

## Response ID ANON-FCMP-9F9H-6

Submitted to **Hopton Kinsley and Purslow FP 2018-2028**

Submitted on **2018-11-25 22:49:52**

### Hopton Kinsley and Purslow 2018-2028 Forest Plan documents

#### Introduction

##### 1 If you work for an organisation who is it ?

**Organisation:**

Hopton Castle Parish Meeting

##### 2 Please Score the following interests in terms of their importance to you or your organisation.

**Matrix 1 - Biodiversity and Woodland Ecology (eg. habitats flora and fauna):**

Very Important

**Matrix 1 - Communities and people (eg. landscape, heritage and culture):**

Very Important

**Matrix 1 - Climate Change (eg. carbon capture and flood alleviation):**

Very Important

**Matrix 1 - Forest products and services (eg. timber, woodfuel and non-timber products):**

Insignificant

**Matrix 1 - Forest Protection (eg. Woodland structure, plant health and soil stability):**

Very Important

**Matrix 1 - Income and employment (eg. game management, timber processing, tourism):**

Important

**Matrix 1 - Recreation and Access (eg. Leases, permissions, trails, facilities):**

Important

##### 3 How well does the Forest Plan address your needs and interests or those of your organisation?

Well

##### 4 Do you agree that the Forest Plan achieves an appropriate balance of social, economic and environmental objectives for the woodland?

Yes

##### 5 Please feel free to add any further comments or feedback.

**further comment:**

Overall we are pleased with the plan objectives, especially the proposed significant increase in the proportion of broadleaf woodland.

The plan would benefit from an environmental risk assessment covering the woodland and the surrounding area so that a clear picture of key risks and mitigation could be understood and assessed. For example, much of the plan concentrates (quite properly) on the risk of tree disease and pests but relatively little on pests and disease to other organisms. It is not clear to what extent operations within the woodland add or subtract to the risks such as invasive species e.g. Himalayan Balsam. So we are left not being quite sure whether there has been an appropriately wide assessment of the risks to the habitat and wildlife in the woodland itself and the surrounding area. Given the nature of the adjacent ESA and AONB this is surprising.

One of the plan's objectives is "To protect and enhance woodland and open habitats and their associated species." It is not clear from the plan how the overall reduction in open space after 2028 is consistent with that objective.

In the section headed Analysis and Concept it is stated that water quality will be protected through "sympathetic management prescriptions". It is not clear what this means.

There is reference to "environmental corridors" Does this mean what is commonly understood as "wildlife corridors" or is this something different? To what extent are there opportunities to collaborate with adjacent landowners on such matters and more general environmental protection and enhancement measures. This is not addressed in the plan.

**6 Please tell us how you found out about the survey. Some examples of how you found out might include: word of mouth, a poster displayed at a woodland entrance or in a library. You may have found out by other means, if so, please tell us. In the same box please feel free to say the area, town or village in which you live.**

**Name (optional):**

Jon Allen

**Please tell us how you found out about the survey:**

Through your invitation

**7 What is your email address?**

**Email:**

jon.allen@allen-haynes.com