Kevock Road, the A768, the riverside walk and along the side of the walled garden. It was also suggested that these access points could be used to link up to the Midlothian Path networks.

*“ Public access currently exists from Kevock Road, but could be improved. Practical public access could also be provided by way of the river path along the North Esk, linking with the proposed footpath around the Eastern perimeter of the former walled garden, as shown in Figure 5. ”*

*“ Access to the House and its curtilage should be facilitated by a path from the riverside path, skirting the walled garden. The pathway into the policies from Kevock Rd. should be improved... ”*

*“ ...if more visitors were going to travel to the site, by car and public transport, the new route suggested in Option 2 from the A768, although environmentally contentious, would be the only viable option given the physical limitations on access and parking elsewhere. ”*

44. 1 response considered the possibility of providing permanent access to the site from the A768, as well as using the adjacent field as a site for parking. They also commented on the need to ensure that road traffic and parking at Kevock Road and Polton Village were not increased.

“I strongly recommend that consideration be given to making the proposed temporary entrance from the A768 permanent. Most or all of the car parking could then be in the present field adjacent to the road. The integrity of the site would be maintained, and a much safer access to the main road would be provided. There should of course be foot access at other point, linking with the footpaths that are nearby. However, care would have to be taken to ensure that road traffic and parking in Polton Village and Kevock Road were not increased.”

45. 2 comments suggested that in the short term walking and cycling into the site could be prioritised using appropriate signage to link into the Midlothian path network. A longer term scheme could involve an interpretive plan to include appropriate signage and promotion.

“The management plan should prioritise walking and cycling into the site with appropriate signage as a quick win and which links into the Midlothian path network – much of which is currently being signed. Within the site and with immediate effect a small amount of signage should be erected to direct the public along preferred routes. In the longer- term an interpretive plan including appropriate signage and promotion will require to be drawn up that links to marketing plan.”

46. Other comments suggested ways to improving access within the site by providing using clear signage to provide circular routes to link up the footpath to the south, along the North Esk and the road to the north.

“There is a footpath to the south, along the North Esk and a road to the north. Plan some routes that make for circular walks using these.”

47. 3 responses suggested the possibility of investigating improved access from Loanhead to benefit public transport users.

“The possibility of access from Loanhead should be investigated to benefit public-transport users.”

48. Several other responses suggested a variety of actions such as drainage improvements to help access to existing paths within the site and the removal of barbed wire on the top of the surrounding fence.

Question 7 What opportunities do you think there are for promotion and interpretation of the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	11 (53%)	3 (14%)	7 (33%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key comments

49. 6 responses suggested that a low key approach that did not over promote the site was the way forward. Most of these referred to maintaining the existing 'as found' environment as far as possible and considered that any signage should be unobtrusive and discrete.

“To preserve the ‘as found’ environment as far as possible it would be best to have a non-intrusive approach to promoting and “interpreting” the site. In other words, as discrete as possible. ”

“Promotion should be avoided and 'interpretation' would best be avoided: interpretation boards tend often to be vandalised or left to deteriorate. ”

50. 1 response recognised the importance of the site nationally and internationally, and how this represented an opportunity for promotion of the site but suggested a low key/light touch approach which was monitored and developed accordingly.

“Clearly there are excellent opportunities for promoting and interpreting this nationally and internationally important site. Begin with a low key/light touch approach, monitor and develop accordingly... ”

51. 3 responses suggested using the visitor attraction pamphlet services provided by the local council to promote the site and the development of a specialist web site to share knowledge and expertise.

“Midlothian council already has a pamphlet distribution system for the parks, wildlife areas and houses it is responsible for. Make use of that. ”

“People should be encouraged to discover, not simply be informed. Web-based information that people/groups would access in advance would be valuable. ”

“Development of an appropriate ‘specialist interest’ website. ”

Question 8 Can you identify and additional funding opportunities for the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	9 (43%)	6 (29%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

#### Key comments

52. 7 responses suggested that money might be available to help with the promotion of the site's path networks from local organisations and local user groups who could apply for funding independently. More specifically most of the responses also provided a name, initiative or type of funding that could possibly be applied for.

“Money may be available from local organizations that seek to promote a network of paths in the area.”

“Local user groups could apply independently of Historic Scotland for funding for specific projects within the site, e.g multi use path construction (e.g from WREN, Lottery Monies etc). There is no guarantee funding would be secured but it's always worth trying.”

“Funding through the North Esk WIAT initiative is being promoted by the Lothians and Fife Green Network Partnership. Also possible funding from WREN. See separate comments sheets for further details.”

53. 6 respondents did not provide a response to this question.

Question 9 What additional measures do you think would be useful to ensure and enhance the protection of the site?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	9 (43%)	5 (24%)	7 (33%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

#### Key comments

54. 4 responses to this question suggested that the grazing policy/grazing management of the site should be reviewed, including suggestions to re-design access, improved fencing and better management of livestock present on the site.

“...to improve grazing management, if people are going to walk through the policies, especially with dogs, there needs to be much stricter management of their routes including better fencing of livestock.”

“Grazing needs to be better managed with fencing, and by keeping walkers and dogs away from sensitive areas.”

“The grazing policy should be reviewed. In particular, horses should be kept to defined areas and away from the scarps, wooded/vegetated areas and all other environmentally sensitive habitats.”

55. 2 responses suggested that a LNR designation would provide better protection by means of appropriate management of the site.

“The site is a designated Local Biodiversity Site. Designation as a Local Nature Reserve might provide better protection by means of appropriate management.”

“LNR designation would do precisely this. As part of the writing of an LNR management plan for the site many small but significant changes could be made including reviewing the current grazing policy...”

56. 1 suggestion received for the this response was in regard to provision of clearer signage particularly in relation to horse riders and appropriate use of path materials.

“Clear signage directing horse riders and other users around the paths. Eventually construction of multi use paths using materials appropriate to the countryside, e.g. whin paths. Do not use tarmac or asphalt to construct paths.”

Question 10 How can we preserve the important link between Mavisbank House (not within the scope of this report) and its policies?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	10 (48%)	5 (24%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key comments

57. Responses to this question mainly concentrated on preserving the link in two ways – either by improving access to the site and ensuring safety and also by preserving the intellectual link.

58. 3 respondents considered that the important link between Mavisbank House and its policies could be maintained by allowing for improved paths to allow for better access to view the house, including improving access along the Kevock Road footpath.

“...without a viable plan or any money for the restoration of Mavisbank House, sadly now a ruin, the only option to maintain a link with the grounds appears to be better access to view the House... The existing track from Kevock Road could be improved and continue past the House on what remains of the South access owned by the Scottish Ministers...”

“ By providing better paths to view the house as proposed in Figure 5.”

“An improved footpath from Kevock Rd to the House would serve this purpose...”

59. 3 respondents considered that the safety and security of the site would be required to be addressed in order to help preserve the link between the house and its policies.

“By stabilising Mavisbank House and introducing other suitable measures, sufficient to allow safe removal of the highly intrusive security fencing.”

“Maintaining public safety and security around an unsafe building that is not in Historic Scotland’s ownership will be an issue.”

60. 2 respondents suggested making use of previous research, the use of interpretation boards onsite, the web and other available information.

“Until the house is developed the landscape should accord with one of the original designs but interpretation could help create the link e.g. an illustrated notice-board.”

“This link can either be an intellectual one, which can be addressed with information on the web and in books or pamphlets, or something you see when you visit the grounds...”

61. 1 response felt that this question could not be fully considered until the future of the house itself was finalised.

“...the nature of the link between the House and its policies can be considered logically and fully only in the context of some understanding as to the future of the House...”

Question 11 Are you content that all key issues for the site have been identified? If not, please specify?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	12 (57%)	3 (14%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key comments

62. Out of the 12 responses received to this question comments mostly ranged from being either generally content, added further information and/or comments on a range of issues.

63. 5 respondents were generally content and added no further comment.

64. 1 respondent was not content, stating that the Issues and Options Paper had not considered the protection of interests to local residents and other stakeholders.

65. 6 responses contributed further information and consolidated comments from previous questions. A range of comments were received including comments on management of grazing, consideration of invasive species, maintenance costs, access for horse riders and consideration of the site as for designation as a local nature reserve and some of these key comments are set out below:

“Maintenance of the ‘open’ spaces is an important issue. In recent years grazing has taken care of this, at least in the area towards the house, and it is probably that this is how it was originally. However, there are issues of people/animal interactions.”

“...on invasive species, no mention has been made of Himalayan balsam, *Impatiens glandulifera*. This has increased enormously along the River Esk in recent years, and is now spreading rapidly onto the Mavisbank estate.”

“...maintenance costs in general do not seem to be been addressed.”

“We would like to see a timetable showing the improved promotion and provision for public access at an early stage.”

“Most of the key issues have been identified. However I am concerned that access for horse riders has not been included.”

“Access issue via the obvious route to the south which goes through someone’s garden – therefore must allow for “official” path down to the river footpath using an alternative route (e.g. alongside walled garden)”

“The impact of likely vandalism. This is an ongoing issue in the surrounding areas. Any signage and seating must be implemented appropriately.”

“Are site-lines along the valley taking into account the fact that recent housing along the southern edge is not attractive? This needs to be kept in mind when considering which trees to fell.”

Question 12 Do you agree with the findings of the environmental assessment? Have we identified key issues associated with these actions/proposals? If not please specify.	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	11 (52%)	4 (19%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key comments

66. Of those responses answered for this question, four responses were generally content with the findings of the environmental assessment and agreed that key issues had been identified.
67. The remaining 7 answers (including 2 from the SEA Consultation Authorities) to this question were varied, but generally they considered that key issues had been covered adequately, whilst providing the environmental assessment with more up to date information about the site such as its status as a Wildlife Site in the list of Designated Sites in Midlothian and also considering that greater emphasis be given to natural heritage standpoint of the site.

“The proposals appear to cover the key issues, although greater emphasis might be given to the environmental aspects given the Report’s acknowledgement that: ‘The management plan will have to be implemented in a time of increasing restrictions on public sector funding and with this in mind the plan may have to focus on a maintenance programme of minimal restorative works required to avoid further loss of historic landscape features.’”

“The important issue for ENHS is that nothing should be done to the detriment of the natural environmental features of the site. We are not convinced that the study has gleaned an adequate view of these and recommend a thoroughgoing environmental survey and audit before any decision is taken on these scenarios.”

“The study has been carried out from a historic designed landscape standpoint. An equivalent study from a natural heritage standpoint would have come up with quite different scenarios.”

“In general we are satisfied with the content of the Environmental Report and we agree with the assessment findings.”

“We note that the ER has incorporated many of our comments from the screening and scoping stages, and we are satisfied that the ER has accurately assessed the potential impacts of the plan upon SNH’s main areas of interest.”

68. A fuller account of the environmental assessment and the responses received to it will be considered in the SEA Post Adoption Statement/Consultation. Report which will follow after the adoption of the management plan.

Question 13 Do you have any comments on the mitigation measures set out in Annex A?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	5 (24%)	10 (48%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

#### Key comments

69. Those that responded to this question were mostly content with the mitigation measures identified in the environmental assessment.

70. 1 response stated that the measures were ‘rather long but otherwise ok’.

71. Another respondent stated that the measures ‘appear to be very comprehensive’.

72. A fuller account of the environmental assessment, mitigation measures contained within it and the responses received to it will be considered in the SEA Post Adoption Statement/Consultation Report which will follow after the adoption of the management plan.

Question 14 Which scenario do you consider best represents your preferred one and why?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	13 (62%)	2 (10%)	6 (29%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key comments

73. 10 respondents considered Scenario 1 their preferred option stating that it represented the least potentially damaging option, least disruption to the area and best value in money terms.

*“Scenario 1 as this would result in the least damage and disruption to the area...”*

*“Scenario 1 best preserves what little is left of the old designed landscape with protection and promotion of the natural environment. Pragmatically it is the only value for money solution.”*

*“Scenario 1. Minimum intervention. I have some concerns about the proposed tree felling in the “front lawn” (albeit without knowing precisely which trees will be removed). There are few enough places close to major urban areas where people who are willing to take a little more time can find some peace and quiet. Make sure Mavisbank remains one of them.”*

74. 2 respondents considered Scenario 2 as their preferred option as it will allow for the development of the path network the in longer term, but acknowledged Scenario 1 as the preferred option in the short term.

*“Option 2 is the preferred option in the long term but the issue of public access i.e. promotion and provision requires immediate attention.”*

*“Scenario 2 as it allows for the development of the path network. However in the short term I would be happy with Scenario 1 as long as it at the very least gives horse riders a circular riding route within the site.”*

75. 1 respondent considered both Scenario 1 and 2 likely to have overall positive impacts, particularly on access, biodiversity, flora and fauna.

Question 15 Are there any other scenarios which we should consider and what are they?	Number of response form answers received for the question (as a percentage of 21 responses overall)	Question not answered	Question answered in separate general comments
	8 (38%)	6 (29%)	7 (33%)

Note percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

### Key comments

76. 8 respondents contributed a variety of additional suggestions in response to this question; in particular two responses considered transferring the management of the policies across to SNH and/or working with Midlothian Council to designate the site as a Local Nature Reserve.

*“Transferring management of the polices to SNH would free Historic Scotland to concentrate on caring for the remains of Mavisbank House and other listed buildings on the site.”*

*“Working with Midlothian Council to designate a formal LNR including landscape cultural heritage aims that are consistent with the statutory aims of HS and an LNR.”*

77. 1 response suggested an even lighter touch than that proposed in Scenario 1.

78. 2 of responses suggested more focused attention in important areas around the house and less intervention in the more remote areas.

*“A combination of 1 and 2, with more action in the most important areas (close to and in front of the house), and less intervention in the more remote areas.”*

79. 1 response also raised the issue of ensuring that horse riders are provided with secure access to ride around the site, with clear signage and good linkage into the surrounding path network.

*“...the basic requirements for horse riders are clear signage into the site showing that horse riding is permitted. Clear signage within the site showing horse riders the way around the paths that can be ridden on. No tarmac or asphalt used in the construction of paths. No locked gates, if there are any gates, they need to be horse friendly and can be opened and closed by riders whilst mounted.”*



Historic Scotland  
Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh EH9 1SH

Phone 0131 668 8600

Email [hs.conservationgroup@scotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hs.conservationgroup@scotland.gsi.gov.uk)

Website [www.historic-scotland.gov.uk](http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright 2011