

Submitted to Future Grant Support for Forestry
Submitted on 2023-05-16 17:13:47

Ministerial Foreword - Forestry in Scotland is a sector that we can be justly proud of.

1 - Introduction and Rationale for Providing Grant Support for Forestry

1. Do you agree that grant support for forestry should continue to be improved and developed as a discrete scheme within the overall package of land support?

Yes

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

While Tilhill recognises the strategic policy rationale for integrated agriculture and forestry land use and potential administrative benefits, we consider that separate grant schemes for agriculture and forestry should not be amalgamated into one grant scheme. We consider that this has the potential to be less clear and potentially more complicated which would curtail take up and woodland creation delivery. Rather, we would be seeking a more streamlined forestry grant system to make it more attractive, simpler, and straightforward to understand what is available, ease the application/approval/administration process and ensure a quick turnaround time for applications for landowners and investors if we are to reach the Scottish Government's ambitious Green Recovery targets for Forestry in Scotland to tackle the Biodiversity Crisis and Climate Emergency. Current woodland creation grant contacts and claims are excessively complicated because they often require to be associated with multiple component individual farm fields rather than allowing these to be amalgamated into a single unified forest "field". With several capital and maintenance options to claim for each field, the contracts, maps, and claims are excessively complicated and often lead to inadvertent mistakes, particularly where field boundaries are remeasured. This is an example of the agricultural compliance system being unsuitable for forestry.

2. Are there any changes that would allow for better complementarity between the forestry and agriculture funding options?

Yes

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

At Tilhill we would call for a distinctive offer for all forestry-related grants via Scottish Forestry as distinct from agriculture and via dedicated grant application platforms as current integration with the Rural Payments System is overly complicated to use and incompatible with forestry industry requirements. We consider that a mixed grant support model is too complicated and off-putting - to understand, apply for, regulate, and administer. In addition, we need to recognise and support the commercial facets of forests in the sequestration of carbon as a key strategic rationale for optimising land use and offsetting the carbon footprint of agriculture production methods, especially in livestock towards net zero farm holdings within a sustainable farming industry.

Where appropriate, there is scope to have overlapping "cross-boundary" initiatives, for example, deer control and agroforestry measures.

2 - Forests Delivering for Scotland's Climate Change Plan

3. How can the support package for forestry evolve to help tackle the climate emergency, to achieve net zero, and to ensure that our woodlands and forests are resilient to the future climate?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Tilhill is the UK's leading provider of nature-based solutions. Forests are an efficient way to sequester carbon which under the Scottish Governments Green Recovery pledge at COP26 Glasgow requires the planting at landscape scale if we are to begin to meet 70% carbon reduction targets by 2030 and net zero by 2045. Trees provide much-needed shade and cooling, particularly in urban environments which will be important as global temperatures rise, we extend our tree cover in both the wider landscape and in particular within urban areas. Trees also help in flood mitigation, slowing water run-off, reducing peak flows, and preventing erosion. As well as capturing carbon the forests produce a valuable and sustainable raw material to support our construction industry and invaluable rural jobs and infrastructure. Home-grown timber has multiple uses in many different products, reduces the need for imports, substitutes for massively carbon-hungry steel and concrete products, and reduces the significant carbon footprint of haulage and or shipping into the UK.

Resilience and sustainability also need to consider economic considerations, which are often ignored or overlooked by stakeholders and, sadly, in many policy documents, in favour of social and environmental issues. A just transition should apply to all sectors.

For example, the current UKFS text has no section on economic considerations and a word search is revealing – "economic" x 61 mentions, "environment" x 490 mentions, "sustainability" x 335 mentions, "biodiversity" x 190 mentions, "people" x 136 mentions and "social" x 77 mentions. In other words, the economic and sustainability impact of home-grown timber is not given sufficient prominence.

One of the key benefits of fast-growing conifers is that they sequester more carbon than slower growing species and produce a product that locks away that carbon. In addition to adaption measures, Tilhill is seeking to explore new innovative approaches working with leading research institutions, and public and private sector partners to trial new silvicultural techniques and identify climate-adaptive trees and shrubs that will cope with the predicted temperature increases. Consequently, the grant scheme must promote flexibility and support research and trials of adaptive and genetically improved species and the re-introduction of native species to trees, shrubs, and plants through the commercially important nursery sector as part of landscape restoration.

4. Private investment through natural capital and carbon schemes can make a valuable contribution to climate change. Do you agree that the grant support mechanism should have more flexibility to maximise the opportunities to blend private and public finance to support woodland creation,

Yes

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Tilhill considers we are well placed to champion and deliver at scale the collaboration forged between The Scottish Government Environment and Forestry (ENFOR) Directorate as a private sector company by bridging the gap between Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPB's) [organisation for which Scottish Government or Scottish Parliament are responsible] and private sector partnerships. We see opportunities for collaboration with leading plant science research institutes (such as the Hutton Institute and the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh) to partner with the public and private sectors to improve climate adaptability through plant science to mitigate risks (e.g. rising temperatures, adverse weather, floods, droughts, and storms) and identify resistance and treatments for the known and emerging pests and pathogens impacting the future production viability of commercial and amenity trees. Grant rates need to be reviewed and increased to take into account new practices, to reflect the societal benefits of environmental protection provided by forests and the resulting likely reduction of net areas of commercial forest production to maintain a viable return on investment.

We believe grant support should promote the maintenance and enhancement of viable forest habitat networks, allowing for plantations amongst restored and better-connected habitats. This powerful combination justifies supporting a positive financial contribution to the owner for the loss of commercial planting areas i.e. wider riparian corridors, peat/grassland protection, and environmental restoration areas or within and above montane zones. More flexibility and empowerment are required to identify and link areas for planting that enable both the economy of scale but also establishing forests to optimise economic land use and climate delivery at both a strategic and significant scale to tackle the climate emergency on a landscape scale. The Scottish Governments Green Recovery seeks to bring together new partnerships across the public sector organisation and agencies in collaboration with the private sector will be essential to deliver projects on both a small and landscape scale. This will necessitate the blending of public and private sector finance and resources to deliver and given the phasing of larger scale projects and it would be advantageous that grants are index-linked for the duration of multi-phased schemes.

5. How could the current funding package be improved to stimulate woodland expansion and better management across a wide range of woodland types, including native and productive woodlands?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

Through ENFOR the Scottish Government taking a strategic stance on the prioritisation of land use across Scotland for both socio-economic opportunities for sustainable timber production and tackling the climate emergency. As first priorities we consider that to deliver at a landscape scale will require accepting that environmental restrictions need to be prioritised and zoned to allow consideration of commercial yield (and by association optimise carbon sequestration leading to viable and valuable wood products) where this is appropriate and the process needs to be reviewed to support larger-scale woodland creation (over 100ha) by rationalising the extensive and time-consuming consultation process, encouraging ENFOR partners to agree on joint policy around this new national rationale to enable less conflict of purpose and present a collaborative approach into the public consultation process.

Grant support to promote suitable management of existing woodlands has declined with the result that a significant proportion of semi-natural and native woodlands are not being actively managed, and, largely due to excessive deer browsing, are in a declining condition - which mitigates against fulfilling their biodiversity potential and ability to withstand climate change. Countering deer browsing is one of the main constraints to woodland expansion and better management of all woodland types which has, until relatively recently, promoted excessive use of plastic tubes and costly fencing. Improved, targeted support for effective deer control would be a major step forwards. The existing woodland creation grant models are also too prescriptive and inflexible with regard to species composition. These could be simplified and broadened to encourage greater species and structural diversity when and where appropriate.

Provision of "community benefits" at cost to woodland creation scheme owners, in effect trying to leverage public funding, is a potential new barrier which is likely to deter significant and larger woodland schemes. Given the urgency of meeting planting targets, we do not believe that now is the right time to introduce such measures. Furthermore, we would advocate the provision of upfront grants to support the substantial survey, planning & consultation works required before any trees are planted.

6. Do you agree that it should be a requirement of grant support that woodlands are managed to ensure that they become more resilient to the impacts of climate change and pests and disease?

Yes

How can the grant scheme support this?:

At Tilhill we see a widely held view by some Regulator personnel, other organisations, stakeholders, and public opinion that only other conifers (i.e. not Sitka spruce) and broadleaves can make woodlands more resilient to climate change, pests, and disease. This is not necessarily the case when economic resilience and carbon sequestration are taken into account. We consider that the improved genetics of Sitka spruce are proven to be growing YC 30 and better! and can play a significant role in fixing carbon and the relative short rotation means major benefits from repeat rotations compared to longer rotations of much lower yield class other conifers or broadleaves. This is the only rational approach that takes account of the time pressure being brought to bear by the changing climate. On the second rotation, we support a replanting rationale which continues to optimise commercial production with amenity woodland designed for climate change mitigation, utilises species selection that is suitable for the location, and utilising advances in plant science for tree stock grown in Scotland (economic development for the local nursery industry); selected, bred, or treated to reduce susceptibility to known or emerging pests and pathogens and to support climate adaptation.

Management to promote climate change resilience should look to identify, enhance, expand, and link key habitat networks, diversifying age-class and species within the forest components, including fast-growing productive conifer species. Grant support for woodland management is currently very limited thus if made conditional on promoting a particularly narrow view of appropriate "resilience", this is unlikely to have any impact and may deter

engagement.

Encouragement for new technology such as somatic embryogenesis that enables tree breeders to respond to new threats. Sacrificing productivity to increase resilience by over diversification of species can be a false economy. Need continued research and trials of alternatives to SS but we have been looking for >100 years! We are over-reliant on a limited number of species, and we need to do everything we can to protect them from new pests and diseases with effective monitoring, response to outbreaks, and horizon scanning for what might be coming our way. The key will be forging partnerships with Forest Research and other plant science experts which as the James Hutton Institute, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, and the Higher Education sector to support new ideas, use of climate adaptive species, and developing innovative practices in both forestry and urban greening. Fast growing conifers give us the opportunity to adapt rotation to rotation as the climate changes. "We have all our eggs in one basket but that doesn't mean we should smash the eggs ourselves but look after them very carefully".

3 - Integrating Woodlands on Farms and Crofts

7. Which of the following measures would help reduce the barriers for crofters and farmers wanting to include woodland as part of their farming business? Please select all that apply.

Clearer guidance on grant options, Flexibility within options, Intervention level, Support with cashflow, Information on how current land use could continue with trees integrated throughout

Are there others not listed above?:

Tilhill has been a leader in forest management and advisory services with our experience spanning over 70 years. We work closely with Scottish Forestry to ensure compliance with policy and procedures and are respected for both our professionalism and reputation. We see an opportunity with our presence throughout Scotland for creating a public/private partnership initiative to support crofters and farmers to get the right advice and delivery of programmes that are coordinated and commercially attractive to the landowner/tenant. We believe we have both the ability and track record to provide a one-stop-shop for advice and delivery to suit both the individual needs and that of the wider rural community and economy – perhaps a specific grant option to encourage tenants and crofters to benefit from planting trees during their occupancy that this would further improve the environment and afford opportunities for the retention of tenants and crofters as part of socio-economic and sustainable communities in remote rural and island communities.

8. Establishing small woodlands can have higher costs. What specific mechanisms would better support small scale woodlands and woodland ownership?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

At Tilhill we consider that the new scheme should offer grant rates that are higher for smaller economies of scale or for sites which are more difficult or expensive to prepare for woodland creation. In addition, all small woodlands should have a requirement and appropriate funding to erect new deer fencing (with rabbit netting as appropriate) or upgrading of stock fencing to deer fences as deer & rabbits are a major constraint to limiting establishment and the production of good quality trees.

Competitive funding has worked previously and in other sectors, but this tends to generate very high-cost schemes, usually maximising fencing. A bespoke Regulator advice service, grant package, and advisor services are probably required, failing which, the grant process needs to be made simpler and more generous to support small-scale woodlands.

4 - Forests Delivering for People and Communities

9. How can forestry grants better support an increase in easily accessible, sustainably managed woodlands in urban and peri-urban areas?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

At Tilhill we strongly support accessible forests. The new scheme should allow for the provision of integrated and connected public access facilities – styles, gates, signposting, and stoning of surfaces can all help provide access and a management grant will help encourage mid-rotation works and maintenance of public access. Vandalism and theft is a major factor impacting urban woodland creation and therefore we consider grant aid should be increased to promote local engagement and education to promote a sense of ownership and care for their community woodland.

Targeted additional peri-urban woodland creation and WIAT funding has worked well in the past and, subject to funding priorities, could be re-targeted particularly to areas of high deprivation to meet the additional costs.

10. How can grant support for forestry better enable rural communities to realise greater benefits from woodland to support community wealth building?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

By its spatial nature, forestry, and woodlands already provide both tangible and intangible community benefits, often at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Improved, more formalised, public access opportunities (via forest tracks and rides) have previously been recognised and well supported by community stakeholders, which generally leads to proactive and regular use as an access destination and resource.

The Green Recovery will require woodland creation at a landscape scale and on a national level. This affords the opportunity to create more varied, better connected, and interesting landscapes, places to visit and enjoy. At a wider level, operational work, and interpretation/promotion already provide local jobs but more emphasis needs to be placed on promoting community engagement for all ages (especially via schools e.g. Learning Outside the

Classroom), to promote forestry as a positive career choice and to sustain community groups through experiencing the health and well-being benefits of forests today while actively tackling the climate emergency where they live.

More direct grant support could be considered to encourage the promotion of the wider benefits of forests and woodland to communities and to promote pro-active engagement - possibly through activities (e.g. sponsored forest open days targeted at local communities) or services (e.g. funded ranger posts).

At a deeper level, public funding to allow communities to acquire forests and woodland to benefit from ownership and wealth creation has had mixed results, often at prohibitive cost and with more uncertain outcomes.

Key to thriving rural communities is the availability of employment. Productive Forestry from planting through harvesting and processing provides a wide range of employment opportunities from semi-skilled to high level management. Forestry or woodland that does not have a significant productive component is of less benefit to rural communities, beyond the establishment phase, than one that does.

11. How can the forest regulatory and grant processes evolve to provide greater opportunities for communities to be involved in the development of forestry proposals?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

The forest industry's record on public consultation is exemplary compared to almost all other land uses and the vast majority of woodland creation applications are approved without issue.

Tilhill also wishes to highlight the clear differences between consultation -> engagement->empowerment, which reflect an increasing depth of responsibility and decision-making power. Consultation suggests stakeholders are being informed and reasonable suggestions consistent with owner objectives and policy could be adopted. Engagement implies that stakeholders may assist in choosing between viable options, with the ultimate decision made by the owner. Empowerment would entitle stakeholders to define options and possibly also make decisions, and is felt to be beyond the scope of forestry Regulation.

Currently, the landowner's objectives, site constraints and opportunities, industry standards, guidance, and grant model requirements set the parameters for generating proposals for woodland creation and management. Technical aspects of the design/plan are normally the realm of statutory stakeholders and the Regulator, to ensure consistent application of national and regional policy, regulation, and appropriate interpretation of guidance. Engagement with stakeholders addresses any remaining issues, and the current consultation processes are considered to be effective in most cases, with the Issues Log being a considerable help in recording, assessing, addressing, and communicating mitigation of constraints, including issues raised by members of the community.

"Communities" comprise a wide diaspora of individuals, groups, and interests and only a small minority will have any technical knowledge or experience of land/forest management and the policies, regulations, and guidance that direct the industry.

When conducting community consultation, typically, only a minority are motivated to respond and, of those, the majority are interested in finding out more about the proposals or to express opinions on particular aspects (usually single issues, such as public access provision). This group tends not to express their thoughts publicly and engage one-to-one for discussion.

Occasionally, a minority of vociferous detractors will raise issues, very vocally and publicly, using social media to promote their views including direct to politicians and the media. In almost all cases, they ignore the legitimate objectives of the landowner, and the policy/regulation/guidance landscape and seek to impose their own opinions and preferences. In the most strident examples, the underlying issue appears to be with the content of policy and grant models that the owner is electing to follow.

Consultation with communities can therefore be fraught, particularly when their knowledge of policy/regulation/guidance is low, and the views of a vociferous minority can polarise discussions. This suggests that consultation should be directed through recognised and formal community groups (i.e. Community Councils) that have a track record of engaging with the planning process.

We have previously highlighted that forest open days could be funded to drive this and held to promote the industry, and our practices and to build rapport with groups of community councils (and other relevant stakeholders), such that when woodland creation and management plans are consulted, the groups have better knowledge on which to base comments and feedback. Communities need to feel they have been listened to through effective consultation and "bought in" to the woodland being created which after all has been funded through their taxes.

12. How can the forestry regulatory and grant processes evolve to ensure that there is greater transparency about proposals and the decisions that have been made on them?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

We have an environmental, landscape, and public perception legacy of commercial forestry in the 1970-the 80s to overcome if we are to plant at scale to tackle the climate emergency. Scottish Forestry has a critical role to play as the forest authority in Scotland to lead and (in collaboration with the Tilhill and others) to proactively work in and with communities to both advocates and reassure the public and communities of the benefits of well-designed woodland creation schemes. This would allow time to present the benefits of new woodland to the local community in terms of their biodiversity, recreation, and landscape but also, and significantly, to show how planting productive trees make a significant contribution to the local and national economy. It is vital the benefits are explained by an independent but qualified practitioner and/or Scottish Forestry as the forest authority and not just by the applicant who, while presenting the case for any new woodland, is often responded with "you are bound to say this". This process would then take some of the shock or negative surprise when larger applications are made in their "back yard".

We have previously highlighted that forest open days could be funded to drive this and held to promote the industry, and our practices and to build rapport with groups of community councils (and other relevant stakeholders), such that when woodland creation and management plans are consulted, the groups have better knowledge on which to base comments and feedback.

Better use of the Issues Log would address issues of transparency, particularly if this was publicly available online.

13. Forestry grants have been used to stimulate rural forestry businesses by providing support with capital costs. Do you agree that this has been an effective measure to stimulate rural business?

Yes

a. How could this approach be used to support further forestry businesses?:

The R&D costs of new machinery are often borne by individual businesses/contractors with the recent development of new tractor-mounted mounding machines for woodland creation being a good example. In a similar vein, a new mounding prototype for restock sites is being developed by Dick Brothers. Capital grants for innovation would help to turn ideas into new machines, equipment, and forest practice.

b. How could this approach be used to support further skills development?:

Tilhill strongly supports the provision of grants to support innovation and enterprise through incentivisation or competitions for funding utilising R&D innovation hubs/partnerships i.e. Interface: University of Strathclyde Design and Manufacturing faculty.

14. How could the FGS processes and rules be developed to encourage more companies and organisations to provide training positions within the forestry sector?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

We are developing the Tilhill Academy to foster skills development in our sector for developing the next generation of forest managers. In response to the opportunities presented for the expansion of forestry which will help to tackle the climate emergency, we are seeking to establish a pipeline for young people to join this generational challenge and this must start from school via STEM and tertiary education at S4 and S5 and developing career paths into apprenticeships and placements alongside new eco-forestry qualifications including Certificate and diplomas to academic higher education degree and post graduate programmes.

Given the increasing complexity and volume of policy, regulation, guidance, grant models, and the application process, the Regulator, stakeholders, and the private sector should collaborate far more. For example, a few days of job shadowing would greatly increase understanding and experience of different roles and skills required across the sector.

5 - Forests Delivering for Biodiversity and the Environment

15. The primary purpose of FGS is to encourage forestry expansion and sustainable forest management, of which a key benefit is the realisation of environmental benefits. How can future grant support better help to address biodiversity loss in Scotland including the regeneration and expansion of native woodlands?

Please explain your answer in the text box.:

The challenge is going to be the need to plant at a landscape scale to achieve the area of new woodland cover required to sequester carbon at a significantly high level to meet SG targets while seeking to manage statutory protection and conservation of biodiversity and affording opportunities for habitat restoration. This will require strategic multi-agency and stakeholder management in a way not seen before and an important component will be the understanding that Sitka spruce (and other conifer species) are the key economic sustainability driver, which also reduces our dependency on imported timber while creating climate adaptive and diversity-rich forests. However, accepting this strategic rationale for sustainable timber production married with protecting and enhancing biodiversity will be very challenging going forward. Getting the balance right will necessitate a new approach to seeing carbon sequestration as an integral part of tackling climate change and will have to be central to SG policy as a clear priority of national importance. The new grant system will need to support what, where and how we protect, conserve, and restore our natural capital and native biodiversity will have to be made clear and accepted as necessary by all NDPBs, conservation organisations, stakeholders, communities, and individuals – we are fast running out of time to act before it is too late.

As previously highlighted, managing deer numbers is important to the realisation of many environmental benefits, allowing woodlands to function as viable ecosystems and potentially to allow expansion through natural regeneration at minimal cost to the taxpayer as farm subsidies and resulting land use changes take effect.

In addition, limited management funding has recently been directed to intervention to address biodiversity loss (i.e. management failure), rather than to reward success (payments for Ecosystem Services). This requires joined-up SG thinking to link budgets and policies – for example, invest in catchment planting rather than building flood defences.

16. Herbivore browsing and damage can have a significant impact on biodiversity loss and restrict regeneration. How could forestry grant support mechanisms evolve to ensure effective management of deer populations at:

Landscape scale?:

The ideal scenario would be to massively increase deer control efforts to reduce the need (and cost) for deer fencing required to protect new woodland creation schemes. Currently, it would appear that only those with a vested interest in managing deer numbers down to sustainable levels are actively engaged in successfully supporting this initiative. Tilhill notes that we are already actively and (largely) successfully managing deer numbers over 100,000ha of managed client properties to safeguard vulnerable second rotation crops and have planted c. 10,000ha of woodland creation schemes in recent years, often without deer fencing. In most cases, this is achieved without a deer management grant and irrespective of neighbours' actions or local deer management groups, which have been found to be unreliable.

Grant support could evolve by:

LANDSCAPE SCALE

1. Continue to support woodland creation projects that will require deer fencing until such time that effective landscape control is achieved.
2. Review restricting deer fence grants to productive schemes or areas considered outside high-density deer areas – although Sitka is less vulnerable, other species are difficult to establish.
3. Offer higher rates for deer management grant - £6/ha is inadequate, particularly given the low value of venison.
4. If need be, trial a distinct area first (e.g. Cowal).
5. Compensatory culls need to be encouraged for the entire deer range. This may rely on neighbours participating.
6. Offer grants subject to the independent setting of cull targets, records, and monitoring of crop damage. In addition, this could simplify the application process – no need to waste grant money to prepare a deer management plan if cull efforts/results are impartially reviewed annually.
7. Fund strategically located deer larders and marketing of venison – a pre-requisite to get venison into the commercial food chain and to verify cull numbers.
8. Fund deer control over a larger footprint area than the (large-scale?) woodland creation area, reflecting that 1,000ha of unfenced planting may require control over 5,000ha of adjacent land, possibly beyond the ownership boundary.
9. Include adjacent vulnerable native woodlands in the cull area and for monitoring.
10. Make grant model conditions and payments more flexible – if open to browsing, some areas will take longer to establish and require more maintenance.

Small scale mixed land use?:

SMALL-SCALE MIXED LAND USE

1. Deer, rabbits, and hares are more of an issue on pasture land thus rabbit fencing is also required and promotes natural regeneration of trees and vegetation.
2. We want to avoid using plastic tubes – or at least make sure they are removed at the end of their useful life. Non-plastic tubes are currently much more expensive (+£3/tube).
3. Deer control across a limited area is often ineffective because deer wander across multiple ownership boundaries. Thus, more pro-active deer management is required at a landscape scale and for a number of years if fencing is to be avoided. Central coordination, an emphasis on compliance, and funding is required.
4. Offer higher maintenance grants to support the use of deer repellents and/or cull control, and for 6-10 years after planting.
5. Fund strategically located deer larders – a pre-requisite to get venison into the commercial food chain and to verify cull numbers.
6. Funding for rabbit control in hot-spot areas?

If you wish to make any other relevant comments, please do so in the text box below.

Please add your comments here.:

Tilhill is the UK's leading provider of nature-based solutions.

We have been in the forest management industry for over 70 years and currently manage approximately 200 000ha in GB

The first plantations we created have been harvested and replanted and are about due for harvesting again. Our graduates are highly skilled and acutely aware of the part they will play in finding innovative solutions for the next generation of foresters to tackle the climate emergency, sequester more carbon and enhance the biodiversity as part of truly integrated land use in Scotland.

Trees are at the heart of Tilhill. We help to purchase forests and woodlands, we design, plant, protect and maintain them, provide the engineering skills to access the timber contained within them then harvest for the best quality timber which we market to achieve the best price for our clients.

As an overlay to this work, we are also skilled at advising on and acquiring funding, as well as using the most up-to-date technology to survey and map the forests and woodlands. The integrity of the environment and the safety of our staff, contractors and the public is uppermost in everything we do.

About you

What is your name?

Name:

Kevin Reid

What is your email address?

Email:

kevin.reid@tilhill.com

Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?

Organisation

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

Tilhill

Scottish Forestry would like your permission to publish your response. Please indicate your publishing preference:

Publish response with name

We may share your response internally with other Scottish Forestry policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Forestry to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Yes

I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.

I consent