

Agenda Item	13
Report No	EDI 09/19

HIGHLAND COUNCIL

Committee: Environment, Development and Infrastructure

Date: 31 January 2019

Report Title: Scottish Government/Historic Environment Scotland Consultations on Draft Historic Environment Policy and Scotland's Forest Strategy 2019-2029

Report By: Director of Development and Infrastructure

1. Purpose/Executive Summary

1.1 This report provides an overview, for homologation, of the response to two recent Scottish Government consultations: Historic Environment Scotland's draft *Historic Environment Policy* and the Scottish Government's draft *Scotland's Forestry Strategy 2019 – 2029*.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Members are invited to homologate the responses to Historic Environment Scotland's Historic Environment Policy and the Scottish Government's Scottish Forestry Strategy.

3. Draft Historic Environment Policy

3.1 Background

- 3.1.1 On 10 September 2018, Historic Environment Scotland (HES) published for consultation the draft Historic Environment Policy (HEP). The HEP will replace the existing Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement, an interim document published when HES was formed as a non-departmental public body in 2015.
- 3.1.2 HEP sets out a series of principles and policies for the recognition, care, management and sustainable use of the historic environment. It is not intended to be operational guidance but rather “a statement directing decision makers”. Detailed operational guidance included the current Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement but not included in the draft HEP will be contained in separate policy guidance (not yet released for public consultation).
- 3.1.3 The HEP will be non-statutory and will sit alongside Scottish Planning Policy and the National Planning Framework as a key policy to which Local Authorities are directed where a proposal may affect the historic environment.
- 3.1.4 The deadline for submissions for responses to the consultation was 3 December 2018. However, the Council do not appear to have been directly consulted and we were only made aware of the consultation at a late stage. Unfortunately there was not sufficient time to consult internally and draft a response for Member’s approval prior to the previous EDI committee on 8 November 2018. Members are therefore asked to homologate this response.
- 3.1.5 The Council’s response includes substantial input and contributions from the Council’s Historic Environment, Development Management and Development Plans teams.

3.2 Response

- 3.2.1 The consultation response is included at **Appendix 1**. A summary of the concerns raised are as follows:
- the draft HEP does not adequately address the importance and fragility of the historic environment which makes a substantial contribution to the Highland economy, helps define a sense of place and is a key driver for tourism;
 - development management feel that the proposed policies do not give the Council comfort that they offer sufficient support to robustly reject a proposal that may have a significant adverse impact on the historic environment;
 - the draft HEP could be seen to conflict with the Scottish Government’s policies as set out under the ‘Valuing the Historic Environment’ section of Scottish Planning Policy; and
 - forthcoming HEP operational guidance will be instrumental in how the Local Authority interacts with Historic Environment Scotland and operates on a day-to-day basis. It would have been helpful in forming a view on the draft HEP if the operational guidance was consulted upon concurrently with the draft HEP as many of the issues raised in the Council’s response may be addressed in the operational guidance.
- 3.2.2 As well as general comments summarised above, the consultation posed a long series of detailed questions (via an online SurveyMonkey questionnaire) on each element of the draft HEP including a challenges and opportunities infographic, the principles and

policies, glossary definitions and associated guidance. The Council's response to the SurveyMonkey questionnaire follows the format provided by HES and is included in the appendix for completeness.

4. Draft Scotland's Forestry Strategy 2019 – 2029

4.1 Background

4.1.1 On 20 September 2018 Scottish Government published for consultation Scotland's Forestry Strategy 2019 – 2029: consultation draft (SFS). The draft SFS provides a 10-year framework for action and the strategy is fundamental to the Scottish Government's ambitions for sustainable forestry management.

4.1.2 The SFS updates previous forestry strategies; it places forestry at the heart of government, and it drives and underpins the wide variety of forest and woodland activities taking place throughout the country delivering an extensive range of sustainable economic, environmental and social benefits, now and in the future.

4.1.3 The draft strategy has been prepared in line with the Forestry and Land Management (Scotland) Act 2018. It provides an overview of forestry in Scotland, sets out a long-term vision for Scottish forestry within the context of the Scottish Government's wider land use ambitions, identifies the major issues that need to be addressed to realise the vision, and identifies clear priorities for action and policies for delivery.

4.1.4 Following the consultation period, the consultation responses will be used to prepare the final strategy, with the aim of laying it, and associated documentation before the Scottish Parliament in early 2019.

4.2 Response

4.2.1 The consultation is available online at <https://consult.gov.scot/forestry/scotlands-forestry-strategy-2019-29/> and the deadline for submission of responses was 29 November 2018. The full response to the draft SFS can be found in the Appendix, but a summary of the key points follows.

4.2.2 The draft SFS proposes a long-term vision for forestry in Scotland which is generally positive in terms of proposing forest expansion and forestry being a sustainably managed asset.

4.2.3 The draft SFS identifies objectives for forestry as economic, environmental and social which is just a reordering of the objectives from the previous Strategy to give greater emphasis to economic growth.

4.2.4 The draft SFS contains an assessment of the major issues likely to have the greatest impact on the achievement of objectives and they correlate well with the issues identified in the Challenges and Opportunities section of the Highland Forest and Woodland Strategy.

4.2.5 The draft SFS identifies ten priorities where action is most needed to deliver the objectives and vision. These are generally welcome, but it was suggested in the consultation response that greater significance should be given to the issue of maintaining a deteriorating rural road network/ infrastructure while timber haulage while timber supply forecasts are set to rise over the next decade.

5 Implications

5.1 The draft HEP and SFS raises no issues in relation to resources, legal, climate change or community. There is a risk that the draft HEP, if adopted by HES in its current form, may impact how the Council manage change in the historic environment. However, any such changes can be incorporated without significant amendments to the Council's own processes and procedures.

5.2 Gaelic – No implications.

Designation: Director of Development and Infrastructure

Date: 7 January 2019

Author: Andrew Puls, Acting Environment Manager
Grant Stuart, Forestry Officer

Contributions from: Dorothy Stott, Principal Planner
Norman Brockie, Planning Officer
Kirsty Cameron, Archaeologist
Ian Scrivener-Lindley, Historic Environment Record Officer
Peter Atkinson, Graduate Planner (Development Plans)

APPENDIX 1 HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND *DRAFT* HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT POLICY

HIGHLAND COUNCIL RESPONSE

Please ask for: Andrew Puls
Direct Dial: 01463 702505
E-mail: Andrew.puls@highland.gov.uk
Your Reference:
Our Reference:
Date: 3 December 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

Draft Historic Environment Policy Consultation

The Council welcome the revised national Historic Environment Policy. The Council's response incorporates views and comments from across the Development and Infrastructure Service with detailed input from Development Management, Development Plans and the Historic Environment Team. The Council's detailed response can be found in the appendix and follows the same format as the Survey Monkey questionnaire. More general comments on the consultation and content of the HEP have been included below.

General comments

As far as we are able to ascertain, the Highland Council has not been specifically consulted on the draft policy and nor has there been any widespread public consultation which would alert the owners of historic properties/sites to the presence of such a change in policy. The consultation was brought to our attention via an ALGAO mailing list. The HEP introductory pages say that it supports everyone's participation but does not appear to have engaged Councils, far less land owners/property owners or the general public in the development of the revised policy document. Proper consultation and education is key in the rolling out of any policy – particularly with key stakeholders i.e. Local Authorities and land/property owners. The Historic Environment Scotland website includes no reference to the draft HEP and even taking into account that the consultation started in September and in using the 'search' box there was an article in the News section on 10 September, the point remains that the consultation was far from obvious.

HEP is a high level policy and therefore consists of broad generalisations. We have concerns that the policy appears to be framed to principally enable development and does not adequately address the importance and fragility of the historic environment. It also fails to acknowledge that there will be circumstances where the level or nature of the change proposed is neither good nor necessary for the future wellbeing of the historic environment or for the community associated with that place. This concern is reflected in the proposed wording of HEP3 and HEP4, neither of which give the Council comfort that, where a proposal will have significant adverse impacts in relation to the historic environment, it can be robustly rejected.

There appears to be a lack of clarity in the HEP wording with regard to communities and insufficient detailed attention to the HEP wording in relation to local government and planning with clearer support and guidance needed for Local Authorities. Indeed there is concern that the HEP could be seen to conflict with the Scottish Government's policies as set out under the 'Valuing the Historic Environment' section of SPP. The Council would have liked the HEP to have reiterated and elaborated on the policies set out in SPP, rather than weaken their position.

There is also concern that it is not possible to give full or detailed comments on the draft HEP, or be aware of its strengths or weaknesses, without site of the accompanying detailed operational guidance. Many of the issues raised here may be addressed in the operational guidance – as a consultee it would have been helpful to have seen the content of both documents at the same time.

If Historic Environment Scotland would find it helpful to discuss the draft policy in more detail, we would be happy to do so.

Yours sincerely

ANDREW PULS
Acting Environment Manager
Development & Infrastructure

SURVEY MONKEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Purpose and Status

A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO THE ENVIRONMENT

STRONGLY AGREE

CLIMATE CHANGE

Our approach to decision-making affecting the historic environment must recognise and respond to ongoing climate change and support reductions in carbon emissions and waste.

NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

In relation to preserving the character of the historic environment (HE), how one deals with supporting carbon reduction is often an on balance judgement.

Whilst we must “respond” to ongoing climate change, preserving the character of the HE should be the priority, goal and driver. Carbon reduction measures should only be applied where they can be shown to not adversely impact the character of the HE.

The issue of coastal erosion is presumably included within the generic climate change terminology, but given the scale of this problem to both archaeological and built heritage it would benefit from specific mention.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND EMPOWERMENT

[The more people engage with and participate in decision-making affecting the historic environment, the more sound the decisions we make will be.*] Decisions about the historic environment don't just have an impact on the conservation of the historic environment – they also have an impact on people. [Decision-makers need to weigh up potentially conflicting needs in an open and transparent way, so that everyone can understand how the decision was made. ^]

NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

* We **disagree** with the first line. In development management terms, engagement is an integral part of the planning system, but it does not necessarily follow that the more people that engage, the better a decision will be. Engagement in decision making can vary significantly depending on the nature of the application and engagement (especially in relation to proposals affecting the HE) is at its most useful when it is informed; ill-informed engagement can at times be negative and result in less sound decisions being made. See also the concern regarding the definition of “decision-makers”.

^ We **strongly agree** with this statement, but strongly disagree with the definition of “decision-makers” in this context.

DIVERSITY AND EQUALITY

Our historic environment should be accessible and provide a source of inspiration, enjoyment and learning for everyone. [It should reflect the whole of our society. We need to think and talk

about the past in a way that includes everyone, and that celebrates and recognises the diversity of our heritage. *]

STRONGLY AGREE

* Yes, but it also needs to recognise that our society is different now than it was in the past and that there will be *elements* of our HE that only reflect *elements* of modern society.

ECONOMIC CHANGE

A strong economy supports effective management of the historic environment. The historic environment also contributes to inclusive and sustainable economic growth. We should always aim to maximise this, and make sure that people are aware of it. [We need to be sure that our systems are flexible enough to handle changes in the economy. *]

AGREE

* Our regulatory system, based on statute and policy is flexible to a point that development can proceed in different economic circumstances. Decisions are made taking into account a range of factors to ensure the best outcome for the HE. It is, however, essential that the outcome for the HE is the primary concern and key driver for all involved, irrespective of the wider economic position.

FUNDING

STRONGLY AGREE

INTANGIBLE HERITAGE

Established ways of managing the historic environment are based around physical, tangible things. These might be buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes. Intangible heritage includes things that do not have a physical presence – things like stories, skills, or traditions. We need to improve our understanding of this intangible heritage. [We need to celebrate and recognise it properly so that it can inform our understanding of the past and the decisions we take. *]

DISAGREE

* As a sector, we deal with tangible sites and we are unsure at this stage what relevance intangible heritage, although valuable, has in relation to our specific remits and especially within the planning system. Ultimately, the presence of intangible heritage (such as a story, skill or tradition) is unlikely to alter a planning decision, unless it can be linked to a *tangible* site. However, we do STRONGLY AGREE that encouraging and fostering the uptake of traditional intangible skills is an urgent action to enable the appropriate and sensitive repair and maintenance of our tangible heritage.

LAND MANAGEMENT

STRONGLY AGREE

But, this area needs urgent action. Currently the systems in place to protect the HE from agriculture and forestry for example are not sufficient and are not working effectively. Equally, measures to protect Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes and Battlefields from small-scale land

management are non-existent, allowing actions to be taken that adversely affect the special interest of the site, i.e. important trees to be felled, fields deep ploughed etc.
To enable change in this area it needs resources, changes to legislation and funding.

CREATING AND MAINTAINING PLACES

STRONGLY AGREE

The Council fully support the aspiration, but to make it happen in practice will require changes in policy to drive change.

REGULATORY CHANGE

STRONGLY AGREE

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

STRONGLY AGREE

This is a significant issue. The Council agree that taking care of the HE is a shared responsibility but there is currently a lack of clarity in relation to who does what and confusion on part of developers and the general public. The Council strongly advocate the clear definition of roles and responsibilities for those operating within the HE, especially HES and LAs. This will not only be of benefit to HES and LAs, but for all stakeholders. Following agreement, this may be a good subject for a guidance note or a formally published reference document.

SKILLS AND CAPACITY

Good management relies on [decision-makers*] having access to the right skills and expertise to make informed decisions. We need to make sure that there is time and support for [decision-makers*] to do their jobs effectively.

STRONGLY AGREE

* See comment in glossary regarding definition of “decision makers”. The glossary definition, when applied to this section, is at best unhelpful.

We Strongly Agree with this statement in reference to Local Authorities and HES. Local Authorities should be better resourced. In relation to having access to the right skills and expertise, we require better access to tradespeople with traditional skills. The sector would benefit from students graduating from Universities with a better understanding and appreciation of heritage management and how the system operates outside of academia. Currently, graduates lack many of the skills required and have little in depth knowledge or understanding of real-world management issues.

SOCIETAL CHANGE

Our population is ageing and shifting. It is better connected than ever before. Our communities are growing and our lifestyles are changing. All of these things should influence how we manage the historic environment. We need to make sure that we are recognising and anticipating these trends, and that our systems proactively respond to them.

STRONGLY DISAGREE

It should be clearer as to what relevance an ageing and better connected population has to heritage and why this would influence how we manage the historic environment. There appears to be no obvious reason as to why ageing or shifting communities would have any impact on “our systems”, or management of the HE. Is it, for example, in relation to development pressure? If so this should be clearly stated.

SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

[Tourism brings huge benefits to the wider economy and specifically provides financial resources for looking after many historic sites and buildings. *] High visitor numbers can also affect the sites themselves, and create challenges for managing them. We need to make sure that we effectively balance these effects to secure long-term benefits.

STRONGLY DISAGREE

* Tourism may provide resources for looking after a very small percentage of the most iconic sites and buildings, but the vast majority of assets receive no money (as a consequence of tourism) to aid their longer term preservation. This would be better worded as “*Tourism brings huge benefits to the wider economy and provides financial resources for looking after a small number of our many historic sites and buildings”.*

ARE THERE ANY GAPS IN THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES LISTED ABOVE?

YES

Overall, many of the challenges and opportunities outlined above appear to have lost their connection with the HE. The HE should - in all cases - be the main consideration, the most important factor, and ultimately at the centre of the infographic. It reads as a corporate, internal document, rather than a document to be adopted by the wider sector.

Some of the wording is vague and it's difficult to be clear what has not been included. However, from our reading, it does not clearly address direct effects and challenges to heritage, for example abandonment, under use, vacancy and lack of maintenance. It does not address issues with inconsistent decision making, for example across Council boundaries, through the appeals process and within individual Local Authorities.

2. Principles and policies: Understanding and Recognition

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following core principles for Understanding and Recognition?

A wide range of values can contribute to cultural significance

STRONGLY AGREE

Knowledge and information about the historic environment is critical to the understanding of our past, present and future. A place must be understood for its significance to be identified

STRONGLY AGREE

The historic environment evolves over time, and so does our understanding and appreciation of it

STRONGLY AGREE

We are all responsible for enhancing our knowledge and making it widely accessible*

NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

* This statement has been interpreted differently by different people. The Council's view is that it is unreasonable to suggest that everyone is *responsible* for making knowledge widely accessible. However, we are unsure who 'we' are? Is this in reference to HES?

HEP 1

Decision-makers should adopt a holistic approach to the historic environment, incorporating an inclusive understanding of its breadth and cultural significance.

See concern regarding definition of "Decision-makers". By taking a holistic approach to the HE, you are by definition "incorporating an inclusive understanding of its breadth and cultural significance." We suggest the second part of this sentence is not necessary and should be removed. We are not clear what the word "breadth" means in the context of this sentence. We suggest "context" would be better (assuming we've understood the meaning of HEP1 correctly). Policies should be clear, concise, written in plain English and avoid jargon – we feel HEP1 could be made clearer.

3. Principles and policies: Managing Change

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following core principles for Managing Change?

Change has to happen for places to thrive *
STRONGLY DISAGREE

Good decisions take a long-term view
STRONGLY AGREE

Good decisions are transparent, robust, consistent and proportionate ^
AGREE

Caring for our historic environment benefits everyone, now and in the future
STRONGLY AGREE

To manage the future of the historic environment in a sustainable way, its significance, and the significance of elements within it have to be understood
STRONGLY AGREE

Good decisions make sure that nothing is lost without considering its value first and exploring options for avoiding its loss
STRONGLY AGREE

Good decisions retain the cultural significance of the historic environment
STRONGLY AGREE

* Change does *not have* to happen for a place to thrive. Change *can* be a catalyst for a place to thrive, although it is vital that that change is informed. This statement is open to interpretation, i.e. what is change? For example, planting a commercial woodland on a prehistoric settlement is 'change', but it is change that that will destroy the HE and not allow it to thrive. How is 'thrive' being defined? Is this in economic terms, or in cultural terms, or both? The Council suggest re-wording this statement along the following lines: "where change is proposed, it must be informed, avoid harm and enable a place to thrive".

^ We agree that good decisions should be consistent, but in practice they rarely are. “Proportionate” is a difficult and potentially difficult word where it does not come with clarification, i.e. proportionate to what? This could be applied in a multitude of ways, some of which could be very unhelpful in protecting the HE.

HEP 2

Decision-makers should ensure that the benefits, understanding and enjoyment of the historic environment are secured for the long term.

Again, the Council have a significant issue with the definition of ‘decision-makers’ in this context. We are not sure what “benefits” are being referred to.

HEP3

Strategic plans and policies and the allocation of resources should protect and promote the historic environment.

[Where detrimental impacts on the historic environment [arising from plans and programmes*] are identified and unavoidable, steps should be taken to demonstrate that other options have been explored and mitigation measures put in place. ^]

* What plans and programmes? Does this refer to development plans? This should be made clearer.
^ The Council has significant reservations over the wording of the last sentence of HEP3. However, it appears to be saying the same thing as the last sentence of HEP4. Although the Council still have significant issues with this line, the HEP4 wording is clearer and easier to follow – we suggest it should be used here in place of the existing sentence (subject to the amendment suggested below).

HEP4

When considering changes to specific assets and their context, significant harm should be avoided. Opportunities for enhancement should be sought where appropriate. Where detrimental impacts on the historic environment are unavoidable, these should be minimised and mitigation measures put in place.

First sentence: “*When considering changes to ~~specific~~ assets ...*”, remove “specific” and replace with “historic”. Otherwise it may be difficult to apply this to assets which are not just one specific site or feature, i.e. GDLs, battlefields, conservation areas.

Second sentence: “*...are unavoidable and can be justified...*”. We have significant concerns with the wording of HEP4. Where ‘detrimental impacts are unavoidable’, rather than attempting to minimise the impacts and putting in place mitigation measures, the development may in fact be refused. This policy does *not* support this position. It is essential that the policy clearly states that, where detrimental impacts are unavoidable and development cannot be justified in light of its impacts it may therefore not be appropriate or supported. Minimising detrimental impacts and mitigation measures are only ever contemplated if robust justification is provided that clearly demonstrates that the advantages of the development outweigh the negative impacts on the historic environment.

The Council suggest that HEP3 and HEP4 could be merged into a single policy and worded in such a way as follows:

Strategic plans and policies and the allocation of resources should protect and promote the historic environment. When considering changes to historic assets and their context, significant harm should be avoided. Opportunities for enhancement should be sought where appropriate. Where detrimental impacts on the historic environment are unavoidable and can be justified, these should be minimised and mitigation measures put in place.

4. Principles and policies: Working Together

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following core principles for Working Together?

Everyone has a stake in the historic environment and how it is looked after
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

Effective management is a collective effort *
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

Effective management should be undertaken in balance with the surrounding environment ^
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

The best management involves empowering and involving communities ~
DISAGREE

Early dialogue and close collaboration lead to better outcomes
STRONGLY AGREE

* The Council do not agree that this statement can be applied in all cases and the use of the term collective (without stating who is in the collective) raises issues. The Council can see how this statement can be applied to the management of Conservation Areas for example. However, it would not apply in the same way to private buildings. Presumably in this context “collective” is relative to the individual asset as not all assets will benefit from input from a wide variety and range of input. As stated earlier, In Development Management terms it does not logically follow that the more people involved in the management of an asset results in a better or more effective outcome. Often the reverse is true.

^ The Council are unclear what this statement means, especially the wording “...in balance with the surrounding environment...”

~ Empowering communities is always important. However, it is not always the case that the ‘best’ management of the HE involves empowering and involving local communities. It may be in some circumstances (conservation areas for example) but in others, especially where private buildings and land are involved, the best management is often a result of the careful and informed discussion between the owner and planning authority, as well as HES where required.

HEP5

Everyone should have the opportunity to enjoy our historic environment, to contribute to our shared knowledge and to participate in decision-making.

Agree. No comment

HEP6

People should be empowered to benefit from the historic environment for the purpose of the sustainable development of their communities and places.

Why only “for the purpose of sustainable development”? The Council are not clear how this policy could be applied. It may be a better policy if it simply said “*People should be empowered to benefit from the historic environment*”.

The Council’s Development Plans team have given the following response to HEP6: Policy HEP6 is the only statement in the consultation that is not covered by existing Highland Council planning policy. Policy 57 makes no mention of empowerment and, while Supplementary Guidance: Historic Environment Strategy has a section on sustainable development, it refers to energy efficiency, traditional materials, re-use and other structural aspects, rather than wider sustainability aims. The guidance mentions the need to provide advice to communities but does not suggest that communities and other groups should work collaboratively. The HwLDP2 MIR, similarly, makes no mention of adopting such an approach in any update of Policy 57. The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 introduced legislation to enable communities to participate by means of the guarantee of new rights for community bodies and Local Place Plans are being introduced as part of the Planning Bill. Local Place Plans may present opportunities for communities to support the historic environment while at the same time forming a component of a wider approach to sustainable development. A general approach to community empowerment is, then, likely to form an integral part of HwLDP2 and may not require a specific statement in any new historic environment policy.

5. Managing Change Guidance

Typo in MCHE External Fixtures.

Are there any missing or unnecessary?

The MCHE Towerhouses and Castles has set a precedent for guidance on specific building types – this area could be further explored, i.e. churches (in ecclesiastical use and conversion), farm buildings etc.

The current Conservation Area PAN has not been updated in a number of years and a Managing Change (or similarly updated guidance note) would be welcome.

Lime mortars and renders.

Roles and responsibilities (as a Managing change or other formal guidance note).

6. Glossary

Do you agree with our key terms and definitions

NO

Asset (also ‘historic asset’ or ‘heritage asset’)

For clarity, chose one term (our preference is historic asset) and use it throughout the document.

Community

Defining community of place and communities of practice and interest seems unnecessary. How many people does it take to make a ‘community’ and what is meant by ‘community values’ at the top of page 7 when you apply the definition in the glossary?

Cultural Heritage

For clarity, use cultural heritage or historic environment, and be consistent throughout.

Decision-makers

The Council strongly disagree with this definition. The definition is much too broad and inconsistent with its wider use in the planning system, other policy documents (both within and outwith

planning) and by groups of people listed in the definition including developers. This definition – and the contrasting definition of the term in HEP compared to other policy documents - will lead to significant levels of confusion. Decision makers should be defined as those making formal decisions, i.e. Planning Authorities and HES and not the public and certainly not developers. Stakeholders would be a more appropriate term for anyone who has a role or interest in the historic environment.

Impact

Impact can be positive, negative or neutral.

Mitigation

This is not clear. Mitigation can include preservation by record which neither eliminates nor reduces risk. Mitigating risk and mitigating impact are two different things.

Planning System

“The planning system is a key tool for...” and “planning decisions are **directed by primary legislation** and guided by...”

The second paragraph fails to make reference to the Local Development Plan and local policy, which are statutory guidance and carry the same or more weight than those policies/guidance listed in this section.

Principles and policies

Either include a definition of policies here, or give it its own entry.

Value

“*Values are a range of beliefs, whether aesthetic, historic, scientific...*” Science is a fact, until proven otherwise – it is not a belief.

APPENDIX 2 SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT *DRAFT* SCOTLAND'S FORESTRY STRATEGY 2019-
2029

HIGHLAND COUNCIL RESPONSE

<p>1. Do you agree with our long-term vision for forestry in Scotland? Please explain your answer.</p>	<p>Generally, yes. The vision itself is positive in terms of proposing forest expansion and forestry being a sustainably managed asset. The vision is based on a number of proposals which are generally most welcome such as 'commitment to sustainable modern forestry' and 'commitment to the principle of the right tree in right place for the right purpose' which ties in with Highland Forest and Woodland Strategy. However we do have some concerns over the loss of woodland to large scale developments such as wind farms and hydro-electric power schemes, which conflicts with 'integrating forestry with other land uses' and conflicts with the 'sustained programme of woodland expansion'.</p>
<p>2. Does the strategy identify the right objectives for forestry in Scotland over the next 10 years? Please explain your answer.</p>	<p>The objectives are as identified in the 2006 Scottish Forestry Strategy, but have been reprioritised from social, economic and environmental to economic, environmental and social. The reordering appears to reflect the changes since the economic downturn started in 2008, with greater emphasis on economic growth in the sector.</p>
<p>3. Do you agree with our assessment of the major issues likely to have the greatest impact on the achievement of our objectives? Please explain your answer.</p>	<p>Generally, yes, as they correlate well with the issues identified in the Challenges and Opportunities section of the Highland Forest and Woodland Strategy. There is however not a great deal of significance given to the issue of timber transportation in rural locations. There is reference to minimising potentially negative impacts on local communities and the environment from timber transportation in the sustainable growth section of Economic Development (4.3), but more emphasis needs to be placed on this. While it is accepted the Strategic Timber Transport Fund has awarded many millions to co-finance road improvement projects, timber transport is becoming increasingly problematic in Highland with an increase in the volume of timber being hauled</p>

	combined with decreasing funds available to Local Authorities for road improvements/ repairs in rural locations.
4. Do the ten priorities identified in table 2 capture the areas where action is most needed to deliver our objectives and vision? Please explain your answer.	Yes, but greater significance should be given to the issue of maintaining a deteriorating rural road network/ infrastructure while timber haulage while timber supply forecasts are set to rise over the next decade.
5. Can you provide any examples of delivery mechanisms that have been effective in delivering similar objectives and priorities?	The Strategic Timber Transport Fund.
6. For any delivery mechanism examples given in answer to question 5, please explain why they worked well?	
7. Do you think the proposed progress indicators are the right ones? Please explain your answer.	Generally, yes. However, as well as measuring the area of new woodland and forest created, it would be useful to see how much woodland is being lost per annum and along with targeted efforts to minimise woodland loss.
8. Do you have any suggestions for other indicators we could use to measure progress (especially ones which draw on existing data)?	
9. For any indicators suggested in answer to question Q8, please explain why you think they would be appropriate.	
10. Would you add or change anything in the Equality Impact Assessment (which includes our assessment of the potential impact of the strategy on inequalities caused by socioeconomic disadvantage – Fairer Scotland Duty)?	

11. Would you add or change anything in the Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment?	
12. What are your views on the evidence set out in the Environmental Report that has been used to inform the assessment process?	
13. Should any additional evidence sources be used in the Environmental Report? Please provide details.	
14. What are your views on the predicted environmental effects as set out in the Environmental Report?	
15. Do you agree with the conclusions and recommendations set out in the Environmental Report?	
16. Please provide any other further comments you have on the Environmental Report.	
17. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the draft strategy for forestry in Scotland?	