

Questions from our consultation

This form sets out the questions we ask in a consultation on restoring and expanding open habitats from woods and forests in England that we launched on 12 March 2009. The consultation ends on 5 June 2009. You can find the consultation at www.forestry.gov.uk/england-openhabitats-consultation or contact Dominic Driver, Forestry Commission for further information (contact details below).

Comments on any aspect of the consultation are welcome, but we are particularly interested in your responses to the questions below. This form is available at www.forestry.gov.uk/england-openhabitats-consultation.

Your name:	E H Stenhouse
Your organisation (if any):	Inwood Developments Ltd
Date:	21 March 2009

No	Question.
The nature of the change	
1.	Does your aspiration for the scale of the policy fit within our calculated range of 5,600 to 30,000 ha of restoration or expansion of open habitats from woodland or forest over 10 to 15 years? This is 370 to 3,000 ha each year. What level of intervention would you prefer and how is this justified?
No. There should be no reduction in tree cover in the UK. It should be expanded. mainyaining open habitats is a continuing cost which the taxpayer will net be able to affrod for at least 10 years	
Desired outcomes	
2.	Have we developed a reasonable list of desired outcomes of the policy? Do you wish to suggest any amendments?
Increased tree cover only	
Measuring the success of the policy	
3.	Have we developed a reasonable set of indicators for evaluation? Do you wish to suggest any amendments to this indicator list?
No	
Policy proposals	
Elements present in the policy	
We will treat woodland and open habitats as potentially mutually beneficial	
4.	Do you agree that woodland and open habitats are potentially mutually beneficial? Is promotion of this idea helpful in gaining support for open habitat restoration and expansion from woodland?

No	Question.
	I am sure there is mutual benefit in environmental terms but the extent is limited and the cost prohibitive. There are greater benefits from retaining trees for construction as this is a far better use than having steel or concrete. hence the environmental benefit for this will far outweigh removing trees for open habitat
A presumption against removal of 'mature native woodland'	
5.	Do you agree with the principle that there should be a presumption against removal of ancient and 'mature native woodland'?
There should be a presumption against removal of all trees unless for use.	
6.	What do you think of our proposed outline definition of 'mature native woodland'?
Not a lot	
We will expect practitioners to help local users to participate in development of the initial proposals	
7.	Do you agree that local participation in decision making is helpful? What is your preferred option for how we should apply this element?
No because this path should not be entered in the first place	
We will promote mechanisms for prioritising woodland removal at a regional level	
8.	Do you agree that prioritisation at a regional level is appropriate for this policy?
No see above. As a manufacturer using timber engineering technology I need trees from all parts of the UK	
We will apply a framework for evaluation to projects	
9.	Do you agree with this framework for evaluation? What is your preferred option for how we should apply this element?
No	
10.	How much and what kind of support do you think we should give to practitioners to help them evaluate their projects using this framework?
We shouldn't be going here	
To avoid net deforestation in England we will try not to go over a threshold rate of woodland removal due to restoring and expanding open habitats.	
11.	Do you agree with the principle of an England scale threshold rate of woodland removal? What is your preferred mechanism by which such a threshold could be applied to policy?

No	Question.
	No we must increase forest cover so that firms like mine can continue to operate in the UK. We are seeking to expand our operation, build house frames which will lock up carbon employ people and use more timber primarily pine. It will an absolute disaster to remove timber
12.	Do you consider that the proposed threshold is about right, too high or too low?
	See above
<p>Key variables</p> <p>What is the balance between achieving biodiversity objectives and the need to reduce green house gas emissions?</p>	
13.	Is there a way, in the short term, we can better estimate the contribution to biodiversity objectives from different levels of restoration or expansion of open habitats?
	Yes by grwoing more trees which can be used for construction thereby reducing carbon emissions form manufacture of steel concrete and brick and locking up carbon
14.	Do you agree that management practices to minimise carbon emissions during restoration or expansion of open habitats should be adopted? Do you agree with the outline practices presented? How could we best ensure that such practices are adopted?
	Creating and managing open habitats will generate co2. Thias is crazy
15.	Do you agree that it is appropriate to include impact on long-term average carbon store <i>and</i> loss of potential to substitute timber for higher carbon materials and fuel in the calculations on carbon balance?
	yes
16.	Where do you think the appropriate balance lies between achieving biodiversity objectives and the need to reduce carbon emissions? What processes might help to make this judgement?
	Biodiversity will suffer anyway due to heating of the climate and therefore reducing carbon emissions must take the highest priority
<p>Should we be managing open habitats to keep them in 'favourable condition' or should we adopt a more dynamic approach to land management?</p>	
17.	Outside SSSIs, do you agree that a more dynamic attitude to land management could deliver equivalent or greater gains for open habitats and species than one where success for all sites is based on assessments of condition as applied to SSSIs?
	The whole thing seems to be driven by whims and without proper analysis of the particular befits that can be obtained. landowners can do a much better job without NE interference

No	Question.
18.	If so, how might such an approach be developed? Is there scope for modifying the conservation objectives on some SSSIs to incorporate a similar approach? If not, do you consider that the endpoint for all restoration proposals should be judged against favourable condition as defined for SSSI habitats?
WE should not even be considering this question	
What level of woodland removal due to restoring or expanding open habitats could avoid a significant negative impact on the timber industry?	
19.	Can you provide any information on the likely links between any reduction in timber production and economic activity in the timber sector?
The availability of timber of the quality we seek is limited in the UK. Therefore every wood that is removed could have an adverse affect on our ability to source the timber we require and add to the cost. The more woodland that si removed the higher will be the cost of getting at the remainder and the whole infrastructure will decline thus increasing cost still further.	
Different approaches to applying policy	
20.	Which of the three approaches by which we make decisions about woodland removal is your preferred option? Can you see any alternative types of approach based either on a combination of these approaches or on new ideas?
don't do it	
The role of compensatory planting	
21.	What is the appropriate role of compensatory planting in this policy?
There wont be enough quality timber available in time	
Factors to consider when deciding which policy is likely to work best	
22.	Have we developed a reasonable set of questions for informing the decision on which policy is best? Do you wish to suggest any changes to the list of questions?
The policy to remove woodland seems to have been agreed already. This is wrong	
Implications for delivery mechanisms	
23.	Have we missed any major implications for delivery mechanisms? Would any be particularly welcome or unwelcome to you?
Delivery of what?	
Other comments	
We welcome your input on any other aspect of this consultation.	
Go back to the drawing board. Consider the use of timber in construction as opposed to high co2 requiring materials such as steel. Don't fell any woodland. Plant more trees	

No	Question.

Please include the “information about you” form with your response.¹

Please send your completed forms to:

[Dominic Driver](#)

Senior Projects Officer | Policy and Programme Group | Forestry Commission England

620 Bristol Business Park | Coldharbour Lane | Bristol | BS16 1EJ

0117 906 6003 | 07779 627668 | oh.consultation@forestry.gov.uk

Fax: 0117 931 2859

By 17.00hrs, Friday 5 June 2009.

¹ See www.forestry.gov.uk/england-openhabitats-consultation for a copy.