

Current Land Management activities that use chemicals.

What are we trying to achieve?	Why we use chemicals	Alternative control methods	Limitations of the alternative control methods	What we are doing to reduce chemical use	Chemical
Keep paths clear from trip hazards	To prevent surface damage from mechanical methods. Cost	Scraping and sweeping hard surfaces, jet washing	Reduces the life of surfaces and increases replacement need, resources and carbon footprint for frequent visits, reduces staffs exposure to potential muscle skeletal exposure due to increased necessity to strim	Do nothing in areas where hazards are acceptable. Targeted application through droplet control system. Explore other methods such as foam, acid, and electrocution.	Glyphosate Active ingredient approx. 4litres per annum
Maintenance of infrastructure/ obstacles: good	To reduce number of site visits. Avoid car park closures. Cost	Strimming	Damage to objects, Frequent visits required,	Do nothing in areas where hazards are acceptable,	

What are we trying to achieve?	Why we use chemicals	Alternative control methods	Limitations of the alternative control methods	What we are doing to reduce chemical use	Chemical
standard of management			Closure of areas required when strimming, e.g. car parks, Frequent complaints in some areas.	Targeted application through droplet control system explore other methods such as foam, acid, and electrocution	
Maintain sports pitches to good standard	To reduce/prevent fungus, broad-leaf weeds, and moss	Mowing, hand weeding/ pulling, sweeping, hoeing, mulching, groundcover planting, overseeding, scarifying, fertilising/feeding	Build-up of undesired plants in playing surfaces	Increasing mechanical methods	Praxys 14l/annum (fluroxypyr, clopyralid, florasulam); 2,4-D 60l/annum; Prompt 20l/annum (mecoprop-P, dicamba); Fungicide 5l/annum (Exteris Stressgard); Trifloxystrobin 2,4-D 1l/annum; Moss killer on ditch faces 2l/annum Enclean (Nonanoic acid)

What are we trying to achieve?	Why we use chemicals	Alternative control methods	Limitations of the alternative control methods	What we are doing to reduce chemical use	Chemical
Maintenance of Shrub and Flower Beds	Reduce visits and complaints	Hand weeding, hoeing, close planting, Permeable membrane	Resources for Frequent visits	Herbicide application reduced to car parking areas	Glyphosate - Active ingredient approx. 10 litres per annum
Protecting Heritage Assets	Currently no approved alternative that does not risk damaging structures	n/a	Damage to Heritage objects from vegetation growth and removal operations	Reduced application to max 2x per year.	Glyphosate - Active ingredient approx. 2 litres per annum
Control of invasive/controllable plant species	To resource removal of controllable species, Fulfil legal requirements To achieve closed vegetation by targeting problem species only Cost and resources availability at the correct time.	Mowing, Strimming, Removal by Hand (staff and Volunteers)	Resources to cover the whole estate by hand removal, mechanical methods are counterproductive when long term reductions are achieved by closed sward. Nonchemical	Targeted application restricted to target species. Use varies with species occurrence. Volunteer Engagement and Partnership work to increase hand removal Chemicals are not used in most areas	Glyphosate Active ingredient approx. 7 litres per annum 2-4-D & MCPA Active ingredient approx. 15 litres per annum Blaster Pro Active ingredient approx. 5 litres per annum

What are we trying to achieve?	Why we use chemicals	Alternative control methods	Limitations of the alternative control methods	What we are doing to reduce chemical use	Chemical
			methods are not effective on species such as Japanese Knotweed		
Control of Oak Processionary Moth (OPM)	GBC does not use chemicals. Forestry Commission continues to spray our trees and considers different approaches as non-compliant with statutory plant health notices.	The Council applies removal by hand.	Noncompliance with current national policy and statutory health notices. Increasing resource requirement.	We are attending several working groups to influence and resolve the national policy position regarding pesticide use in this area as this has the greatest collateral damage in the environment.	n/a

What are we trying to achieve?	Why we use chemicals	Alternative control methods	Limitations of the alternative control methods	What we are doing to reduce chemical use	Chemical
Control of scrub regrowth/ tree regrowth for habitat management	To prevent habitat deterioration. To target problem species only. To reduce burning. To reduce nutrient built up. To achieve closed swards without mechanical disturbance. Cost and resources availability at the correct time.	We are aiming for no herbicide use. Scrub control is carried out by conservation grazing, cutting by hand and machinery. Cattle grazing reduces amount of scrub treatment required.	Mechanical methods in some areas cannot be deployed without impacting on ground nesting birds and reptiles. Removal of arisings is an issue, requiring burning and/or chipping and frequent costly visits.	Volunteer Engagement and Partnership work to increase hand removal. Atmospheric nitrogen deposition has an impact on this work area. Reduction of outside emissions would reduce this area of work. Public education required.	Glyphosate Active ingredient approx. 3 litres per annum Asulox Active ingredient approx. 4 litres per annum Grazon/ Garlon Active ingredient approx. 3 litres per annum
Control of rats/ wasps/ ants	To deal with public health concerns	No affective methods. Removal. trees and shrubs.	-	-	Alpha SCT, MaxForce Quantum, Cimetro Super EW, Digrain, Eradisect, Ficam D, Goliath Gel