

LIS VERBATIM COMMENTS FROM TREES AND WOODLANDS STRATEGY STAKEHOLDER
WORKSHOP
28.06.2018

Proposal 1: In order to help deliver the National Park Partnership Plan target, the Trees and Woodland Strategy will identify priority areas for native woodland creation. We have identified areas of high potential by a modelling exercise to explore where woodland creation would benefit woodland connectivity. It is not proposed to detail a split in the National Park Partnership Plan woodland creation target between productive conifer and native woodland.

LIS Response

Agree with the proposal to target native woodland creation to areas where it would benefit connectivity and why

Agree but should also take into account where may be of benefit to priority species.

Disagree with the proposal not to split the National Park Partnership Plan planting target and why?

If not split, targets likely to follow lead of FGS – a NP target should emphasis Native Woodland & achieve better balance between commercial and woodland.

Additional comments

Woodland Creation Potential to Enhance Connectivity Map Target should be split so there is something to measure success between productive and native woodland.

This target should be above target set in the Forest Grant Scheme for native woodland.

Just because productive now doesn't mean couldn't benefit change to native?

What / where would a key change in a large block of plantation woodland to native woodland be transformed?

What is the process if conifer plantation proposals come forwards in priority native woodland areas?
Vice versa?

What / where are key gaps that would be transformational in connectivity?

Category Blue Split? Could you have a divide on the high potential areas for native woodland connectivity defined in 2 colours so native and conifer separate?

Proposal 2: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will refer to the previously agreed Wild Challenges and promote actions to help deliver the Wild Park outcomes.

LIS Response

Should these existing Wild Challenges and their targets be incorporated into the Strategy?

Yes

The life of the Trees and Woodlands Strategy goes beyond the current WILDPARK 2020 and therefore referencing it may not be required BUT the principles / aims and targets should be incorporated.

This strategy should be a clear mechanism and give a mandate to deliver for species and habitats associated with woodland but also protect those species of open habitats.

Are there other important species that should be specifically highlighted or prioritised for action in the Strategy?

There are several species that should be monitored and helped and conserved that are useful indicators of that at the management is working. These can be supplied – Yvonne.

Are there other important woodland habitat types that should be specifically highlighted or prioritised for action in the Strategy

Scots Pine – Atlantic Oakwood

Woodland glades

Wood pasture

Proposal 3: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will identify issues and solutions to improve or enhance woodland management. This could include unsustainable herbivore impacts, invasive species, woodlands with limited species diversity and age structure, and limited woodland management options.

LIS Response

Are there other management issues you would wish the Strategy to address?

- Current funding arrangements do not always incentivise the most appropriate management for a site
- Climate change impacts (e.g. weather, slope stability, tree diseases)
- Impacts from recreation on woodlands
- Restocking – guidance on situations where it might not be desirable to restock (e.g. plantations on peat)

- Lack of skills to manage woodland
- Tree diseases/Biosecurity (covered by proposal 6 below)
- Herbivore impacts – the presence and potential expansion of beavers within the National Park (NP) should be considered alongside the impacts of other herbivores
- Herbivore impacts - Lack of grazing/browsing can also be a problem (e.g. could be detrimental to lichen interests)
- Ancient trees – the biodiversity/landscape/cultural value of these trees should be recognised in the TWS along with consideration of appropriate management

Can you identify any woodlands in the Park where management could be improved or enhanced – and if so, where and how?

No specific woodlands where management could be improved were identified within the park

Please suggest any solution to these issues

Funding arrangements:

- Publish updated TWS to allow grant uplift within the NP to encourage positive management (is this correct or would it just apply to woodland creation?) (NPA note – Forestry Commission grant uplift is only available for woodland creation)
- Ensure that TWS identifies key woodland management issues including those issues that are difficult to address through current funding arrangements
- Seek to influence post Brexit funding scheme for woodland management to address shortfalls in current scheme - there might be a greater scope to design a more local scheme to address these issues
- Examples of current funding issues included:
 - No grant uplift available within the NP as there is no current TWS
 - Restocking small areas of conifers with broadleaves to enhance biodiversity is not always financially viable
 - No grant funding available for deer fencing when restocking and this discourages woodland managers from increasing species diversity and encourages the use of less palatable species (particularly Sitka spruce)
 - Current scheme requires the same density of stems for regeneration as for planting and this isn't appropriate in some circumstances (NPA correction – new grant model enables lower density natural regeneration to be grant aided)
- Promote good examples of projects to encourage future applications

Climate change

- Consider how climate change may affect woodlands and identify how this should influence their management to ensure resilience in the long-term (Proposal 6)

Recreation

- Highlight that recreation is a key factor in how woodlands are managed in areas with high visitor numbers

- Identify potential issues and solutions

Restocking

- Provide guidance on the factors that should be considered to identify any areas that might be inappropriate for restocking

Lack of skills

- Encourage apprenticeships and small-scale operators as a means of increasing the number and diversity of available contractors

Herbivore impacts - Beavers

- The presence and potential expansion of beavers within the NP must be considered alongside other herbivores to ensure the sustainable herbivore impacts are achieved
- If the impacts of other herbivores are high, this could intensify the impacts of beavers on woodlands as this would prevent coppice regrowth and regeneration
- As well as impacts on woodlands, this could have implications for the future viability of beaver populations

Ancient trees

- Use the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory as a starting point for identifying important ancient trees within the NP
- Identify specific actions to protect ancient trees and associated landscapes

Unsustainable herbivore impacts

- There was a general consensus that this was a key issue that needs to be tackled in order for the objectives of the TWS to be met and to protect public/private investment in woodland management/creation
- There was some debate on the role that fencing should play in addressing unsustainable herbivore impacts
- Red deer, roe deer, feral goats and sheep were highlighted as being the main species of concern within the NP
- If impacts from deer could be tackled to reduce the need for deer fencing, this would free up money to be spent on more positive woodland creation/management.
- There was a desire for the National Park to take on a more active role in addressing unsustainable herbivore impacts through involvement in deer management groups
- Reluctance of some NGOs to manage deer on the land they manage was highlighted as barrier to delivering sustainable herbivore impacts
- Opportunity to promote venison as a resource
- Improve maintenance of agricultural fences

Invasive species

- What areas/species to prioritise?

- There was some confusion about the current status of the Wild Park priority areas for rhododendron control (NPA comment – the map presented as part of proposal 2 showed catchment/ potential project boundaries rather than priority areas)
- Funding was seen as a key constraint for taking forward control of invasive non-native species (INNS). Could a post-Brexit woodland grant scheme provide focussed funding? Could the NP provide funding or support for land managers to apply for funding?
- Habitat restoration needs to form part of any approach to tackle INNS as recent research has highlighted a lack of recovery of native ground flora following the removal of rhododendron in woodlands and there was some experience in the group of removing one invasive species from a riparian corridor only for it to be replaced by another INNS
- The possible use of grazing to manage INNS, such as giant hogweed, was suggested

Limited species and age structure diversity

- Addressing unsustainable herbivore impacts was seen as key to addressing limited species and age structure diversity
- One reason for the strong preference for Sitka spruce in commercial forestry is that it is less palatable to deer than other species (there are a number of other factors that favour the use of Sitka spruce)
- As highlighted above, providing grant funding for deer fencing when restocking woodlands might also encourage a greater range of species to be planted
- Ensure that grant funding adequately incentivises restocking woodlands of all sizes with a greater range of species
- See comments on proposal 6 for other relevant points

Proposal 4: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will identify where different types of woodland could be located to bring landscape enhancement while not detracting from the special landscape qualities of the National Park. The Strategy will provide a toolkit to assist with woodland landscape assessment and design.

LIS Response

Agree with this proposal and why?

Yes, but what do we mean by landscape enhancement?

Yes, it makes sense to work with existing baseline.

Yes. Changes in livestock regimes may open up new opportunities.

Yes – important to manage the landscape for visitors.

Yes, the proposal will help estates and land managers with their planning so long as the strategy is not a strait jacket.

A tool kit will be helpful in helping non-landscape architects to do a good job; detailed landscape analyses can be outside the skills set of some foresters.

Yes, but landscape should not overrule ecology.

Yes, working at the landscape scale means thinking about multiple benefits and consideration of other objectives.

Yes e.g. the “Scotland is now” campaign is all about selling Scotland’s landscape abroad but we need policies to protect this resource.

Yes, but remember that planted conifers are a key element of the landscape character of the Park and add diversity to it.

Disagree with this proposal and why?

Concerned that previous strategies have been too conservation led.

Questions raised

Will strategy allow flexibility for private sector e.g. will the approach to zoning be too prescriptive? Will there be scope for ambitious new big schemes? What are the barriers to woodland creation? How will we deal with Drinking Water Protected Areas in discussing new woodland proposals?

The Landscape Character Assessment layer is a useful starting point but we need to be able to break landscape down to a finer grain of resolution. We need to break the landscape down to more localised areas e.g. not all strath floors are the same as each other.

How do we promote landscape scale new woodlands that span ownership boundaries? E.g. Sharing of forest plan aspirations with neighbours.

Can we incentivise new woodland creation with planning “carrot”? E.g. Are there ways of linking planning permission with the environmental gains of new woodland?

Can we do more to map out the existing biodiversity features?

Are we good enough at looking after the biodiversity we’ve got in planning new woodlands? e.g. eagles.

You can’t address woodland creation in isolation you also need other management for biodiversity such as legal predator control.

How will be rank landscape along with other attributes in planning new woodlands? Can we make more use of tools like Prospect Software?

Are there specific locations where you would consider woodland creation to be either particularly appropriate?

We need to ensure that future timber crops are planted in places that are harvestable.

The River Temperature Tool Kit will help to identify catchment where new riparian planting can have climate change adaptation benefits e.g. by providing shade to reduce water temperatures for fish.

Proposal 5: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will identify areas in the lowlands and strath floors of the National Park where the management of existing tree features such as parkland, boundary trees and groups of trees will be prioritised for management to retain, enhance or expand such features for landscape, biodiversity and economic benefits.

LIS Response

Agree with this proposal and why?

Yes, trees and hedgerows are important to our landscape.

Yes, small farm woodlands grants are still available but only very small ones.

Yes 20 trees in the right place can bring as much amenity benefit as 200ha.

Yes, but it is important to keep open views of the landscape e.g. not planting up to road verges and creating more tunnels of trees.

Yes, but where are with what species? Especially where tourism is important.

Yes. It is important to assess the space, height and distance of the existing landscape features in planning new woodland cover.

Yes, this is important for meeting conservation objectives because really small-scale planting usually falls between funding stools. We also need a more flexible approach in dealing with failures of trees to establish in a way that FGS don't.

Small scale replanting and expansion can benefit existing small woodlands.

Disagree with this proposal and why?

Concerned that landscape should not be separate from other considerations, can't look at it in isolation.

Nervousness about separating off trees and woodlands from the rest of the landscape.

Don't like the name of the strategy, concerned that this will be seen as being all about native woodland and not about productive conifers. We prefer the word forestry. Forestry in a commercial sense versus woodlands for other purposes.

Questions raised

Are we taking account of climate change impacts on traditional agricultural uses? E.g. traditional grazing models don't work so well these days because we have 40% more rainfall

Are there any constraints to enabling this proposal being implemented?

Small scale planting may need to have constraints too.

The funding regimes don't currently allow integrated considerations and securing funding can get very complicated.

We need to manage road verge views to keep them open.

We need to manage the visual impact of brash in key locations for amenity benefit.

Are there specific locations where you would consider such management to be either particularly appropriate or inappropriate?

Can we make use of Community Action Plans to guide this strategy? E.g. prioritising places where the communities want more trees and woodlands.

There are some strath floors where we don't want more trees e.g. to protect farm land waters.

It would be particularly useful to have new planting targeted at burn-sides this is good for spawning head waters.

Riparian wooded ribbons along rivers for economic biodiversity landscape and flood reasons.

The approaches to Callander by road from west and east are greatly enhanced by the existing parkland features but the approach from the south is not so well managed despite offering excellent views.

We need to make sure that shelter belts are designed and located to fit the landscape.

We should prioritise the head waters of catchments for "Keeping Rivers Cool" benefits.

Marine Scotland have mapped out the area's most likely to be affected by temperature rises in rivers. Good data are available on their web mapping system.

Proposal 6: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will encourage increased woodland diversity in both species and age structure and will promote biosecurity measures to help deliver resilient woodlands.

LIS Response

Agree with this proposal and why?

Increased species and age class diversity

- There was general support for the aim but some concerns about potential restrictions on the design of future commercial forestry schemes. In particular:
 - Sitka spruce is the favoured tree for productive forestry for a large number of reasons including; yield, ability to grow anywhere, palatability to deer, current disease

susceptibility and there are well established markets and supply chains for processing timber from this species. As a consequence, there were concerns that requiring greater diversity of species could undermine timber production and commercial viability.

- Continuous cover forestry as an alternative to clear fell management – whilst continuous cover offers potential benefits for structural diversity, landscape and general biodiversity, it could not be applied to all productive forestry in the NP due to the high windblow risk for much of the area. It would also be difficult to retrospectively apply this approach to forests originally planted/designed to be clear felled and this could have implications for the economic viability of forestry. However, there is scope to expand the area of continuous cover forestry where suitable conditions exist.
- Unsustainable herbivore impacts reinforce the planting of Sitka as this is less palatable to deer.
- Different road infrastructure would be required for different management regimes and this also needs to be considered
- If the TWS deviates significantly from existing Scottish/UK policies, this could undermine the viability of commercial schemes within the NP
- It would be useful if the TWS could outline a range of approaches for improving species and age class diversity to enable the most appropriate approach for a particular site to be selected

Promotion of biosecurity measures

- There was universal support for the promotion of biosecurity measures as this was seen as vital for addressing the increasing threats to tree health

Do you have any suggestions how these objectives can be achieved?

Increased species and age class diversity

- Require greater proportion of broadleaves in commercial proposals (e.g. along watercourses and road corridors)
- Encourage more small-scale woodland creation/management (e.g. for wood fuel)
- Promote use of continuous cover management in appropriate areas
- Consider trialling the felling of small areas of mature trees to encourage greater age class diversity in broadleaf woodlands with limited age class diversity and where the canopy species requires light to regenerate
- Encourage planting of commercial broadleaves
- Help foster markets for a greater range of wood products to encourage a greater variety woodland management techniques
- Promote agroforestry

Biosecurity measures

- Promote increase in species and age class diversity
- High profile campaign to educate the public on why biosecurity is important and what steps they can take to minimise risks. The success of Blue Planet 2 in raising awareness of the

impacts of plastic pollution was highlighted as a good example (leaflets aren't enough on their own)

- Work with other organisations to include biosecurity with other learning about woodlands (e.g. schools, forest schools, ranger activities)
- Introduce a preference for regeneration over planting to reduce the requirement for nursery stock and associated risks
- Promote genetic diversity as well as species diversity
- Ensure that there is a clear process for coordinating a response to a tree disease outbreak including advice to the public

Proposal 7: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will promote alternative woodland management and integrated land management techniques where appropriate, identify new economic markets and seek solutions to issues preventing harvesting/timber haulage of existing conifer forests.

LIS Response

Agree with this proposal and why?

Integrated approach was supported

Should be explored and offer real opportunity

Do you have any suggestions how these objectives can be achieved?

Park could use technology e.g. drones. How do we make broadleaves pay? This is an opportunity small scale hardwood production could be a way for farmers to diversify.

We should promote more specialist timber - huge opportunity. Could local people use woodland for biomass?

Sheep are needed in the uplands but in the past there has been too many. Could the strategy promote a mix between forestry and agriculture?

Grant scheme key issue for what happens on the ground

Shelter belts – encourage these and set out the multiple benefits they can provide

Skills – need skills to achieve this approach, currently a huge skill shortage and young people entering the industry

We need to actively promote apprenticeships and groups should get together to look at this topic

Deer issues could they be part of the integrated land management approach

Health and wellbeing benefits from woodland could this be more explicit

Managing blocks of smaller woodlands and the economics of this. We need to encourage smaller operators, we need training schemes, and we need to develop markets that are a smaller scale. The strategy needs to identify smaller scale and diverse markets. The strategy needs to encourage innovation e.g. birch syrup, needs to be high value and quirky. We need to encourage sawmills to diversify. We need smaller equipment with firewood going to local firewood market. We need grant for small scale sawmills. Northumberland National Park doing good work on small scale woodland suggestion to look at for their approach

Changing market price makes some of these site potentially more favourable to extract woodland

Need to try and generate local employment

Potential for biomass and local markets

Strategy could include mapping and identify areas and thresholds for felling. e.g. in lots of areas woodlands has been left and not harvested because it was felt it wasn't feasible however because of market price this may no longer be the case.

Deep peatland restoration opportunity for strategy to highlight these opportunities where existing woodlands are not suitable and could be removed

Strategy to encourage non timber forest products e.g. fungi, woodland craft

Need locally sourced wood available

Strategy could encourage a brand as locally grown and produced and make more of the near to source processing

Create forest roads away from communities but need to acknowledge that transport links are needed

Innovate UK – partnership to apply for funding

Grown in Britain – a certification process which could be encouraged

Could heavy horse haulage be encouraged where there are issues preventing timber extraction

Proposal 8: The Trees and Woodland Strategy should have additional requirements to enhance the delivery of the National Park Partnership Plan through woodland creation and management proposals which are considered alongside the current suite of UKFS requirements. For example, requiring increased minimum proportion of native broadleaves in productive conifer woodland creation to maximize the multiple benefits for the new woodland.

LIS Response

Agree with this proposal and why?

Session 1 agree, session 2 disagree, session 3 mixed (NC) session 4 agree (SF)

UKFS is a "standard" over Scotland should be higher in NP

Should we be saying that the UKFS is a baseline but within the NP there should be greater emphasis on public benefit and balance with private interest?

RSPB increase current minimum standard

Would require clarification of objectives by National Park

Expectations of land owners

Disagree with this proposal and why?

If you are already following best practice, why should you do more?

There is enough interpretation of UKFS to allow for flexibility

Give trust to professionals to write up innovative schemes

Not park wide

What part of UKFS can we emphasis as part of T&WS to allow delivery of NPPP?

Already "high standard"

Can add in Woodland Assurance Scheme

Restructuring plantations helping to redress the monoculture of Sitka NP should be a place of excellence but should this standard be rolled out nationally? Shortfall of timber - & NP should be able to contribute. If not chasing grant money, you could plant what you want where having followed UKFS. Are we going to incentivize additional proposal / requirements? Allows innovative schemes to be sent in for application? Should deliver NPPP priorities

Could reviewed proposals be sent to SLE before going to public/open consultation, so that they can support it (or not!) and tell their membership that they can support it.

Do you have any suggestions about what these additional requirements should be?

Need grant incentive. Higher % of native broadleaves within woodland creation. Consideration to design and landscape character. Transition between conifer and other habitats – edge effect – larger transition areas Scrub edge on montane side of plantation More flexible grant scheme to allow for thin riparian planting for example. Design consideration for multiple benefits – deer management, access etc. Scale appropriate assessment Health and well-being agenda. NP is a social construct and needs to have multiple benefits

Comments

Proposal 8 statement - does sustainable forestry have different constraints and parameters within the NP?

Minimum standard - there needs to suit specific tweaks to improve/higher level – should be cover and above

Proposal 9: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will encourage land managers/owners and local communities to identify the best ways to co-ordinate and manage a balanced approach to woodland management and creation. This could, for example, be via the existing Deer Management Groups as a forum to discuss these issues.

LIS Response

Agree that decisions about land use changes have social, economic and environmental impacts which should be considered at both a local and landscape scale?

Agree session 1, 2 & 3 (NC)

Yes (SF)

Perception that DMG do not know anything about woodland management.

Consultations must be done Scale does matter – 2a woodland in corner of field not as lump as larger plantations, however, there's a cumulative effect.

Should be cared by statutory process - project specific

Willing collaboration over boundaries with different land managers- joint ventures – even between agricultural forestry

Disagree and why?

Disagree session 3 (NC)

Not all stakeholders are present at DMG's. If you have a 60ha (e.g) woodland creation in NP then there should be open meeting for discussion with statutory and non-statutory. As planning authority, we should have more influence into final say on woodland schemes (above/more than FCS) LMF – a better plan. 10yr Forest Plan should cover enough. Already “due diligence” as part of the scoping exercise. Engagement of statutory and non-statutory consultation for woodland creation within NP For open meeting. LMF has to be at right scale for the issues being discussed. Consultation process has changed from open meeting to by correspondence – not a good thing. Fisheries Board – status could benefit schemes. List of stakeholders consultees

Are Deer Management Groups an appropriate forum for discussing land use issues?

DMG – good place to start

Community Councils – statutory consultees.

Already a lot of issues.

Should occur already

If not could such a forum be set up?

Needs to be inclusive

Tenant farmers often don't go to DMG's/NFUS local branch local

Local recorders

Local ecological groups – Fisheries Trust / SBI / RSPB

Out with designated sites – things might get missed

Land management forum – management tool as more bodies / stake holders represented

Land managers should be transparent

Aspirational proposals at landscape scale via land management forum

CC's Forum's in West Dunbartonshire

Statutory existing consultation already set up - if you use a non-designated group.

Management of existing forest (depends if it's used by public) neighbours don't care(?)

Woodland creation – more consultation required

Landscape versus cost constraints effect schemes

Proposal 10: The Trees and Woodland Strategy will encourage engagement between local communities and woodland owners/managers to explore opportunities for greater involvement in the use and management of woods, as well as greater understanding of the opportunities and constraints associated with woodland management and creation. In addition, the Strategy should signpost interested communities to relevant information and support should they wish to exercise their powers through the Community Empowerment or Land Reform legislation.

LIS Response

Agree with this proposal and why?

General support for proposal

Agree but need to take whole community with us at all scales e.g. from local citizens science all the way to communities managing and taking on land

Disagree with this proposal and why?

Statutory consultation exists and unsure what more this strategy can do

Community and Forestry Commission need to work better together and cautious about communities managing woodland as FCS as the experts so therefore if communities take on woodlands FCS should be available to advise.

Already existing process

Do you have any suggestions about what relevant information or support would be required?

Suggest to identify support for communities on how they go about the acquisition of land but also provide support where help is available for the longer-term management

Should encourage a case study in the document e.g. Strathfillan Community Woodland could be used to highlight not only benefits but also issues they have encountered

For when engaging with communities on new woodland it is important to engage early and issues log should be used - signpost to relevant guidance e.g. FCS Guidelines on Woodland Creation

Forest plans are reviewed every 5 years so there is an opportunity to encourage further consultation with communities (NPA correction - Forest Plans are renewed every 10 years)

Is there an opportunity for the National Park to facilitate engagement between communities and forestry owners?

The strategy could contain online materials for woodland management to help communities

SRUC - talk to for case study on community engagement

Opportunity to highlight woodland crofts and their benefits

FCS existing guidelines needs to be signposted

National Park should have final say on consenting new woodland

Educate the community on what forestry is and encourage ongoing liaison with communities

The strategy should encourage outreach opportunities

Face to face engagement really important however need to have enough detail to show communities before consulting them

Agree to signposting information could highlight forest schools and relevant organisations

Has Woodland Trust been engaged in the development of the strategy?

Look at the opportunities on how communities work with land managers

Communities can have an observatory role to help woodland management e.g. identify where diseases are appearing and other biosecurity issues.

Please prioritise 3 proposals you think are most important for the Trees and Woodlands Strategy

Proposal no.	Number of votes
1	10
2	4
3	15
4	11
5	2
6	8
7	11
8	3
9	5
10	1

Any additional comments?

Forestry Strategy not Woodland.

Yes to Trees and Woodland not just Forestry.

Where is the integration with the other land users?

Can we use Community Action Plans to inform AECS applications?

Riparian Areas - Salmon – SEA – Trout nursery areas important. Grants should be available for planting and fencing. Fishing is a big economy driver in the NP.

NP should be the deciding authority for all plans re forestry.

Montane/upland scrub, although not strictly woodland, can become a key element of linkage between woodland habitats. Can the strategy provide a place for incentives/uplift for including elements that promote this habitat type at the upper edge of the new forest/woodlands proposals? This would also soften upper edges.

Strategy needs to note woodland importance for species i.e. red squirrels etc. (Wild Challenges).

Need to see the encouragement of more woodland scrub above woodland rather than sharp edges of woodland then open ground.

Freshwater Strategy for NP required which needs to include how this is resourced to get sustainable solutions.

Water temperature issues – riparian planting informed by Marine Scotland research.

Protection of Teith SAC with other protected sites needs to be promoted more. Catchment scale approach.

No direct proposals which refer to Natural Flood Management solutions.

Like to see the park have a database of local sites of nature conservation value which can be used to help the woodland creation process of devolving if the woodland is appropriate.

Can we get the map that shows what trees can be used to most stop the floods getting down?

Focus on PAWS restoration – while PAWS are an obvious strategic focus for restoring native woodlands, this can sometimes be at the expense of non-PAWS woodlands with better potential for restoration. There is a risk that these areas might get overlooked if the TWS focusses too much on the restoration PAWS.

Planting/management of woodland along riparian corridors – this can help to mitigate the effect of increased water temperature on fish populations as a result of climate change. Marine Scotland has carried out research on this issue and modelling has been undertaken to identify watercourses that are at greatest risk (<http://marine.gov.scot/information/scotland-river-temperature-monitoring-networksrtmn-predictions-river-temperature-and>). Creating/enhancing woodland along these watercourses should be a priority in the TWS.

Framework – the TWS should be a framework for influencing proposals that come forward but it should allow some flexibility and enable decisions to be made on a case by case basis taking account of more detailed site specific information.

Powerline wayleaves – need to consult with SSE well in advance of any felling works that might affect powerlines as power outages may need to be planned a year in advance.

Research/demonstration - Fund research/demonstration sites to find and promote new ways of addressing the woodland management issues identified in the TWS.