

Scoping Report

New Forest Inclosures Forest Plan

February 2018

Contents

1. Project Description
2. Assessment of Alternatives
3. Strategic Background
4. Stakeholders
5. Key Environmental Constraints & Opportunities
6. Proposed EIA Programme

Project Description

The proposed project involves the deforestation of 460 hectares of conifer plantation within the New Forest Inclosures during the 10 year Plan period (2018 – 2028).

The deforestation is proposed in order to restore degraded heathland habitats within the New Forest [Special Area of Conservation](#) (SAC), [Special Protection Area](#) (SPA) and [Site of Special Scientific Interest](#) (SSSI).

The 460 hectares is spread across the approximately 24,000 hectare landscape and divided into 114 individual units with an average area of 4 hectares. A location map of these areas can be found in Appendix a.

The areas of proposed deforestation are identified as having the potential to restore the desired open habitats, i.e. those stipulated within the SAC, SPA and SSSI citations.

This project has been determined as being a relevant project under the Environmental Impact Assessment (Forestry) Regulations 1999.

Assessment of Alternatives

The main objective of the proposal is to enable the Forestry Commission's to undertake its statutory obligations to maintain and restore designated landscapes.

The areas identified for this change currently consist of conifer plantation. Not being a qualifying or notified feature or habitat within the SAC or SSSI, we are required to identify how these areas may be changed to best support the special features of the New Forest.

An appraisal of alternatives will be carried out in the Environmental Statement which will include:

- a) Maintaining conifer plantations into the future, i.e. no change;
- b) Changing from conifer plantations to native woodland instead of open habitats;
- c) Allowing the current generation of conifer plantations to mature and decay naturally but control any seeding to ensure no subsequent generations establish.

Strategic Background

Policy Framework

The deforestation proposals are part of the New Forest Inclosures Forest Design Plan (NF FDP). This Plan covers approximately 8,500 hectares within the 24,000 hectares of New Forest landscape managed by Forestry Commission.

The entirety of the management area is subject to nature conservation designations (SAC, SAP, SSSI).

The NF FDP states objectives in line with the Forestry Commission Strategic Plan to manage its land to deliver benefits to nature, people and the economy.

The New Forest benefits from a clarity of hierarchy of these benefits through the [Mintister's Mandate](#) (1998, 2006) which states that conservation of the natural and cultural heritage are the principal objectives of management of the New Forest.

The proposed areas also lie within the New Forest National Park, as such we work in partnership with the New Forest National Park Authority to progress their [purpose](#):

- To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area
- To promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Park by the public.

Historic Background

The proposed NF FDP is the 3rd iteration of this document. Originally instigated in 1999, the FDP has historically proposed and allowed for the expansion of natural habitats in line with sustainable management practices, supported a nation-wide organisation which helps to support the affordability of maintaining these special features.

The 2018 proposals set out a long term vision of a connected, robust network of the designated features of the New Forest. Transition to this landscape is proposed over a period of around 200 years to allow for the sustainable establishment of habitats such as mature and old-growth native woodlands. This long term is used to develop proposals for achievable outcomes with the 10 year approval period of the Plan (2018-2028). The 460 hectares of deforestation sit within this 10 year period.

Stakeholders

Throughout the development of the NF FDP proposals, FC have carried out extensive public and stakeholder consultations to refine the Plan.

A list of stakeholders involved throughout the process can be found in Appendix b.

Scoping Meeting with Key Stakeholders

On 16th January 2018 Forestry Commission hosted a scoping meeting with a number of organisations, individuals and agencies. This scoping meeting had the objective of identifying the key environmental constraints and opportunities to be addressed within the Environmental Statement. The agenda for the meeting can be found in appendix 1. Invitees and attendees can be found in Appendix 2.

In addition, the New Forest National Park Authority submitted a response to Forest Services by email.

The following are notes from the EIA Scoping Meeting.

Notes		Comments
Introduction		
BR	<p>Welcomed all participants and thanked them for their time to assist in the next stage of the EIA process for the Forest Design Plans for the Inclosures of the New Forest.</p> <p>Introduced the purpose of the meeting in relation to the EIA regulations; the scope of the area within the Forest Design Plans to which this meeting applies and our meeting objective (above) to identify the priority issues that need to be addressed in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>FS have already reviewed the initial Forest Design Plan submission and undertaken a screening as to whether it, or parts of it, constitutes a relevant project under the EIA (Forestry) Regulations 1999. It is their opinion that the deforestation components of the plan do and they have provided an opinion letter to explain that judgement.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Historic England.</p> <p>ACTION – FE to circulate, or provide a link to, the EIA Opinion Letter to all attendees and invitees</p>	
MW	Presentation by Forest Services. This provided an	

	<p>overview of the EIA Regulations and the EIA process. The key points highlighted were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This process only relates to the parts of the plan that seek deforestation and then restoration to open habitats within the next 10 years of the Plan; • This meeting is not about finding solutions but only seeks to get agreement on identifying the issues which are likely to have a significant environmental impact as a result of the deforestation. These should then be addressed within an Environmental Statement prepared by the applicant. • The broad topic areas that we should consider in discussion were presented. • The next steps once an ES has been submitted • No further questions were raised 	
JS	<p>Presentation by the applicant – FE. This provided the meeting with a reminder of the locations (maps on tables) of felling areas in scope for discussion today; details of the habitats to be restored and some background and reasons (including relevant policy) why the deforestation has been proposed.</p> <p>ACTION – FE to share the breakdown statistics of the remaining Inclosures following the 10 year Plan.</p>	Action completed Feb 9 th 2018
BR	Asked for any questions of clarification on the presentations or EIA process before starting discussion.	
JC	Enquired whether the prescription to clearfell these areas might allow retention of strategic clumps of conifers as a contribution to landscape.	
JS	Confirmed that it would be an operational decision based on SSSI condition assessment and landscape considerations.	
MW	Reminded the meeting that the ES should include, where possible, mitigation measures that could limit the impacts identified.	
DT	Asked whether the 10% of deciduous woodland identified within the proposed areas is also to be felled. DT also asked about whether fences will also have to be removed or relocated to facilitate restoration.	
JS	Explained that the 10% of broadleaves occur in intimate	

	<p>mixture with the conifers and some retention of small clumps may be considered at detailed site level.</p> <p>Consideration of the retention, removal or realignment of fences will be considered during detailed planning of the work and will depend on the need to have access for grazing stock to help restoration of the habitats.</p>	
Human Beings (People and Recreation)		
BR	Read the section of FS's opinion letter relating to this theme	
MC	57% of respondents to the FDP consultation raised concerns about the reduction in conifer and deforestation components and the impact on local economy and employment.	
DW	Asked if employment data relating to forest management could be obtained and the proportion of those who were local.	Employment impacts to be explored further in ES.
BR	Suggested we could investigate generating data on employment (number of employees and contractors) but advised that knowledge of the downstream employment directly linked to the proposals would be more difficult. In terms of employing local people the FC must work within government procurement processes to provide open opportunities for contracts. BR explained that managing the landscape also requires employment to sustain non-woodland habitats and management of public access and recreation.	
JT	Reminded the meeting that the wider Plan does retain the objective of a 'working forest'.	
RB	Asked whether some of the clearfell area includes a change to wood pasture?	
JS	Wood pasture is not classified as open habitat; the proposals under discussion today are only concerned with those areas which will be converted from woodland to non-woodland habitats, principally heath and mires.	
MW	Could this be an option as opposed to deforestation?	Areas for open habitat restoration have been identified as those which will restore to SAC/SPA

		open habitats. The soils and current structures will not successfully support a conversion to pasture woodland on these areas.
TD	Against the broader thrust of reducing conifer in the wider FDP, TD suggested that broadleaves will be less productive and provide less employment potential than coniferous woodland. Employment is not only directly related to the felling operation but also includes the downstream processing supply chain. TD asked if Scots Pine could be considered as a native species.	
JS	Currently Natural England considers Scots Pine to be non-native.	
BT	Is the Minister's Mandate [formalising a hierarchy of objectives, prioritising in order, objectives for conservation, recreation and economic management] a factor in this process?	
SW	Do the clearfelling proposals not also provide a short term boost to employment and timber producers?	
TD	Unsure without seeing the detailed forecasts of production data.	
RR	Increasing pressure from people means it is essential to maximise the special features of the New Forest including open habitats. There is so little of this [New Forest open] habitat in a UK context that it should be extended. The longer plan shows the transition to those habitats.	See JT comment below. People mainly stay on forest tracks, minimising the threat to restored habitats and associated species.
JC	The resilience of wooded habitats [e.g. conifer woodlands] to absorb public pressure is higher than that of open habitats such as bogs.	
DW	In the past [first phases of FDPs in early 2000s], people objected to deforestation at Millersford & Turf Hill based on landscape change but now it now looks fantastic and is accepted by the visitors to that area. It is important to collect information about how people feel about these areas before and after change.	Landscape impact will be further explored in ES.

MCo	Agreed, from experience elsewhere local anxiety over deforestation is followed by appreciation when habitats are restored.	
MCo	It is true that heathlands are more susceptible to wildfire but more so are young conifer crops. Given the proposed species diversification of the remaining Inclosure woodlands, which will itself reduce the risk of wildfire within the landscape, wildfire is not a significant issue.	FS opinion states that wildfire will be mitigated by current vegetation management of open habitats within the New Forest.
MCo	MCo believes in the ability of the forestry sector to be innovative and adapt to new species and sources of timber supply. This plan only affects the next 10 years. New markets can be found, in the longer term, for broadleaved woodland products.	
JT	Tracks in recently restored Inclosures provide robust areas for people to 'recreate' without causing disturbance to the open habitats. This can be seen at sites previously cleared to open habitats at Markway and Ipley. The users of the Forest generally keep to forest road network for recreational purposes, reducing impact on habitat.	
BT	Supports maintenance of conifer woodlands for amenity use along Waterside Inclosures.	
DI	Expressed concern that loss of woodland was reducing the extent of cover for deer and was altering their natural movement patterns.	
HM	BSW [sawmill at Bartley] employs 43 full-time staff within the New Forest National Park boundary. The reduction of conifer production within the forest will lead supplies being source from further afield with a consequent increase in haulage mileage and carbon emissions. The UK is the 3 rd largest timber importer in the world. Increased [net] deforestation in the UK could lead to the loss of FSC certification.	
MW	Woodlands are more capable of absorbing public pressure. The relationship between recreational pressure and value of the woodlands could be included in the Environmental Statement.	
MC	In terms of quantity, timber production from broadleaves will never match that from conifers.	
RB	The SPA designation highlights the importance of these	

	habitats for wildlife. Broadleaved and conifer woodlands are similar in terms of their value to wildlife. Need to focus on the importance of the habitats (open habitats). It should also be remembered that we are focussed on the proposals of specific deforestation, not wider recreation management.	
BR	To summarise the discussion BR suggested that the economic impact on employment and downstream businesses and the wider financial sustainability of the proposals should be considered in the ES along with an assessment of the any potential recreation and landscape impacts of the changes.	
Flora and Fauna		
BR	Read the section of FS's opinion letter relating to this theme	
RR	Made a broader statement that he felt there was a misunderstanding of landscape ecology and a strict adherence to strict mapped boundaries of habitats when the natural systems demonstrate, over many decades, that the habitat boundaries are more flexible and it is often the edge habitats that are more valuable. RR felt that some parts of the areas proposed for heathland reversion may well have been pasture woodland. The opinion letter suggested detail on the types of habitat to be restored, however, the dynamic character of the New Forest means this would be unhelpful.	
JT	Agreed with previous statement. JT explained that flexibility has been included into the prescription for the delivery of open habitats allowing opportunity for a mosaic of habitats to establish consistent with the conditions. JT reminded the meeting that the Forest Design Plan has already been through extensive stakeholder consultation.	
RR	RR re-iterated the preference for use of natural processes to restore habitats on a landscape scale. Dynamic management of landscape.	
DW	Recreating open habitats is easier here [New Forest rather than other parts of the country] because there is a grazing system already operating.	
DR	Removing conifer in certain places could increase their resilience because the units of habitat increase in size and	

	become more inter-connected.	
RB	Enquired about future alignment of fences.	A process has been agreed which allows for a collaborative approach to fenceline changes. This approach can be found in Appendix 3 of the Scoping Report.
JS	Some of the open habitat restoration sites are located within fenced (Inclosures). Explained that the assessment of the need for fencing (retention of some can assist in stock management) with the Verderers will be discussed at each site and the timing of that action may be variable. It is important the habitats that require grazing to improve their condition are open to stock when required.	
JT	Most rare species [for some of them the New Forest is the only site on the country] rely on grazing therefore the fencing arrangements will need to reflect this over time.	
DW	The Verderers have concerns about all fences coming down as some may be needed to help manage stock (drifting)	
BT	Raised the question of how much of the proposed deforestation was afforested in the 1960s [Verderer's Inclosures] and how much of this has already been deforested.	
SW	Requested that the ES should include clarification of how the open areas are to be managed and maintained and what the mechanisms for achieving that would be?	The ES will further explore and explain the methods of open habitat restoration following tree removal with potential mitigation measures.
DR	Historic and contemporary records to be checked to build inform operational decisions.	A comprehensive Operational Planning Process identifies site properties which include known historic features. This process was included in submissions to FS in April 2017.
BR	In summary BR suggested that no significant impacts specific to the deforestation proposals had been raised for	

	this theme [flora and fauna], but there had been comment about how we sustain management of these habitats in the longer term.	
MW	The ES should include a suggestion of an appropriate level ecological of monitoring to ensure that we achieving are aim and seeing progression towards the improved quality of the habitats in the plan objectives.	
TD	Enquired if there were any concerns about the net loss of woodland habitat in the Forest.	
JS	Need to consider this in the context of the whole forest and the designations of the land. These areas have been selected due to their potential for restoration. The operational assessment process will be used to assess specific constraints on a site by site basis.	
MC	Regarding the change of habitats, an assessment of the habitats that will be lost should be made.	An assessment has been made using known data which was shared with FS in April 2017. Species present will be identified part of the Operational Planning Process and implementation will be informed appropriately.
Soil and Water		
BR	Read parts of the section of FS's opinion letter relating to this theme	
DR	Impacts on soil and hydrology are linked more to how the restoration work is implemented during work and after extraction of timber to ensure the soil profiles and hydrology suffer minimal disturbance.	To be explored further within the ES.
BT	Getting hydrology right is essential.	
BR	These comments are relevant to the operational delivery of the restoration works.	
Climate		
BR	Read parts of the section of FS's opinion letter relating to this theme	
DI	Expressed a view that trees are an important for filtering	

	air pollution (especially with the proximity of urban areas and the port) and concerned that permanent tree removal may impact the potential to reduce air pollution.	
MC	Need to assess the impact that the removal of woodland [potential loss of habitat diversity] will have over the overall resilience of the New Forest in the face of climate change.	
MCo	Focus on open habitat restoration. Big is better: the bigger the areas of open habitat, the more connected and more resilient become. Ecological resilience can come from removal of trees to create larger habitat units.	
JT	The removal of trees and the improvements in hydrology will restore natural habitats and improve resilience. The majority of the areas to be restored [part of this scoping meeting] contain mire systems. They are critically important for carbon sequestration and resilience.	
MC	The overall plan is the removal of conifers.	
TD	If timber is not produced at local level, it has to be moved nationally and internationally. Need to consider the carbon cost of additional transportation of timber products.	
BR	Summarised discussions: significant impact on carbon; impact of diversity on resilience.	Carbon sequestration and Forest Resilience to be explored further in the ES.
Landscape		
BR	Read parts of the section of FS's opinion letter relating to this theme	Landscape impacts will be explored further in the ES.
RR	Conifer plantations [such as those proposed for deforestation] are not a special feature of the New Forest. Any reliance on the retention of such habitats for landscape reasons shows a need to educate about the New Forest.	
DW	The sites proposed for restoration have very positive elements: natural topography and hydrology [mire systems] is restored and connected. The areas will look good in the landscape when they are restored.	
BT	Suggested that part of the mitigation for loss of woodland in the New Forest may be new conifer planting elsewhere [a suggested condition of the ES?].	

Archaeological and Cultural Heritage		
BR	Read parts of the section of FS's opinion letter relating to this theme	
BR	<p>The Opinion letter refers to a "Growth Duty" – clarification of the meaning requested.</p> <p>ACTION – FS to clarify the significance of "Growth Duty".</p>	
RR	There are extensive and significant areas of archaeology. Concerns about potential damage as a result of operations. The features are largely field systems.	
JS	An operational assessment of sensitive ecological and heritage features will be done in advance of any work.	
JSp	We can use LiDAR data to identify those important features.	
JSp	Over all the thrust of the plan priorities is about reclaiming what it is most easily reclaimable.	
RR	There is a correlation between the location of ancient field systems and where woodlands are located on the open forest, or with the distribution of gorse [Ref: Colin Tubbs].	
DW	Explained archaeology around the Verderers' Inclosures.	
JS	Explained protection of scheduled monuments [management plans agreed with HE] and unscheduled heritage features protected through UKFS, expert advice from archaeologist and the operational assessment of each site.	
TD	Conifer silviculture in the New Forest has a heritage value of its own as it represents an important era in the Forest's history. Elements of this heritage should be retained.	This deforestation proposal does lead to the wholesale removal of conifer from the New Forest. It is a reduction of 5% of the conifer area (from around 28%). Conifer will still play a large part in the new forest landscape and

		management for many years to come.
Interaction between all the factors		
JSp	<p>Context: These proposals represent 464 ha of deforestation but the Forest is not isolated from the broader impacts of climate and social change. We need to look at overall carbon budget, which can be compensated anywhere in the UK or even abroad; timber production – these felling areas are some of the lowest productive areas in terms of Yield Class; and the habitats to be restored are extremely rare and important.</p> <p>Climate change and resilience: His recent research suggest that Scots pine is a native tree in England and can have a role to play in the resilience and diversity of the New Forest habitats into the future.</p>	
BT	Carbon sequestration calculation should take into consideration the change of habitats	To be explored further within the ES.
RB	The Defra 25 year plan to improve the environment has been published this week.	
BR	<p>Summarised the session and explained next steps.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The FE team will compile a draft record of this meeting and agree it with FS. This will be shared with participants for points of accuracy or omission. 2. The FE team will then agree with FS the final issues that should be addressed in the ES. Participants will be notified of this list. 3. FE will then prepare the ES and ask FS to conduct a public consultation upon it, before they can make their final decision as to whether to approve the deforestation proposals. <p>Timing on this process is not yet determined.</p> <p>The principles should be that the ES should be a short document in plain English with any supporting and more technical data provided in appendices.</p> <p>Closed the session and thanked everybody for their time and contributions.</p>	

Key Environmental Constraints & Opportunities Identified

During consultation and EIA Scoping the following environmental issues were raised which will be further explored within the Environmental Statement. Here they have been categorised by the main areas of the EIA (Forestry) regulations, in non-hierarchical order.

Human Beings (People & Recreation)	The effects on employment; the effects of people upon the restored open habitats
Flora & Fauna	Methods of post-deforestation maintenance of open habitats; the effects on incumbent habitats and species
Soil & Water	Methods of post-deforestation maintenance of open habitats
Climate	The effects on carbon sequestration of the proposal and subsequent implementation operations
Landscape	The effects on local landscape character
Archaeological & Cultural Heritage	The effects of implementation methods on historic features and heritage value

Proposed EIA Programme

Having carried out the Scoping Exercise in January 2018, these are the next steps in this process:

- Forest Services (FS) agree this Scoping Report;
- Forest Enterprise (FE) prepare Environmental Statement (ES);
- Public Consultation of ES;
- Amend ES following consultations;
- FE submit ES to FS;
- FS offer final decision of approval.

END

Appendix 1 – Scoping Meeting Agenda

New Forest Inclosures Forest Design Plan Proposal– Open Habitat
--

Restoration Proposals with Regards to EIA (Forestry) Regulations 1999	
Date	16 th January 2018
Time	10.00 – 12.00
Location	Oak & Beech Rooms, Lyndhurst Community Centre, SO43 7NY
Facilitator	John Stride – Planning & Environment Manager, South Forest District, Forest Enterprise
Presenters	Jonathan Harding (Forest Services) John Stride (Forest Enterprise)
Objectives	<p>To scope out the EIA Regulations criteria to be further investigated within an Environmental Statement for the clearfell to open habitat proposals. Criteria may include flora and fauna, soils and water, people, access and recreation, archaeology and landscape and climate.</p> <p>N.B. This meeting is specifically about the open habitat restoration proposals and not about the wider Plan proposals</p>

Appendix 2 – Scoping Meeting Invite List

Organisation	Invited to EIA Scoping?	Attended?
Amphibian & Reptile Conservation Trust	Y	
Bat Conservation Trust	Y	
Bournemouth University	Y	
BSW	Y	Y
Butterfly Conservation	Y	Y
Camping in the Forest	Y	
Confederation of Forest Industries	Y	
Country Watch - Hants Police	Y	
County Watch Leader	Y	
Deer Initiative	Y	Y
Deer Society	Y	Y
Emma MacIntosh	Y	
Environment Agency	Y	
Freshwater Habitats Trust UK	Y	

Hampshire & IOW Wildlife Trust	Y	Y
Hampshire County Council	Y	
Historic England	Y	
Institute of Chartered Foresters	Y	Y
National Trust	Y	
Natural England	Y	Y
New Forest Association	Y	Y
New Forest Commoners Defence Ass	Y	
New Forest District Council	Y	Y
New Forest Equestrian Forum	Y	
New Forest History & Archaeology Group	Y	
New Forest National Park	Y	
NPA Access Forum	Y	Y
Pondhead Conservation Trust	Y	Y
Royal Forestry Society	Y	
RSPB	Y	Y
Verderers	Y	Y
Ashurst & Colbury	Y	
Beaulieu	Y	
Boldre	Y	
Breamore	Y	
Bramshaw	Y	
Bransgore	Y	
Brockenhurst	Y	
Burley	Y	
Copythorne	Y	
Denny Lodge	Y	
East Boldre	Y	
Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley	Y	Y
Exbury & Lepe	Y	
Fawley	Y	
Godshill	Y	
Hale	Y	
Hordle	Y	
Hyde	Y	Y
Hythe & Dibden	Y	
Netley Marsh	Y	
New Milton	Y	
Redlynch	Y	
Ringwood	Y	
Sway	Y	
Woodgreen	Y	

Appendix 3 – Process to Agree Fenceline Changes

Proposal for implementing fence line changes to New Forest Inclosures in order to advance the objectives of the 2017 New Forest Inclosures Forest Design Plan (FDP)

Following discussions with the Verderers, Agisters and local FC teams, the following feedback was received:

- That although the principles of introduced grazing for the benefit of designated habitats within the New Forest are understood, there are many site specific constraints which require specific reference when implementing such a change. These include but are not limited to: ground conditions (stock welfare), location and age of pens for stock management, the use of the fenceline for stock management, the age of the fence itself;
- As the length of fenceline changes required to fully implement the FDP involves many Inclosures spread across the whole of the New Forest, a detailed programme could be unwieldy and difficult to plan and implement;
- A site by site discussion of the timing and type of change (e.g. fence removal or simply gate opening) would allow us to consider the site conditions and make a change which suits all interested parties.

As a result, the following is proposed:

- Follow the management rotation of the Inclosures according to the Working Block cycle (the rotational way FC manages its woodlands in the south). This would identify those Inclosures due to be worked within a given financial year and thus allow us to plan ahead;
- In addition, any sites which force a reactive change (i.e. the fence has failed and needs replacing) would be added to this list for consideration.

At the time of writing, those Inclosures which are due to be worked in 2019-20, or have fences which are failing now **and** which the FDP proposal suggests grazing is appropriate at some point in the future are:

Inclosure Block	Reason for Consideration	Agister	Keeper	Beat Forester
Poundhill & Fletchers Thorns	Working block cycle	Robert Maton	Maarten Ledeboer	Simon Holloway
Denny Lodge	Working Block Cycle	Mike Lovell	Alan Stride	Simon Holloway
Norley	Working Block Cycle	Robert Maton	Jonathan Cook	Simon Holloway
Milkham	Working Block Cycle	Peter Rix	Lee Knight	Alex Howells
Frame Heath	Fence failing	Robert Maton	Jonathan Cook	Simon Holloway
Pondhead	Fence failing	Mike Lovell	Alan Stride	Simon Holloway
Kings Copse	Fence failing	Mike Lovell	Jonathan Cook	Simon Holloway

It is proposed to set up meetings between the Agister, Keeper, Forester, FC Forest Management District Forester and the FC Planning & Environment Manager to discuss these sites, consider the constraints and suggest proposals for:

- Appropriate timing of the change;
- Appropriate type of change;
- Any other requirements prior to making the change.

In addition, it may be necessary to include a representative of the Verderers and Natural England and the Commoners Defence Association.

This proposal is drafted with the intention of agreement from the Verderers and Agisters to proceed in this way. Any changes suggested should be made to John Stride, FC Planning & Environment Manager, (john.stride@forestry.gsi.gov.uk).