

# 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](http://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](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/england-openhabitats-consultation).

<b>Your name:</b>	Dave Radford
<b>Your organisation (if any):</b>	Kleen Kutt Ltd
<b>Date:</b>	24/03/09

No	Question.
<b>The nature of the change</b>	
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?
I would prefer as little as possible. I understand that there is a need for some area's to be restored but am at a loss as to why we cannot deliver bio-diversity with timber production as well.	
<b>Desired outcomes</b>	
2.	Have we developed a reasonable list of desired outcomes of the policy? Do you wish to suggest any amendments?
To be able to supply various timber products locally including the growing use of timber for heat and power generation without the need to transport by sea or road hundreds or thousands of miles. Manage forests environmentally friendly and bio-diversely.	
<b>Measuring the success of the policy</b>	
3.	Have we developed a reasonable set of indicators for evaluation? Do you wish to suggest any amendments to this indicator list?
<b>Policy proposals</b>	
<b>Elements present in the policy</b>	
<b>We will treat woodland and open habitats as potentially mutually beneficial</b>	
4.	Do you agree that woodland and open habitats are potentially mutually beneficial?

No	Question.
	Is promotion of this idea helpful in gaining support for open habitat restoration and expansion from woodland?
<b>A presumption against removal of 'mature native woodland'</b>	
5.	Do you agree with the principle that there should be a presumption against removal of ancient and 'mature native woodland'?
yes	
6.	What do you think of our proposed outline definition of 'mature native woodland'?
<b>We will expect practitioners to help local users to participate in development of the initial proposals</b>	
7.	Do you agree that local participation in decision making is helpful? What is your preferred option for how we should apply this element?
yes	
<b>We will promote mechanisms for prioritising woodland removal at a regional level</b>	
8.	Do you agree that prioritisation at a regional level is appropriate for this policy?
no	
<b>We will apply a framework for evaluation to projects</b>	
9.	Do you agree with this framework for evaluation? What is your preferred option for how we should apply this element?
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?
<b>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.</b>	
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	

No	Question.
12.	Do you consider that the proposed threshold is about right, too high or too low?
	too high
<b>Key variables</b>	
<b>What is the balance between achieving biodiversity objectives and the need to reduce green house gas emissions?</b>	
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?
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?
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?
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?
Both have equal importance with the balance split between the two. How much timber is used and produced locally, how much is transported in. How much more timber is going to be needed to supply the growing fuel market.	
<b>Should we be managing open habitats to keep them in 'favourable condition' or should we adopt a more dynamic approach to land management?</b>	
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?
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?

No	Question.
<b>What level of woodland removal due to restoring or expanding open habitats could avoid a significant negative impact on the timber industry?</b>	
19.	Can you provide any information on the likely links between any reduction in timber production and economic activity in the timber sector?
Local sawmills, timber buyers and contractors, log merchants will all be effected to some degree.	
<b>Different approaches to applying policy</b>	
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?
Is it not possible to grow timber and maintain wildlife side by side. Other countries seem to manage this but we swing from one side of the pendulum to the other. Hardwood to softwood-softwood to hardwood etc. I feel that it is possible but we need a long term approach, not what is PC at the time.	
<b>The role of compensatory planting</b>	
21.	What is the appropriate role of compensatory planting in this policy?
don't know	
<b>Factors to consider when deciding which policy is likely to work best</b>	
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?
yes	
<b>Implications for delivery mechanisms</b>	
23.	Have we missed any major implications for delivery mechanisms? Would any be particularly welcome or unwelcome to you?
no	
<b>Other comments</b>	
We welcome your input on any other aspect of this consultation.	
none	

Please include the "information about you" form with your response.<sup>1</sup>

**Please send your completed forms to:**

<sup>1</sup> See [www.forestry.gov.uk/england-openhabitats-consultation](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/england-openhabitats-consultation) for a copy.

[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](mailto:oh.consultation@forestry.gov.uk)

Fax: 0117 931 2859

**By 17.00hrs, Friday 5 June 2009.**