

# Community Woodlands in England

## Baseline Report for Forest Research

Angela Pollard

Woodland Initiatives Network Co-ordinator

Phil Tidey

Policy and Technical Manager

Small Woods Association



**Small Woods  
Association**

# Contents

	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 England's Community Forests	3
1.2 Woodland Initiatives	4
1.3 Community Woodland Groups in England	4
1.4 Land Restoration Trust	4
1.5 Pocket Parks	5
1.6 Green Flag Award Scheme	5
1.7 British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	5
<b>2. Background</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Further Research Planned	7
<b>3. Accessing groups – selection criteria</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Methodology</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Analysis of results -</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 Establishment	9
5.2 Tenure	9
5.3 Governance/structure	10
5.4 Membership	10
5.5 Support	10
5.6 Ongoing funding	11
5.7 Woodland	12
5.8 Management decisions	12
5.9 Practical Management	12
5.10 Management Objectives	12
5.11 Woodland produce	13
5.12 Insurances	13
5.13 Constraints/problems – common themes	13
5.14 Brief Summaries of the community woodland groups (by region)	13
Yorkshire & The Humber	15
South East	16
East Midlands	17
East of England	18
South West	19
West Midlands	20
North West	21
<b>6. Recommendations for further research</b>	<b>22</b>
 <b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1 – Questionnaire	24
Appendix 2 – Case Studies (currently separate documents)	27
Appendix 3 – Case Study : Late addition - North East (Friends of Chopwell Wood)	50

## 1. Introduction

This study was commissioned by Forest Research. The intent was to research a representative sample of community woodland groups across England that is comparable with similar studies in Wales and Scotland as a basis for future research on development support.

The background to this baseline study is explained in “What Does Community Forestry Mean In a Devolved Great Britain?” (April 2009)<sup>1</sup>, which focuses on the development of community forestry over the last 20 years in Great Britain and identifies the need for further research on community groups.

It is important to highlight current understanding in England of the difference between community forests and community woodlands (see below). To add to the mix “community woodland” is also the name given to woodland created on former colliery sites by the Land Restoration Trust, information on this organisation is included at 1.4. A scheme called Pocket Parks was also highlighted within the research and information on this is also provided at 1.5.

**1.1 England’s Community Forests:** The Community Forest programme was established in 1990 by the then Countryside Commission as a pilot project to demonstrate the potential contribution of environmental improvement to economic and social regeneration. The three initial urban pilots quickly grew to a national programme with 12 Community Forests based within large cities, all of them making use of broad-based partnerships to pioneer activity and deliver lasting change. In March 2004 it was announced that the ten year Government funding stream for Community Forests would come to an end. There was a transition period of 2 years to give the Community Forests time to realign themselves for the future and in April 2007 the Community Forests became financially independent receiving support for a variety of different projects from sources which include national, regional and local government, trust funds and a variety of new partnerships. Their focus is still aimed at green infrastructure, regeneration and community involvement. During more recent years new Woodland Initiatives have emerged that are doing similar ‘community forestry’ work and opportunities have been created for these organisations to work together and share best practice. Unfortunately there have also been losses within the Community Forest programme where the financial changes have been difficult to overcome and funding hasn’t been found in time to keep the organisations afloat. North East Community Forest which oversaw the Great North Forest and the Tees Forest went into administration in November 2008, with the loss of the two forests. Another two Community Forests have become more closely aligned to the Local Authorities in their area so operate within the jurisdiction of local government, although they are still linked to the communication network.

The Community Forest programme has encouraged and supported communities in improving their local environment and helping them to care for it and protect it from abuse, this includes local woodland, greenspaces and street greening. Street greening includes enhancements using plants, shrubs and trees.

---

<sup>1</sup> What Does Community Forestry Mean In a Devolved Great Britain? Anna Lawrence, Barbara Anglezarke, Bob Frost, Paul Nolan, Rosalind Owen. Awaiting publication in International Forestry Review, April 2009

Community woodland groups have been formed from this help and support through schemes and published resources e.g. A Guide to the Community Contracting Initiative in the Mersey Forest and Greenwood Community Woodland Handbook.

- 1.2 Woodland Initiatives:** Although not highlighted as part of this study it would perhaps be useful to briefly explain Woodland Initiatives because they too help and support community woodland groups in their region or sub-region. Woodland Initiatives are a diverse group of wood related projects and organisations operating from the local to the regional level. Their work supports a wide spectrum of targets, policies and strategies – from those directly linked to reinstating woodland management and creating new woodlands, to developing new markets for timber products, growing the market and local economies, and supporting projects that develop community cohesion and high quality Green Infrastructure through to education and health. They excel in partnership working with a wide variety of partners and are funded through a variety of means including national, regional and local government, trust funds and through the sale of services, such as training and social forestry. In the context of this baseline study the Woodland Initiatives have also provided information on Community Woodland groups that they have helped and supported.
- 1.3 Community Woodland Groups in England:** These groups can have a variety of titles, although they are usually grouped under the generic title of Community Woodland Groups, they can be called e.g. “Friends of...” “Conservation Group”, “Environment Group”, “Volunteer Group”, the amount of activity they are involved in can vary too, from a couple of volunteers keeping a watchful eye on some street trees to a more proactive group of volunteers managing a local woodland for community benefit. The common denominators are the word “volunteer” and the objective of protecting and caring for a piece of land within the community. Community Woodland groups in England are run by volunteers from the local community and for the benefit of local people. The benefits can include recreation, health and well-being, community engagement and in a few cases local wood products. Ownership of the woodland they manage is also varied and includes privately owned, local authority and Parish Council owned and in some cases ownership is with the community woodland group themselves.
- 1.4 Land Restoration Trust<sup>2</sup>:** This Trust is a partnership of English Partnerships (now the Homes and Communities Agency), Groundwork, Forestry Commission and the Environment Agency, with their aim being to improve the environment and quality of life for communities by providing long-term sustainable management of public spaces by restoring derelict land.
- The Trust refers to “community woodlands”, which consist of areas between 10ha and 100ha in size, created as a resource for the community, providing a mix of woodland and open space for amenity purposes, but these woodlands are not managed by community groups, they are actively managed on behalf of the Land Restoration Trust by the Local

---

<sup>2</sup> Land Restoration Trust : <http://www.landrestorationtrust.org.uk/>

Authority, Forestry Commission, or Wildlife Trust. Community engagement is part of their focus through events and volunteer work.

- 1.5 Pocket Parks<sup>3</sup>:** A Northamptonshire County Council initiative which was created in 1980 in response to the need to provide greater access to the countryside. The scheme has helped to create 80 Pocket Parks varying in size from 0.04ha to 35ha. Pocket Parks are open spaces owned and managed by local people, helping to protect and conserve local wildlife, heritage and landscape whilst providing free, open access to the countryside for all. Not all of them have any woodland attached, the purpose of these parks is to assist in the regeneration of areas and to help maintain existing features. One Pocket Park has been included within our study.
- 1.6 The Green Flag Award Scheme<sup>4</sup>:** This scheme was referred to by one of the community woodland groups (Friends of Colliers Wood) as the motivation within the local authority for encouraging the setting up of community woodland groups. The award scheme began in 1996 as a means of recognising and rewarding the best green spaces in the country. It was also seen as a way of encouraging others to achieve the same high environmental standards, creating a benchmark of excellence in recreational green areas. The Green Flag Award has become the national standard for parks and green spaces in England and Wales. The scheme is currently managed by a consortium of Keep Britain Tidy, BTCV and GreenSpace.
- 1.7 British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (BTCV)<sup>5</sup>:** In pinpointing the moment today's community woodland groups began to be noticed, we could look to an organisation that many of the groups have highlighted in terms of the support, guidance and advice they have received, BTCV. This charity has a long history of supporting environmental conservation groups throughout the UK and in other countries. Set up in 1959 it was known then as the Conservation Corps, the name changed to British Trust for Conservation Volunteers in 1970. In 1971 the local group affiliation scheme was launched and three years later 57 groups had joined. By 1981, 350 local groups had registered, these include a wide variety of environmental volunteer groups and not solely community woodland groups. BTCV's Community Network now supports several thousand local groups. Membership of the Network costs £35 p.a. and gives groups information and support as well as access to insurance, grants and discounts on training and merchandise. There is an on-line database which could help with future research.

---

<sup>3</sup> Pocket Parks : <http://www.pocketparks.com/about/default.asp>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.greenflagaward.org.uk>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www2.btcv.org.uk/display/community\\_network](http://www2.btcv.org.uk/display/community_network)

## 2. Background

Much of the background information to this research has been established within “What Does Community Forestry Mean In a Devolved Great Britain?” (April 2009) as indicated in the Introduction, so this section is not intended to repeat that information, merely to highlight the basis of the England Community Woodland survey.

Historically, almost all woods were managed as an essential part of the rural economy, providing wood for everything from shipbuilding to clothes pegs. Large estates and small communities relied on the produce from their woodlands to support their vegetable patch, fence their land, cook their food, heat their homes and provide a place for recreation. Industrialisation, the change in skills and migration to find jobs and opportunities in towns left the woodlands to slip into neglect<sup>6</sup>. Communities forgot what the woodland could provide and many disappeared or became fragmented. Today when the emphasis is on somewhere to walk and exercise the dog, the sound of a chainsaw preparing to pollard or coppice a tree can send panic through the neighbourhood.

The 2003 Forestry Commission report The National Inventory of Woodland and Trees<sup>7</sup> was based on survey fieldwork completed in July 2000. The total woodland cover in Great Britain was identified in this publication as 2,665,125ha (2,544,631 of 2ha or more and 120,494ha 0.1 to less than 2.0ha). The England proportion of this is 1,096,885ha (total), which is 8.4% woodland cover. For small woodlands and trees in England (0.1-<2.0ha) the survey identified 75,063ha, 6.8% of the total woodland cover in England.

Many community woodlands within this current research are larger than 2ha and unlike their ancestral communities, very few of them utilise the produce from the woodland, preferring to protect the land for environmental, biodiversity and public amenity value.

The importance of communities to the environment and social regeneration has been highlighted in recent years particularly under the heading of sustainable development. In 1996 the UK established a set of indicators to review sustainable development, publishing regional Quality of Life Counts with set ‘headline’ indicators (updated in 2004). Each of the regions published regional sustainable development frameworks which went across rural and urban areas. A new UK Government sustainable development strategy, Securing the Future<sup>8</sup> was published in 2005. Within this strategy the Government’s priority is to deliver cleaner, safer, greener and healthier communities and includes:

- creating attractive and welcoming parks, play areas and public spaces, expanding the Green Flag Award scheme, which recognises well maintained and managed green spaces.
- engaging and empowering local people and communities through Community Action 2020: Together We Can<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Caring for Small Woods, Ken Broad (1998). Earthscan Publications

<sup>7</sup> National Inventory of woodlands and trees: Great Britain. Forestry Commission 2003  
[http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/nigreatbritain.pdf/\\$FILE/nigreatbritain.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/nigreatbritain.pdf/$FILE/nigreatbritain.pdf)

<sup>8</sup>Securing the Future: UK Government sustainable development strategy  
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/sustainable/government/publications/uk-strategy/>

<sup>9</sup> Community Action 2020: Together We Can  
[http://sca21.wikia.com/wiki/Together\\_we\\_can\\_secure\\_the\\_future](http://sca21.wikia.com/wiki/Together_we_can_secure_the_future)

There is some indication within our research that funding has been accessed by community woodland groups, for instance, via their AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) but nothing to indicate widespread success or even knowledge of this support.

The Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE), under Axis 3, also provides “new opportunities to build the ability of local communities to influence their own environments and develop social enterprises”<sup>10</sup>.

Access to the England Woodland Grant Scheme by community woodland groups was a specific question within our survey (5.6 Ongoing Funding).

## **2.1 Further Research Planned**

In the East of England, the Green Light Trust is a Woodland Initiative that has been working with communities for a number of years focusing on community spirit, children, wildlife and global kinship, the latter encouraging a link with an overseas community. Their scheme, originally called Community-owned Woodlands was renamed a little over a year ago when it became Community-owned Wildspace, to include other eco-systems. The initiatives approach is to encourage people with an interest and the commitment to work together to form a group and then find the land on which to plant trees or create other green space. Sometimes the groups have to wait for a long time before the right space becomes available. The group is affiliated to the Green Light Trust and supported by them throughout including annual networking opportunities. The Trust is based in Suffolk but they are developing further afield and currently have Wildspace groups listed in London and the South East. This initiative is about to undergo an independent evaluation commissioned by the Forestry Commission. Two groups affiliated to the Green Light Trust in the East of England were interviewed for this study.

## **3. Accessing groups – selection criteria**

This study has concentrated on Community Woodland Groups in England as defined in 1.3 above.

A list of community woodlands in England was drawn from the following sources:

The Woodland Trust set up a Community Woodland Network in 2002, to help support community woodland groups, this includes a website, a biennial conference and provides some small grants. The website captures some contact information for community woodland groups, including those who help manage Woodland Trust sites, although it is not exclusive to Woodland Trust groups.

Information on additional community woodland groups has been collated with the help of the Woodland Initiatives, England’s Community Forests and the Small Woods Association, each of these provide help and support to community woodland groups and woodland owners, in some cases they have been carrying out this work for more than 20 years.

From the names and information collected a list was compiled and duplications were removed, leaving a list of more than 200 identified groups. We do not believe this is a definitive list and more research through established contacts and Local Authorities is likely to produce an extended list.

---

<sup>10</sup> England’s Trees, Woods and Forests Delivery Plan 2008-2012.  
<http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/INFD-7DYC7Z>

From the identified groups a small amount of web-based research was conducted. Community woodland groups that had identified a website were located via the internet to try and ascertain the objectives of that group and help with the selection process.

## **4. Methodology**

This report is based on a desk study and a series of telephone interviews with community woodland groups in England. The authors work with a variety of people and organisations through the Small Woods Association and the Woodland Initiatives Network including a number of community woodland groups, using this knowledge, contacts, web based research, network partners and associates the authors collated a list of community woodland groups.

**4.1** A list of Community Woodland Groups was established via the process explained above. The list was then divided into regions and the initial plan was to contact three groups in each region. The nine English regions were then divided between two researchers (27 interviews).

**4.2** A set list of interview questions was devised in consultation with researchers carrying out similar studies in Wales and Scotland and with Forest Research. In England, after conducting one interview each and establishing the likely duration of the interviews and the time constraints of the study, the number of planned interviews was reassessed and the decision was made to contact no less than two groups per region (18 in total). A copy of the questionnaire used is at Appendix 1.

**4.3** Interviews took between 20 - 45 minutes, sometimes interviewees were easy to contact, because the representative was retired or able to discuss the woodland group during office hours, others had to be contacted during evenings and weekends and given the opportunity to book a call at a more convenient time. Many interviewees were happy to spend the time discussing their group and their woodlands and were enthusiastic about being part of this research. Two interviewees asked to be sent the questionnaire because of the limited time they had available, these interviews were not thought to be as successful, so all other interviews were conducted over the telephone.

**4.4** The number of groups contacted expanded from the revised aim of 18 in total because of the desire to obtain a mix of profiles and community group objectives. Information from Wales indicated that one of their interviewees had been influenced by the Pocket Park scheme in Northamptonshire. No Pocket Parks appeared on our initial list so a decision was made to contact one, in the end two Pocket Parks were contacted, the first was an unsuccessful scheme in terms of community engagement and the one person involved was being paid by the council "to cut the grass", therefore a second was contacted. Information on Brickle Pocket Park is included in Analysis of Results. Two other woodland groups who were selected from the initial list didn't meet the criteria we were aiming for within the questionnaire. One such group plant trees locally on other people's land but do not manage any woodland, another group only formed 12 months ago so are not fully established and currently perform more of a tree warden role within the village.

**4.5** At the end of the interview period 25 groups had been contacted but only 22 were considered to be suitable for the study. A further interview was conducted by Anna Lawrence of Forest Research, who was visiting a community woodland site in Oxfordshire.

**4.6** One region, the North East, unfortunately was not represented in this initial study and the analysis of results, due to time constraints. Contact has subsequently been made with one community woodland group in the North East and a case study of the Friends of Chopwell Wood has been added as Appendix 3. We would recommend any future studies to complete the North East area, and in particular consider how the closure of the two Community Forests might have impacted on community woodland groups in the region.

## **5. Analysis of results**

### **5.1 Establishment**

Of the 22 groups in this study the oldest was established in 1974, over 35 years ago. Ten have been in existence since 2000, five were brought into being in the nineties, four in the eighties and two in the seventies. The three oldest established groups are three of the five groups that actually own the freehold of their sites. This longevity seems to be a product of the need for groups that own sites to build more robust organisational structures to support the additional responsibilities involved, and it could be that actually owning the site gives the local community more of a stake in the site and so as a result it is easier to attract committed volunteers.

The motivation of groups to form initially is varied. With seven of the groups the motivation could be said to be defensive – the coming together of local people to respond to a perceived threat to their local environment. The most common threat was of a change in use – generally the existing landowner had plans to sell the site and there were worries that the new owner would develop or otherwise use the site in undesirable ways. In four cases the response was to purchase the site, and in the others to influence the owners through representation.

In some cases groups were initiated by other bodies such as local authorities and the Woodland Trust. For example, in Basingstoke an initiative from the council stimulated the formation of groups to manage four woodlands owned by them, and in Bradford the council employed an officer specifically to initiate the formation of 'Friends of' groups for council-owned green spaces. Their continuing support of a 'Friends of' support group within the council has resulted in the existence of a thriving forum of such groups, and The Friends of Judy Woods, as one of the longest established groups, has acted as a source of expertise and inspiration for others in the network.

The Woodland Trust has been instrumental in setting up groups associated with their woodlands. Pepper Wood Community Woodland, in Worcestershire, was set up, along with four other groups, in the early 1980s as part of an initiative by the Trust to involve local people in the sustainable management of their local woodland. An officer on a short term contract provided facilitation and support. Pepper Wood is the only woodland surviving from this initiative. Many of the Woodland Trust sites have Friends Of groups associated with them, which in general carry out less complex and demanding management tasks and are not involved in the broader management decisions. These groups tend to be focussed on management for wildlife (quote 'if we were asked to do something that would be detrimental to or of no benefit to the wildlife then we wouldn't do it') and not on timber production or other woodland produce.

### **5.2 Tenure**

Of the 23 woodlands managed by the 22 groups approached 11 are owned by local authorities, three by the Woodland Trust, five owned by the groups, three by private landowners and one by the Forestry Commission. Of the 18 sites not owned by the groups there are seven management agreements in place. Of the 11 local authority owned sites, however, only two have management agreements. Two groups, Halesowen Wildlife Group and Woodcutters for Wildlife, do not confine their activities to a single woodland and operate as opportunities arise in other sites. None of the groups approached held a formal lease or rented their woodlands (with the minor exception of the

Witch Wood group which rents a narrow access strip which links their two areas of woodland in order to provide a footpath through route).

### 5.3 Governance/structure

The types of structures used are summarised in the table below-

Voluntary organisation	11
Company limited by guarantee	2
Registered Charity	5
Charitable Trust	1
Unincorporated Voluntary Group	1
Industrial Provident Society	1
Unincorporated Association	1

Of the five groups that own their woodlands, two are registered charities, two are charitable trusts and one is a company limited by guarantee.

21 of the 22 groups approached are constituted. All have a secretary, chair and treasurer, and a number have additional named officers such as grants officer, publicity officer or tasks officer. Committee size varies from six to 15, and in many cases a representative from the landowner also attends. Depending on the tenure of the site in some cases representatives from other bodies also have places (for example, Sadlers Wells Wood – two Trustees from Bunbury Parish Council, one from Spurston Parish Council, one from Cheshire Landscape Trust and the head teacher from the local school).

### 5.4 Membership

Twelve of the groups charge no regular fee to members. Of those that do, most charge under £5, two charge £10 and one (Lytham St Annes Civic Society) charges £25 but this includes membership of the society as a whole. Membership numbers varies enormously, with a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 430, but 17 of the 22 groups have a membership of less than 100. In most cases the membership makes no more than a token contribution to the running expenses of the group.

### 5.5 Support

This section details the sources of advice, encouragement and guidance provided to groups when starting up and on an ongoing basis. Those groups whose creation was stimulated by the local authority or other body have naturally received such support from those bodies, but other groups where the initiative originated within the local community have received support from a wide range of sources.

### **a. Establishment**

Six of the groups said they received no advice from any source when they were getting established, and in addition two said they had sufficient professional expertise (foresters, solicitors for example) within the group and therefore needed no additional support. Of the remainder, eight mentioned the local authority, four the Forestry Commission, two the Woodland Trust and BTCV and eight mentioned others (principally Woodland Initiatives).

### **b. Ongoing**

13 groups are receiving ongoing guidance from their local county, district or parish council. The majority of these are on council-owned sites but in a number of cases support is extended to sites under other ownership. Five groups are receiving advice and guidance from BTCV, three from Forestry Commission, two from Woodland Trust and eight from other sources (initiatives, Green Light Trust, wildlife trusts, AONB staff, for example).

### **c. Networks**

The majority of groups are members of the BTCV community network, in most cases purely to access the volunteer insurance. Most are also registered with the Woodland Trust Community Woodland Network but are not actively involved. A small minority of groups have contact with similar groups in their immediate area.

## **5.6 Ongoing funding**

Ongoing funding for groups comes from a wide variety of sources. As mentioned above the majority of groups surveyed charge a membership fee and this makes a variable contribution to ongoing costs. Five groups raise income from fundraising and events, five from their local council, seven in small grants from a variety of sources, four from Forestry Commission, one from bequests, two from sponsorship and four from produce sales. Groups that own their woodlands have a much higher requirement for revenue and capital income than groups that work on sites owned by others.

Of the latter, groups insurance (mostly through BTCV) was the major expense although for many they were covered by policies held by the owners (local authorities), Woodland Trust or others). Other expenses were confined to occasional tool purchases and training and met by membership fees or small one-off grants, or again funded by the owners. Site owners in some cases provide a range of in-kind support such as space to store tools and machinery, loan of tools or provision of materials.

Of those groups that owned their woodlands, they have a diverse range of funding models. Two are in the EWGS which meets agreed management expenses. One group has a membership of 350, each paying £10 annually and also has a significant income from log and woodchip sales. Another group has an annual expenditure of £1000, funded through memberships, small grants and bequests. Another is owned and managed by Lytham St Annes Civic Society, which manages it within the sizeable budget of the whole society. Of the remaining two, one has £250 a year income from a local Trust and the remainder through EWGS and interest on their sizeable reserves, and the other from a mix of small grants, memberships and a growing social forestry provision.

Eleven of the woodlands are not in the England Woodland Grant Scheme. Of the remaining groups seven are aware that the woodlands are in the England Woodland Grant Scheme but they

have no involvement and no funding from this source as the grant is managed by the landowners (local authority, Woodland Trust or FC). Only four groups have applied for and received EWGS funding for their woodlands in their own right.

## 5.7 Woodland

Woodlands managed by the groups in this study range from 2ha up to 84ha in size. The average is 22.4ha. Eighteen woodlands are stocked with mixed native broadleaves, four have areas of broadleaves and conifers. Three manage areas of coppice.

## 5.8 Management decisions

The five groups that own their woodlands make their own management decisions, in all cases working to a management plan. Of these five, two are in the EWGS with an agreed management plan. With the others, the management plan is prepared by the group. Of these, only one receives advice from FC and the others have no contact.

In the other cases, where the woodlands are owned by another body, there is a range of management models. In some cases, (Woodland Ways, Brickle Pocket Park) the group is responsible for preparing the management plan and planning work. In other cases, the group works in partnership with the owner to prepare the management plan, then has a lot of control over the planning of the work (Cherry Wood), in others the group has to work within a management plan prepared by the owners (Friends of Judy Wood) but has a lot of freedom in planning tasks, and in others the group has to work closely with the owner (Friends of Hagg Wood).

Where groups do not actually own their woodlands they usually have no contact with FC. In all these cases the woodlands are in the EWGS but this is handled entirely by the organisation which owns the woodland.

## 5.9 Practical Management

All of the groups get involved in practical tasks within their woodlands. Some groups are confident in taking on major tasks (Pepper Wood, Woodcutters for Wildlife) and others are happy using hand tools to carry out more minor tasks such as scrub clearance (Woodscape, Friends of Hagg Wood).

## 5.10 Management Objectives

Interviewees were asked about their management objectives. The responses are summarised in the table below

Objective	Number of mentions
Wildlife/biodiversity/conservation	11
Clear paths	4
Recreation	6

Education	3
Silvicultural objectives	6
Tidy up	2
Timber or other woodland produce	0

### 5.11 Woodland produce

The groups were asked whether they sell any woodland produce from their woodlands. Only six of the groups in this study produce timber or other woodland produce from their woodland, and of these two make less than £100 a year from this source. A few groups provide small amounts of logs to group members at no charge, but this is seen very much as an incidental by-product of their management activities. One group used to produce a significant income from coppice products but decided several years ago that they no longer wished to make money from the woodland as the income was not necessary to support the operation of the group and the members valued their involvement in the management of the woodland without the pressure/need to produce an income.

### 5.12 Insurances

21 out of the 22 groups were aware of the need to have public liability and volunteer activity insurance, and had obtained such insurance. Most groups had volunteer cover through the BTCV Community Network. With public liability insurance, where specified, six groups use the BTCV scheme, others go through Zurich, Civic Trust, RAP, and NFU. In many cases groups were aware that the landowners (local authority, Woodland Trust, FC) held public liability insurance cover on the site.

### 5.13 Constraints/problems – common themes

- Most groups rely on a small core of committed individuals, of whom many are 'getting on' in years. This makes the groups vulnerable to the loss of key people – the 'drivers' of the group.
- A number of groups mentioned the constant search for funding, and how hard it is for volunteers to keep track of what is available.
- This study has shown some evidence that ownership of the woodlands helps groups survive, and conversely it follows that perhaps where groups are not genuine partners in the planning and management of 'their' woodland they are less likely to survive.
- Following on from the above, for groups to act as genuine partners with the landowner and to have credibility they need members with a good degree of knowledge about woodland management.
- This study has shown that most groups focus on management for biodiversity and conservation. A greater understanding of woodland management might assist groups to look at a more multipurpose management approach.

#### **5.14 Brief Summaries of the community woodland groups (by region).**

Detailed case studies for each of the community woodland groups interviewed for this study appear at Appendix 2 (in alphabetical order). The following tables provide a summary of information on who the groups are, where they are in the country and their structure.

### English Region: Yorkshire and The Humber

Name of Group	Year Formed	Location	Tenure	Wood Size (ha)	Legal Structure	Group Structure	Income & Funding
Heaton Woods Trust	1977	Bradford, Yorkshire	Own the woodland	16.19	Charity	350 vote at AGM. 16 on committee. Membership fee £10 individual. Schools/groups £20.	Produce sales - wood chippings and logs as thinned (raised £5,000 recently) Grants, Membership £10 p.a.
Friends of Judy Woods	2002	Bradford, Yorkshire	Bradford Council owners	56	Voluntary Organisation	125 members, 13 on committee, inc chair, vice chair, sec, treasurer, education officer.	The Coop supports events programme, Membership £1 p.a. Built up contingency fund to cover 3 years expenses. Some small grants for tools.
Woodscape	1991	Huddersfield, Yorkshire	Huddersfield Council owners. No formal lease or management agreement.	80	Company limited by guarantee	10 members paying £1 annually. Committee of four (secretary, treasurer, chair, task coordinator)	Small grants, jam making, council pays for insurance, tools and materials kept on land provided rent free by council
Friends of Hagg Wood	2001	Dunnington, York	Church Commissioners own freehold, lease to FC. The group has a written management agreement. Ongoing dialogue with FC staff to coordinate group with FC activities.	43	Voluntary Organisation	90 members, committee of 10 including chair, secretary and treasurer	Regular grants from York City Council and parish council, membership fees (£4 single, £6 family), donations

### English Region: South East

Name of Group	Year Formed	Location	Tenure	Wood Size (ha)	Legal Structure	Group Structure	Income & Funding
Besselsleigh Woodland Group	2007	Appleton, Oxfordshire	Owned by the Local Authority (Vale of White Horse) purchased in 2000 for the community.	10	Unincorporated Voluntary Group. No constitution.	3-5 core members, 10 + for tasks. No committee.	Sale of pea sticks and beanpoles. Sales £100 in first season. Plans for firewood. Grants for tree planting and access improvements.
New England Woodland Trust	1980	Cuckfield, West Sussex	Group own the freehold.	11	Charitable Trust	10 Trustees, plus 3 officers.	£250 p.a. From local trust. Group has reserves. EWGS. Sale of beanpoles £60 p.a.
Oakleigh Woodland Group	1997	Basingstoke, Hants	Leased by local authority from a local landowner	2.6 & 5.9	Voluntary Organisation	60 members, 15 regular volunteers, 8 on committee.	Council pay for lock up garage and BTCV insurance. Grants from BTCV, Whitbread Action Earth and £300-£500 p.a. From produce sales.

### English Region: East Midlands

Name of Group	Year Formed	Location	Tenure	Wood Size (ha)	Legal Structure	Group Structure	Income & Funding
Brickle Pocket Park	1993	Silverstone, Northants	Owned by the Parish Council as a Pocket Park in perpetuity.	0.582	Informal arrangement. No committee meeting. Have a volunteer co-ordinator. Three signatures on bank account.	No membership. 10 volunteers of which 5/6 is adequate and regular.	Barclaycard fund for community activities (nearby offices) for tools, trees & materials. Occasional fund raising functions. Silverstone Circuits fine people for inappropriate parking and pass on money raised.
Friends of Colliers Wood	1999	Moorgreen, Nottinghamshire	Owned by Broxtowe Borough Council	14.2	Constitution	15 regular active members. Less regular 25 more at major events. 50 voting members. Officers elected at AGM.	Fundraising. Events and Shows. Grants. No membership fee. Run a lottery. Theatre Group - money from sale of tickets but most goes to charity. No produce sales.
Friends of Colwick Wood	2004	Nottingham	Owned by Local Authority	45	Voluntary Organisation with constitution	Voting members 150. Committee members 15.	Membership fees.
Friends of Holly Hayes Woodland	2006	Whitwick, Leicestershire	Owned by the group. *Woodland 15.3ha and meadowlands 10.3ha	15.3 & 10.3*	Friends of...Not for Profit Limited Company hold the land in trust. Holly Hayes Ltd will run the Social Enterprise.	40 members (100 individuals). All voting members at AGM. 10 board members.	Range of membership fees. Money to purchase land raised through National Forest Company, FLAG (Forward Leicester Aggregates) through the local authority. Support from local community,

### English Region: East of England

Name of Group	Year Formed	Location	Tenure	Wood Size (ha)	Legal Structure	Group Structure	Income & Funding
Cherry Wood	2001	Stoke by Newland, Suffolk	Owned by Tendering Hall Estate. A second wood (Royston Wood) owned by Babergh District Council	3.05 Cherry 0.77 Royston	Voluntary Organisation with constitution	Cherry Wood - Steering Group of 10. Ten voting members at AGM plus any volunteers. 2nd wood (Royston Wood), 5 voting members	First 3 years represented at Bluebell Fairs in each local village - raised £200-£300 at each. Fourth year did Open Gardens and made £1,500 in an afternoon. Grants from Parish Council, AONB Sustainable Development Fund.
Friends of Batchwood	1998	St. Albans, Hertfordshire	Owned by Local Authority	4	Constitution	50-60 members all with voting rights. Ten committee members. AGM.	Membership fees. Retrieve lost golf balls from the wood and sell back to golf club. Council pay for insurance. Donations. Catering at AGM covers costs.
Friends of Hanstead Wood	2003	St. Albans, Hertfordshire	Owned by HSBC.	2	Constitution	40 Friends of who receive regular newsletters. No membership fee. 9 on committee who can vote.	Occasional grant from Watling Chase Community Forest. HSBC annual grant.
Woodland Ways	2001	Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk	Owned by Local Authority. (4 woodlands)	9.25 (total of 4 woodlands)	Unincorporated Association - constitution	60 households and 8 trustees. All vote at AGM and have equal status.	Grants - through management agreement. Membership. Heritage Lottery grant for specific capital works.

### English Region: South West

Name of Group	Year Formed	Location	Tenure	Wood Size (ha)	Legal Structure	Group Structure	Income & Funding
Friends of Dunccliffe Wood	1986	Shaftesbury, Dorset	Woodland Trust own site.	83	Voluntary organisation	24 members, 6-8 per work day. Committee of six.	Previously supported through produce sales of firewood and coppice products, a few years ago decided they no longer wanted to manage the wood to make money for the group so survive on reserves.
High Bickington Community Woodland	2004	Barnstaple, Devon	Owned by Devon County Council. Higher Bickington Community Property Trust - developing site for affordable housing and regeneration.	2.5	Industrial Provident Society	200 shareholders, board of seven.	Membership. EWGS, some training funds from Woodland Trust. Future plans include sale of timber.
Woodcutters for Wildlife	1995	Clevedon, Somerset	Owned by private owner.	16	Voluntary organisation	14 members.	Income from talks, £200 p.a. from town council. Logs, hazel coppice sales. Retainer to manage trees in local school grounds.

### English Region: West Midlands

Name of Group	Year Formed	Location	Tenure	Wood Size (ha)	Legal Structure	Group Structure	Income & Funding
Halesown Wildlife Group	1988	Halesowen	Woodland Trust own Uffmore Wood site but group also work elsewhere in the region on ponds, hedge laying and footpaths.	84.84	Charity	100 members. All can vote in event of serious decision, but no AGM. Six committee members.	Membership fee. Charge nominal fee for attending meetings. Used to sell T-shirts, plants and nesting boxes. Grants for tools. Funded by people who ask them to do additional work (see Tenure).
Pepper Wood Community Woodland	1981	Gordale Road, Bromsgrove	Woodland Trust own the woodland.	54.23	Charity	25 working with group but mainstay 12. Officers elected at AGM. Six on committee.	Sale of produce and firewood covers costs £1000 p.a. Grants received but usually unsolicited because they don't apply for them if not needed.

**English Region: North West**

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Year Formed</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Wood Size (ha)</b>	<b>Legal Structure</b>	<b>Group Structure</b>	<b>Income &amp; Funding</b>
Sadlers Wells Wood	2001	Bunbury, Cheshire	Group own the freehold.	5.5 (3ha ASNW & 2.5ha new planting)	Charity	Trust owns the woodland. 6 trustees. Friends of group is separate body with 60 members.	Approx £1000 p.a. Includes membership, small grants and bequests.
Witch Wood (Lytham St. Annes Civic Society)	1974	Lytham St. Annes, Lancs	Lytham St. Annes Civic Society	4	Charity	Civic Society has 430 members. In process of setting up an independent trust to manage woodland which will have a committee of 8.	FC grants, other grants. Civic Society membership. Sale of logs through local dealer.

## 6. Recommendations for further research

1. Few groups in this sample list woodland produce amongst their objectives, most are neglecting timber, woodfuel and coppice product sales as a contributor to their income and in many cases are actively dismissing economic woodland management as harmful to their main aims of conservation and biodiversity enhancement. These woodlands have a valuable part to play in providing local carbon neutral energy and in product substitution. We would recommend further research looking at the barriers to bringing community woodlands into economic management and the potential of an education and training programme aimed at community woodland groups and their partners in local authorities and conservation bodies, coupled with a targeted grant programme to support the purchase of equipment and access improvements.
2. This study is very much a pilot, aimed at identifying future research opportunities. We have identified in excess of 200 groups across England, and a much larger study aimed at identifying support needs should be a priority.
3. The groups identified in this study is not an exhaustive list and we would recommend further research through established contacts and other sources e.g. Local Authority Woodland Officers and BTCV's Community Network to capture more groups and produce an extended list.
4. Most advice and guidance received by these groups is from local authorities and conservation bodies whose experience and objectives are far more likely to be around management for biodiversity and recreation than timber/coppice products/woodfuel production, and in some cases they might actually be advising against management for woodland produce as being inconsistent with management for wildlife. The woodland management experience and credibility of Forestry Commission staff means that they are better placed to provide advice on silviculture and productive management, and to raise awareness of the potential benefits for community woodlands of economic management. Many groups are not aware of the range of advice, grants and services offered by FC and the Commission should consider being more pro-active in contacting these groups. Wider experience of the authors of this report suggests that there is still some suspicion of FC in the community; the FC may need to challenge these perceptions so as to engage community woodland groups with the local produce and carbon agenda.
5. Why do groups fail? Obviously this study has only accessed groups that are 'in business' and a study of groups that have not 'lasted' would be worthwhile, looking at why they have failed and looking at lessons that can be learnt.
6. We would recommend any future studies should include the North East region, in particular how the closure of the two Community Forests in the region (Great North Forest and Tees Forest) might have impacted on these groups, unfortunately this study was unable to complete this region.
7. We would recommend asking the community woodlands whether they would like to form and be part of a national Community Woodland Association in England, similar to the Llais Y Goedwig (Voice of the Woodlands) example in Wales, where the community woodland groups steer the association and work together for the benefit of all community woodland groups in their nation, empowering them to lobby and champion the work that they do. Llais Y Goedwig is facilitated by Coed Lleol a project of the Small Woods Association. This may in turn open up opportunities for them to directly access community based

funds. They would still individually be able to access the local help and support they already receive.

8. What support should be provided to groups that do not own or lease woodlands, and manage them in accordance with a management plan prepared by the owner? Should there be a mechanism for providing advice to or grant funding these groups directly, or routing it through the EWGS application where the owners state that they are working with a dedicated community group?

Interview number:
-------------------

## Community Woodlands Study - England

NAME OF GROUP: \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATION OF GROUP: \_\_\_\_\_

ENGLAND REGION: \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

EMAIL ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF INTERVIEW: \_\_\_\_\_

INTERVIEWED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

1. When was your group formed?
2. What was the motivation/reason for forming your group?
3.
  - i Does your group own the woodland? YES/NO  
If No go to iv below
  - ii If you own the woodland – what were the circumstances of the purchase?
  - iii Where did money come from? How was it raised?
  - iv If not your group - who does own the woodland?
  - v Or do you have a management agreement YES/NO  
Or do you have a lease? YES/NO  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Does your tenure status impose any restrictions on what you can do?  
YES/NO
5.
  - i Who supported you in the purchase/lease/setting up of the group in terms of advice?
  - ii Is there ongoing support? YES/NO
  - iii Are you involved with any networks or support groups? YES/NO  
Which ones?
  - iv What kind of support do you receive and from whom?

v How would you describe the support you have received?

6. Do you have any contact with other similar groups, either locally or through regional or national networks?

How frequently?

7. How do you fund ongoing costs?

- i. Produce sales
- ii. Grants
- iii. Memberships
- iv. Other

8. Are you aware of any Legislation or policies which affect community woodland activity?

9. What are the main aim(s) and activities of your group?

10. i. What is your legal structure?

ii. If no legal structure – do you have a constitution? YES/NO

11. How many members do you have?

What is their status:

i. Voting members (number)?

ii. Friends of (number)?

iii. Board members (Number)?

iv. Committee members (Number)? (Number of officers?)

12. Do you have a membership fee? YES/NO

How much is it?

13. Would you describe your woodland location as:

i. urban

ii urban fringe

iii rural

14. How big is your woodland? (hectares)

What tree stock do you have?

15. What percentage of local residents are involved in the group?

In what way?

How would you define the local community?

16. Do you engage with the wider community? YES/NO

**How?**

- 17. How does the local community use the woodland?**
- 18.**
- i Who plans and who carries out woodland management?**
  - ii Does the group get involved in the management? Or do you use professional foresters or someone else to manage the timber?**
  - iii What are your management objectives?**
  - iv Do you have a silvicultural system?**
  - v Is the woodland management part of the England Woodland Grant Scheme?** YES/NO
- What has the grant paid for?**
- vi Does your woodland have FSC or other certification**
  - vii Is any part of your woodland designated as of conservation interest?**
- 19. Do you sell or otherwise provide any produce from your woodland (timber/non-timber)**  
**Do you sell it direct or through another organisation?**

## Appendix 2 Case Studies

	Page No.
Besselsleigh Woodland Group	28
Brickle Pocket Park	29
Cherry Wood	30
Friends of Batchwood	31
Friends of Colliers Wood	32
Friends of Colwick Wood	33
Friends of Duncliffe Wood	34
Friends of Hagg Wood	35
Friends of Hanstead Wood	36
Friends of Holly Hayes Woodland	37
Friends of Judy Woods	38
Halesowen Wildlife Group	39
Heaton Woods Trust	40
High Bickington Community Woodland	41
New England Woodland Trust	42
Oakleigh Woodland Group	43
Pepper Wood Community Woodland	44
Sadlers Wells Wood	45
Witch Wood (Lytham St. Annes Civic Society)	46
Woodcutters for Wildlife	47
Woodland Ways	48
Woodscape	49

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Besselsleigh Woodland Group</b>
<b>Location</b>	Appleton, Oxfordshire
<b>Region</b>	South East
<b>Year formed</b>	2007
<b>Motivation</b>	Besseleigh Wood liaison meeting was held twice yearly at the Vale of White Horse DC between the council, Oxfordshire Woodlands Project and representatives of Besselsleigh and Appleton, LA were open to more active engagement with the local community and currently no 'friends of' type group existed. So a group of actively interested woodland users was formed to engage with woodland management and policy for Besselsleigh wood.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Oxfordshire Woodland Project
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Oxfordshire Woodland Project - advice and guidance, help with grant applications. Local Authority. Representatives from Vale of White Horse District Council attend events and meetings.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Oxfordshire Woodland Project
<b>Perception of support</b>	Good - very supportive.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Just started selling pea sticks and bean poles. Sales of £100 in first season. Sold direct to community. Have permission to split and stack and remove seasoned felled wood for firewood, as long as the proceeds are returned to the wood. Grants for tree planting and footpath/bridge improvement. No membership yet but planned.
<b>Legislation</b>	FC grants, landfill tax and engagement with local communities for health and education.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Encouraging woodland use among local community, campaigning and designing better access, planting, weeding of new and established planting, controlling invasive floral species, footpaths, coppicing/pollarding.
<b>Urban/urban Woodland - stocking</b>	Rural Sycamore planted 1950; oak, ash standards (low quality), hazel coppice, recent planting of cherry, field maple, ash oak under WGS.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	1% (population 1200). Tree planting, bramble clearing, pulling Himalayan balsam, coppicing. Activity sessions and events advertised on noticeboards and in Parish magazines and on web page on the Appleton and Eaton website. Community fought the landowner in the courts in 1960s over closure of public rights of way through the wood, community won. Legacy that "it's our wood".
<b>Definition of community</b>	Not specified
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Dog walking, short cut to bus stop, brownies, beavers, some individuals practice bushcraft.
<b>Management</b>	Planning - Oxfordshire Woodland Project, Vale OWH tree officer and group. Use qualified foresters. Objectives to increase environmental, social and economic value of Besselsleigh Wood to the community. Silvicultural system based on hazel coppice with oak standards, but much variation. ASNW. Small quantities £100 pea sticks, woodfuel (currently drying). Aim to sell within community.
<b>In EWGS Certified</b>	Yes for tree planting No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Brickle Pocket Park</b>
<b>Location</b>	Silverstone, Northants
<b>Region</b>	East Midlands
<b>Year formed</b>	1993
<b>Motivation</b>	District Councillor in contact with Countryside Department of County Council and they devised the Pocket Park scheme. Joy Townsend a local woman knew of a piece of land and they became the 25th Pocket Park.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Parish Council and Joy Townsend (their founder) was post mistress, district councillor and held various other offices she led the establishment.
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Grants from the Parish Council, District Council and a donation from Silverstone circuits.
<b>Support - networks</b>	None
<b>Perception of support</b>	Good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Barclaycard fund community activities (offices nearby). The group go with a shopping list. The spent £1000 on tools, trees and materials last year. £500 next year. They organise occasional fund raising functions. Silverstone Circuits fine people for parking wrongly at the Grand Prix which is then donated to Brickle Pocket Park. £350 last time.
<b>Legislation</b>	None
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Maintain woodland as a haven for wildlife, a peaceful retreat for people, increase number of species, trees and flowers. Plant every year. Two Pocket Parks in Silverstone and the Parish Council owns both.
<b>Urban/urban Woodland - stocking</b>	Pocket Park - rural. Willow - could be 200 years old. Hazels, sycamore, young oaks/red oaks, 5 scots pine planted a month ago.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Very small percentage involved in the group. Population about 1400 and 10 people involved in work/management, keeping site tidy and safe. Occasional coffee mornings, join other events in the village to publicise Brickle Pocket Park, when people hold 'open gardens' - Pocket Park is included.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Middle class - commuters to London. New executive housing. Volunteers mostly retired.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking, young Mums with pushchairs. Some damage done by young people.
<b>Management</b>	By the volunteer group. Used to prepare 5 year management plans but it expired in 2007 and it is now left to the group. The volunteers manage and develop the site on behalf of the Parish Council for haven/biodiversity. Professionals used for overgrown trees which are at risk and for pollarding willows.
<b>In EWGS Certified</b>	No No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Cherry Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Stoke by Newland, Suffolk
<b>Region</b>	East of England
<b>Year formed</b>	2001
<b>Motivation</b>	Encouraged by Douglas Pike in association with the Green Light Trust - group formed first with an interest in and a feeling that they should plant more trees, then they found the land. This is a Green Light Trust initiative, some groups have been looking for suitable land for a couple of years. Cherry Wood found their wood and now have a second wood.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Green Light Trust in both woods. Parish Council for Royston Wood.
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Affiliated to Green Light Trust (GLT) at a cost of £30 p.a. GLT provide advice and a network. Parish Council - financial support and have to report at their monthly meetings. Dedham Vale AONB - including tools.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Green Light Trust annual networking day.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Adequate. Fund raise themselves, use Green Light Trust name as a base level.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	First 3 years represented at Bluebell Fairs in each of the local villages and raised £200-£300 at each. Fourth year did Open Gardens and made £1500 in an afternoon. Grants from Parish Council, Sustainable Development Fund (Dedham Vale AONB), the AONB sits on the Steering Group.
<b>Legislation</b>	Health and Safety - medium to low risk group (hand tools only)
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To involve the community. To promote wildlife
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Rural
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Cherry Wood - one third mature cherry, one third new planting, one third meadowland. Royston wood - broadleaf.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Leavenheath (Royston Wood) - population 1400 and about 20 volunteers. Visit/work with schools, write monthly newspaper article, have events - pond dipping, dawn chorus. Cherry Wood is part of a major shoot
<b>Definition of community</b>	Stoke Nayland (Cherry Wood) wealthy, retired and two major schools nearby. Leavenheath (Royston wood) village, mixed community.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Cherry Wood - walking, peace and quiet (although it is part of a major shoot). Royston Wood - trail bikes, cubs, scouts, cooking marshmallows over fires, dog walkers.
<b>Management</b>	The group plans woodland management with District Council for Royston Wood and the Council looks after tree work. The group carries out woodland management. Cherry Wood had professional foresters to cut down old poplars. They have put a new pond in. Managed for wildlife and access. There is hazel for coppice. There is also firewood – they give it away. The Tendering Hall Estate has a restriction on Cherry Wood which says No Dogs, the group have imposed another restriction themselves - no spraying and no fires. No restrictions on Royston Wood.
<b>In EWGS</b>	No
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Batchwood</b>
<b>Location</b>	St. Albans, Hertfordshire
<b>Region</b>	East of England
<b>Year formed</b>	1998
<b>Motivation</b>	Protest against over development of the tennis centre. The house and estate is owned by the council and leased to a leisure company. The house is a nightclub and there is a tennis centre and a small woodland, which is surrounded by a golf course. The plan was to build a bigger tennis centre in the old walled garden which the Friends of group opposed.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Local Authority supported group.
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	L.A. ongoing.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Woodland Trust, Countryside Management Service. Member of RFS.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Described as on/off. New person, new bureaucracy, previously it was okay.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Retrieve lost golf balls from the wood and sell them back to the golf club. Insurance from BTCV supported by the council. Membership (£5 p.a.) and donations. Catering at AGM covers costs.
<b>Legislation</b>	No
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Maintaining and improving the wood and footpaths for the community. Wood neglected for 20 years. Keeps public away from golfers. Replace and nurture trees, no natural regeneration because of squirrels, rabbits and deer.
<b>Urban/urban Woodland - stocking</b>	Urban fringe Oak, ash, sycamore, mixed. Hazel understorey, bluebells.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	80% of residents involved in group. Volunteers 8-10, the rest help litter pick but not active management. Don't actively engage with the community. One event each year for voluntary groups at which they have a stall.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Two council estates adjoining mixed prosperous area.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking, dog walking, running
<b>Management</b>	The 5 year plan was written for the sub-contractor (Leisure Connections) and they agree what parts the group need to undertake. The group is involved with the management, one member is a 76 year old forester who acts as a mentor and advisor, the rest have basic qualifications. Anything bigger than 18" that needs cutting the sub-contractor pays for professional help. No silvicultural system. Objective is to increase biodiversity, judicial coppicing and planting. ASNW remnant of 'close on' 700 acres. Have a rare fungus or two.
<b>In EWGS</b>	No
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Colliers Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Moorgreen, Nottinghamshire
<b>Region</b>	East Midlands
<b>Year formed</b>	1999
<b>Motivation</b>	Government criteria for Local Authorities on the Environment - Green Space (Green Flag Scheme). No targets set but government pressure. The site was an open cast mine in need of regeneration, L.A. engaged with BTCV and the Friends group was formed. They currently have interest in several brownfield sites and negotiations to take them over are taking some time.
<b>Support -</b>	BTCV supported the setting up.
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Part of the Greenwood Community Forest Forum. As they got more involved - Notts Wildlife Trust came along. BTCV give advice - they are engaged separately by Broxtowe Council on the site and paid by Broxtowe.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Greenwood Community Forest Forum - meet in different locations. Network with other members. Linked to Woodland Trust only because there are WT sites close by. Some other Friends groups more active in social/community.
<b>Perception of support</b>	All good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Fundraising essential. Community work - events/shows, Dog Show profitable, Xmas event. Grants. No membership fee. Started a lottery which raises quite a bit, twice a year, money from it aimed at projects/events. Don't own too much equipment. Shakespeare (Rain & Shine Theatre Company) small profit from selling tickets - most of the money goes to charity. Some events they are lucky to break even. Have a free concert each year as well. No produce sales.
<b>Legislation</b>	Not aware of any
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Environment, community health, lifestyle, working together, learning (fun with learning). Greenwood Community Forest aims of usable green space. An environmental corridor, habitat requirements, working with landowners informing them that what they do matters.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	urban fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mixed broadleaf, some spruce & larch, dominant elder/birch - pioneer species, oak, berry trees - holly & rowan. Planted 1997. Opened formally 1999. Coal measures - unique site two thirds disturbed soil.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	The percentage of local residents involved in the group is low. Population of the full parish (4 villages is over 10,000). To engage the community the group attend environment events at local IKEA and attends exhibitions at Coronation Park and they go to local schools.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Mixed - fringe of different urban areas. From high unemployment to high employment. Social mix.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walk, fly kites, sledge, dog walkers, walking groups, health programme through L.A. Walk & Talk Centre.
<b>Management</b>	Management plan with Broxtowe Council. Management work is carried out by Broxtowe Council staff or BTCV or the Friends of volunteers. The group are planting hedgerows to restrict access at the moment. Biodiversity, encourage adjacent landowners, creating an environment people enjoy, facilities for public to use, discourage them from using copse & meadows - hence the hedgerows. No silvicultural system. Some of the new brownfield sites they are trying to get they hope to get ancient woodland status. This was the 2nd site in the area to apply for a Green Flag.
<b>In EWGS Certification</b>	Not aware of any. No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Colwick Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Nottingham
<b>Region</b>	East Midlands
<b>Year formed</b>	2004
<b>Motivation</b>	Frustration with an indifferent landowner - the Local Authority.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	No one
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Yes
<b>Support - networks</b>	No
<b>Perception of support</b>	Generally poor at best
<b>Funding - ongoing</b>	Membership £2 p.a.
<b>Legislation</b>	None
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Campaigning, lobbying, promoting the site, practical work, educational activity.
<b>Urban/urban fringe/rural</b>	Between urban and urban fringe.
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	ASNW, scrub, secondary woodland, open space. Entirely broadleaved, sycamore biggest single species percentage canopy.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	1% estimated local residents involved in the group as members. Engage with community through voluntary activity, events, publicity.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Working class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Didn't specify.
<b>Management</b>	Only limited intervention. Management decided by Friends of Group. Have experienced land managers within the group. Timber not a management objective. The objective is to manage Colwick Wood as a local nature reserve and protect, maintain and enhance the site for the benefit of wildlife and local people. No silvicultural system set out but elements of shelterwood, single tree selection, group selection, continuous cover, none underpinned by conventional forestry analyses.
<b>In EWGS</b>	No
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Duncliffe Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Shaftesbury, Dorset
<b>Region</b>	South West
<b>Year formed</b>	1986
<b>Motivation</b>	Desire to look after local environment, local people liked the woods.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	None
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	None
<b>Support - networks</b>	None
<b>Perception of support</b>	n/a
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Previously supported activities through produce sales of firewood and coppice produce but a few years ago decided that they no longer wanted to manage the wood to make money for the group and now survive on reserves. Members take the produce.
<b>Legislation</b>	No
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Conservation, managing habitat for biodiversity, path clearance.
<b>Urban/urban fringe/rural</b>	Rural
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mixed broadleaves, some conifer but being progressively removed.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Notice on village notice board, leaflet for enquirers
<b>Definition of community</b>	Rural, middle class area
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Well used, walking, dog walking, over 150 attended recent open day
<b>Management</b>	Group has a free hand, but has to fit in with the five year plan that the Woodland Trust prepares. Conservation coppicing only. Work to keep woodland clear, coppicing, path clearance. Group has a tractor and trailer. Site is a Local Nature Reserve.
<b>In EWGS Certified</b>	Through Woodland Trust, group not involved. Through Woodland Trust, group not involved.

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Hagg Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Dunnington, York
<b>Region</b>	Yorkshire & The Humber
<b>Year formed</b>	2001
<b>Motivation</b>	To preserve the wood - FC (owners) were considering selling and there were plans to fell for a golf course.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	FC
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	FC, Friends of Dalby Forest, Woodland Trust Community Woodland Network, York City Council (fundraising advice)
<b>Support - networks</b>	Woodland Trust Community Woodland Network
<b>Perception of support</b>	Very good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Regular grants from York City Council and parish council, membership fees (£4 single, £6 family), donations. No produce sales.
<b>Legislation</b>	No
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To preserve wood for the local community, to enhance conservation value.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Rural
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	50% conifer, 50% mixed broadleaves
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Website, monthly article in parish magazine, information board.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Rural, middle class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Dog walking, cycling, walking, horse riding
<b>Management</b>	FC have management plan, group carries out tasks within this. FC manage conifers, road maintenance and major tasks. Group plants broadleaves where conifers felled, tidys up, keeps paths clear, improves access, bird/bat boxes. Group aims to maintain easy access for benefit of visitors and enhance biodiversity. Part PAWS, part ASNW.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Yes, through FC with no involvement by group.
<b>Certification</b>	Yes, through FC with no involvement by group.

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Hanstead Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	St. Albans, Hertfordshire
<b>Region</b>	East of England
<b>Year formed</b>	2003
<b>Motivation</b>	Land is part of the HSBC Bank Training College. It was offered to the community for community use.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Countryside Management Service, Watling Chase Community Forest, funding from Groundwork Trust
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Watling Chase Community Forest, occasional grant. HSBC grant on an annual basis but they have to apply for it. Countryside Management local project officer very helpful - gives advice.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Involved with BTCV - purchase tools from them. Part of the Community Woodlands Network but don't get much from it. Have contact with other groups through St. Stephen's Parish Council who own two woods in St. Albans, and another Friends of group. Also represented on the Parish Council woodlands committee. Formal meetings 4 times per year, informally they meet occasionally.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Very good, wouldn't have got off the ground without it.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Watling Chase Community Forest, occasional grant. HSBC provide a grant on an annual basis but they have to apply for it each time.
<b>Legislation</b>	Guided by Countryside Management Service - had to attend risk assessment and first aid courses.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To promote community involvement, monthly volunteer days and the community planted 2000 trees.
<b>Urban/urban fringe/rural Woodland - stocking</b>	Urban fringe Oak, ash, hazel, willow, field maple, guelder rose, hawthorn, blackthorn, apple trees. Planted 2004 (part already wooded)
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Local population about 1800 of which 40 are members. Not all of them are active - but about 20 are involved in management work. Active residents association, write articles about wood, have seed gathering events and planting the seedlings.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Higher percentage of retired people, new building in the area for working people.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking, picnics, dog walkers
<b>Management</b>	No lease or management agreement - the group has tried but HSBC have resisted. The committee decide on the management. Do the work themselves, not had to use external foresters yet. Aim to promote the woodland for the benefit of the community. Make people aware of that.
<b>In EWGS Certified</b>	No No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Holly Hayes Woodland</b>
<b>Location</b>	Whitwick, Leicestershire
<b>Region</b>	East Midlands
<b>Year formed</b>	2006
<b>Motivation</b>	To acquire three pieces of land from Hanson Aggregates (local quarry people) for the local community. It was being sold on the open market - advertised as an asset for sale - they had first refusal.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Money raised through National Forest Company, FLAG (Forward Leicester Aggregates) - through the Local Authority. Support for the purchase also came from local school, MP, District Councillors, local community, NW Leicestershire District Council. Hill Holt Wood (helped with business plan and undertook a feasibility study).
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	none
<b>Support - networks</b>	no
<b>Perception of support</b>	Whilst acquiring the site - v.good. Since then more problematic.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Generating income difficult. Seeking grants, money from membership. Membership fees: OAPs £7.50, Family & individuals £10 p.a. Corporate - £35. Plan to sell firewood and produce.
<b>Legislation</b>	Not aware of any
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Income from pupil referral unit and probation service.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Urban fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Primarily oak, beech, ash, silver birch, sycamore, holly.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Village population 5000 (membership 100). Some of the members do work on the land on a monthly basis (say 15). Use the local press to help with engagement, letters to households, events.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Woodland perimeter is an affluent area in part, council estate near as well. So mixed community. Problems with some youths.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	For recreational purposes, dogs, cycling, horse-riding.
<b>Management</b>	Friends plan and carry out management - business plan endorsed through the National Forest. Trying to secure funds for a project manager. Have a forester who is a local man so does the professional work on a voluntary basis. Utilise the site for rehabilitation and alternative education. No silvicultural system. Meadow SSSI. Plan to sell produce i.e. firewood and products from students.
<b>In EWGS</b>	No
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Judy Woods</b>
<b>Location</b>	Bradford, Yorkshire
<b>Region</b>	Yorkshire & The Humber
<b>Year formed</b>	2002
<b>Motivation</b>	The council had funding for an environment worker in south Bradford to create groups to get involved in management of council owned sites - this group grew from that initiative.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Forest of Bradford, council environment worker
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Forest of Bradford, council environment worker
<b>Support - networks</b>	Bradford Council has a 'Friends of' group support team, the group tends to give support to other groups in the area rather than receive it.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Excellent
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	The Coop supports the events programme. There is a membership. £1 membership. They have built up a contingency fund to cover three years expenses, and in the past they have had small grants (inc LHI) to cover tool purchase. No produce sold.
<b>Legislation</b>	Not really
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To preserve environment and recreation value of woodland through practical tasks and clearance
<b>Urban/urban</b>	urban fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Beech PAWS
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Newsletter, articles in local paper, website, notice board
<b>Definition of community</b>	working/middle class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	dog walking, walking
<b>Management</b>	The group has no written management agreement. Council woodland manager has prepared plan, agrees tasks with group, although group has a free hand in general as long as it fits with overall plan. They keep paths clear, maintain access, plant mixed broadleaves as gaps appear (no felling). The Group handles most tasks but requests council to bring in contractors for heavier work. Part RIGS.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Probably, but council deals with this.
<b>Certification</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Halesowen Wildlife Group</b>
<b>Location</b>	Halesowen
<b>Region</b>	West Midlands
<b>Year formed</b>	1988
<b>Motivation</b>	Many are ex-members of larger organisations but wanted to do something to protect the local environment on their doorstep. Initially renovated footpaths for Worcestershire Council and Dudley Metropolitan Council. Also help out private farmland and owners of small woods.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	No one
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Woodland Trust support them e.g. chain saw refresher courses that they pay for. Help with buying tools. Members of BTCV. Do work for Worcestershire Council and Dudley Metropolitan Council - paid small amount for their work.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Also voluntary wardens for Worcestershire Wildlife Trust reserves locally - meet with other volunteers there. Get emails from Community Woodland Network but never been involved or attended any meetings.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Membership fee £2 p.a. Quarterly meeting - charge nominal entrance fee. In the past, sale of t-shirts for members, plants, nesting boxes. Not out to make a profit just cover costs. Grants for tools to do a job. Also funded by people who ask them to do work.
<b>Legislation</b>	Health & Safety.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To help the local environment
<b>Urban/urban</b>	urban fringe - three quarters of a mile from urban conurbation
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	60% conifer plantation, areas of mature oak/hazel under storey. Large areas of regenerated woodland, mixture of native species.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Very few of the local community involved - 100 members and thousands in the local community. Only 5/6 regulars do the work. Made attempts in the past to engage with community but found it frustrating, time consuming and of little benefit.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Working class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	99% dog walking! Some orienteering events.
<b>Management</b>	Woodland Trust plan the management of Uffmoor with some input from the Halesowen group. The group works elsewhere in the region, putting in ponds, hedge laying and footpaths. In terms of Uffmoor Wood, they meet annually with the Woodland Trust to discuss what work is to be done, mainly in the winter. They are one of three different groups that do work in the woods. Others are volunteer wardens group and BTCV. WT also employ contractors sometimes. The group carry out improvements for the benefit of wildlife, the Woodland Trust are more people orientated so if the group is asked to do something that they think is detrimental or of no benefit to the wildlife then they wouldn't do it. The Woodland Trust aim is to reduce conifers and return Uffmoor to a natural woodland. ASNW and PAWS.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Don't know.
<b>Certified</b>	yes FSC

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Heaton Woods Trust</b>
<b>Location</b>	Bradford, Yorkshire
<b>Region</b>	Yorkshire & The Humber
<b>Year formed</b>	1977
<b>Motivation</b>	Land became available and it was in danger of being bought for housing. Residents on the west side of the city bought it (10 acres). Purchased on the open market. The money came from house owners and various charities. They became a Trust and their constitution was accepted by the Charity Commissioners. The Trust now owns the land. Once purchased the land can't be sold unless the constitution is changed. They now own 40 acres.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Bradford Council, solicitors, accountants, lots of local people. Knowledge based on joining in 1987.
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Support when renovating/new paths, new pond. Heritage Lottery - quite a few grants. Various local charities. Plus the committee of 16 all voluntary. Regularly in Bradford evening paper. Yorkshire Post running an environment competition - the group is in the final 3.
<b>Support - networks</b>	Only contact with Bradford Council and the Forest of Bradford
<b>Perception of support</b>	Grant support - good.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Produce sales - wood chippings and logs as thinned. Sell chippings in bags - process themselves. Grants, Membership (350) £10 each per year. Schools/groups £20. Thinnings raised £5,000 recently.
<b>Legislation</b>	Dogs - problems with dogs not on a lead. Chairwoman of group bitten by dog recently. Police not dealt with it properly.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To keep hold of the woods. Manage them. Earl of Ross - President, he used to live in Heaton area.
<b>Urban/urban Woodland - stocking</b>	urban fringe English broadleaf, oak, elm, silver birch. Planted 2000 trees for year 2000.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Most live within locality. North facing slope. Pupils help middle schools with work. Arboricultural Day 1st/2nd March - Lord Mayor plants a tree. Weaving willow, orienteering group occasionally.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Working to middle class. Asian population within a mile they come to the woodland.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	For amenity, walking/recreation.
<b>Management</b>	Have a sub-committee for woodland management, one person very knowledgeable and deals with all work in the woods. Use a combination of DIY and provided they can find the funding they will bring in the professionals. The group meet once a month and keep the woodland well managed. No management plan in place. Some parts are Ancient woodland. The restrictions imposed on the land are no motorbikes, no horseriding - on foot only.
<b>In EWGS Certification</b>	No. Recently had someone point out that grants are available. No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>High Bickington Community Woodland</b>
<b>Location</b>	Barnstaple, Devon
<b>Region</b>	South West
<b>Year formed</b>	2004
<b>Motivation</b>	The woodland is part of the Higher Bickington Community Property Trust which is developing a site for affordable housing and regeneration. The group is in the process of arranging a tenancy from the council. The newly planted woodland is part of a larger holding and is designed for recreation, conservation and as a shelter belt.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	FC, South West Forest
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	South West Forest (although SWF has recently closed down)
<b>Support - networks</b>	Member of Woodland Trust Network, also support from South Molton Community Woodland
<b>Perception of support</b>	Good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	From EWGS, some training funding from Woodland Trust. Membership £1. Future plans include sale of timber.
<b>Legislation</b>	No
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Regeneration of community using land and woodland.
<b>Urban/urban fringe/rural</b>	Village fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mixed broadleaves
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Monthly newsletter, posters, website
<b>Definition of community</b>	Rural
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking, dog walkers, picnics
<b>Management</b>	Woodland subcommittee advises board which makes decisions. County Council rarely involved. 3-4 work parties per year. Tree planting and maintenance carried out. Managed for recreation, conservation, education, timber in due course.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Yes
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>New England Wood Trust</b>
<b>Location</b>	Cuckfield, West Sussex
<b>Region</b>	South East
<b>Year formed</b>	1980
<b>Motivation</b>	The woodland was put up for sale, and local people were aware that a company had plans to develop it as a holiday complex. A few local residents provided guarantees, then there was a local appeal.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	None
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	FC (EWGS), some contact with BTCV (work groups)
<b>Support - networks</b>	Member of Woodland Trust Community Woodland Network, SWA, BTCV Community Network.
<b>Perception of support</b>	FC - good, otherwise adequate
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	£250/year from a local Trust, has £24k in reserves, £325/yr from EWGS. Sale of beanpoles about £60 per year - sold through group (word of mouth).
<b>Legislation</b>	Understands felling regulations
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To preserve the woodland for wildlife and benefit of the people of Cuckfield
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Rural
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mixed broadleaves, some neglected coppice.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Two open meetings a year, deliberately chose not to have a website or much else for publicity as the woodland is well used and want to keep it for benefit of local people.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Village is within easy walking distance, woodland seen as an asset for local people
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Dog walking, general walking and quiet enjoyment.
<b>Management</b>	Trustees prepared a management plan, volunteers carry out work on basis of agreed work plan for each year. Almost all management carried out by volunteers, occasional contractors when e.g climbing required. Objectives are wildlife/biodiversity, keep footpaths clear, use as much of woodland produce in woodland as possible - chipped brush/coppice for paths, sweet chestnut for bridges and fencing. No real vehicle access to wood. Some planting carried out and access work. ASNW.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Yes
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Oakleigh Woodland Group</b>
<b>Location</b>	Basingstoke, Hants
<b>Region</b>	South East
<b>Year formed</b>	1997
<b>Motivation</b>	Initiative from local council to involve local people in management of their woodlands. Four pilot schemes started, only one of original four survives but many more have become established since. Group runs coppice training courses for other groups.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Council funded an officer who was employed by the Wildlife Trust whose job was to establish groups to manage local woodlands
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Wildlife Trust, local council
<b>Support - networks</b>	Forum established comprising community greenspace groups managing council sites. This group is seen as one of the more competent and long established
<b>Perception of support</b>	Very good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Council pay for lock up garage, BTCV volunteer insurance, deer netting. Have had money for tools and training from BTCV and Whitbread Action Earth, also £300-500 per year from produce sales. Produce sold direct through newsletter/word of mouth. Membership £1 p.a.
<b>Legislation</b>	TPOs on part of woodland
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To bring the coppice back into cycle for produce and biodiversity benefits.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Urban fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mainly oak standards over hazel coppice, with other BL species.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Notice boards in woods, display at annual fair, council website, article in village magazine.
<b>Definition of community</b>	A lot of people live within regular walking distance.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking, dog walking, big event every few years, smaller volunteer events
<b>Management</b>	Group does not have a formal management agreement. Committee plan work in accordance with management plan prepared with local council. Annual review meeting with council. Group handles all management except occasional chipper use and dangerous trees. Objective to restore coppice cycle for produce and biodiversity. Produce includes hazel coppice products - beansticks, heatherings, beanpoles, faggots, poles for a local cooper, charcoal.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Yes - through council
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Pepper Wood Community Woodland</b>
<b>Location</b>	Gordale Road, Bromsgrove
<b>Region</b>	West Midlands
<b>Year formed</b>	1981
<b>Motivation</b>	The respondent believed the motivation came from the Woodland Trust and they were about the 21st/22nd group set up at that time.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Woodland Trust
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Yes - organisational only, respondent quoted they "should be financially self sufficient".
<b>Support - networks</b>	Used to be Woodland Trust network site but didn't think it worked. Been speaking to SWA about the Coppicing Network which has a wider range for them. Meet other Community Woodlands at the biennial conference of WT. Receive newsletters from other groups.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Brilliant from Woodland Trust
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Sell produce and firewood which covers costs (about £1000). No membership necessary because it is a volunteer group. Had 1 or 2 grants, Worcestershire £1500 for a trailer for the tractor. Don't apply for grants if they don't need them, because they fence you in with conditions that are onerous. Woodland Trust gave them a grant for interpretation boards but it was unsolicited.
<b>Legislation</b>	Health and Safety - Euro legislation. FC - cutting.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Operate informally. Managed for species diversity, maintain coppice rotation. Coppice as standards. Footpaths in reasonable order, erosion from public.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	rural
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Oak, ash on higher ground, some rarities - wild services common. Birch, blackthorn, rowan, hazel (coppice wood of choice), hawthorn, crab apple, lime, aspen.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Of the 25 that come along, 2 people within a 2 mile radius, most active members come from further away. One volunteer is the treasurer and another is a roving ambassador (or warden). Two yearly open days advertised in a 15 mile radius. Attend farmers shows to demonstrate. Have a website and a newsletter (goes to 70 people), link with local nature centre. Schools come into woods. Educational people - Bell Heath Group bring people to the woods, schools and teacher groups.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Prosperous area, large houses, large plots of land. Retired business/farming dormitory residential. "Gentile"
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking the dog.
<b>Management</b>	5 year management plan approved by Woodland Trust and Natural England. The committee, with the approval of Woodland Trust, carry out the woodland management using a standard yearly cycle, if outside that the group will discuss it with the Woodland Trust. Group has one professional forester but Woodland Trust do use commercial contractors for certain operations. Coppice as standard, no planting, all SSSI. Diversity clearance for new maiden oaks. Wood was clear felled approx 1946. Thinking of growing from local seed. Layering of hazel. Produce sold direct to public.
<b>In EWGS Certified</b>	Didn't know yes FSC

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Sadlers Wells Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Bunbury, Cheshire
<b>Region</b>	North West
<b>Year formed</b>	2001, owned wood since 2004
<b>Motivation</b>	To stop wood being clear felled. Purchased from the Peckforton Estate, if sold must be offered to the estate first. HLF part funded the purchase, remainder from donations.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	FC, lots of professional expertise in group (foresters, solicitors etc).
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Friends of the Wood
<b>Support - networks</b>	No, but would like contact
<b>Perception of support</b>	n/a
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Totals about £1000/year. Memberships from Friends £5 per year, small grants, a number of bequests
<b>Legislation</b>	Tree Preservation Orders on part of the site
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Preserve woodlands, enhance wildlife, provide facilities for recreation and education
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Village fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	As above, overdense high forest
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Notice boards on village hall and at wood entrance, newsletter, and articles in Cheshire Parish Link
<b>Definition of community</b>	Rural, middle class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Dog walking - dog bin in place, walking, some over use
<b>Management</b>	Trust prepares overall management plan. Friends of the wood carry out work, fortnightly sessions during the summer. Contractors handle mowing in newly planted area, some felling to create glades. Enhance wildlife, maintain recreation value, education. ASNW
<b>In EWGS</b>	no
<b>Certified</b>	no

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Witch Wood (Lytham St Annes Civic Society)</b>
<b>Location</b>	Lytham St Annes, Lancashire
<b>Region</b>	North West
<b>Year formed</b>	Civic Society 1960, acquired woodland 1974
<b>Motivation</b>	Not specified
<b>Support - establishment</b>	None
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	FC (grant), Myerscough College, Fylde Borough Council Tree Officer
<b>Support - networks</b>	None
<b>Perception of support</b>	Good
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	FC grants, other grants paid for path. Civic Society memberships, including purchase of cipper and tractor. Sale of logs through local dealer.
<b>Legislation</b>	Tree Preservation Orders on parts of the site
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To preserve the woodland for the local community
<b>Urban/urban fringe/rural</b>	urban
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	mixed broadleaves, much sycamore but mainly beech and oak
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	newsletter, website
<b>Definition of community</b>	very varied
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	walking, dog walking, cycling
<b>Management</b>	At present the Witch Wood committee, a subcommittee of the Civic Society, plans the management, but this will be taken over by the Trust. Contractors handle major tree felling and arboricultural work, minor tasks by volunteers. Aim to thin out sycamore, replant with native broadleaves, open canopy
<b>In EWGS Certified</b>	Yes
	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Woodcutters for Wildlife</b>
<b>Location</b>	Clevedon, Somerset
<b>Region</b>	South West
<b>Year formed</b>	1995
<b>Motivation</b>	Sustainable management of local woodland
<b>Support - establishment</b>	No
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Affiliated with BTCV
<b>Support - networks</b>	Some contact with BTCV and Woodland Trust networks
<b>Perception of support</b>	Little support, not satisfied with BTCV.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Income from talks, £200 annually from town council, log sales - marketed through the group, hazel coppice sales, retainer from local school to manage trees in grounds.
<b>Legislation</b>	Site is SSSI
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Restore coppice, new woodland planting, new cider apple orchard.
<b>Urban/urban fringe/rural</b>	Urban Fringe
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mixed broadleaves, primarily ash/lime overstood coppice.
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	Occasional paragraph in local press, via local voluntary council
<b>Definition of community</b>	Rural, middle class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Walking - permissive access
<b>Management</b>	Group has a loose management agreement and a ten year management plan agreed. All management tasks are carried out by the group, their objectives are to restore coppice. SSSI.
<b>In EWGS</b>	No
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Woodland Ways</b>
<b>Location</b>	Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk
<b>Region</b>	East of England
<b>Year formed</b>	2001
<b>Motivation</b>	To plant a new community woodland and manage existing woodland in Moreton Hall, Bury St. Edmunds. Land had become available, part of a planning deal. House builders had to leave it free. Negotiated with the council to manage public open space.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	Green Light Trust
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Green Light Trust. Local authority and ranger service. Receive advice mainly
<b>Support - networks</b>	Green Light Trust - networking once a year. BTCV membership.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Very good, particularly GLT on social and educational part of the work.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Grants - through the management agreement. Membership minimum £5 per household - some pay more. Heritage Lottery Grant - for specific capital works.
<b>Legislation</b>	Health & Safety regulations, Public Liability, Felling Licenses. Part of Land SSSI. Forestry environmental impact regulations.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Planting and managing community woodland. Social and educational activities about woodland.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Urban
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Broadleaf
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	2.4% of residents involved in the group. Around half of the members join in work parties. Education programme with schools. Go to community events to provide information. Monthly article in local newspapers.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Middle class
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Dog walking, children playing.
<b>Management</b>	The planning comes from the group. Management work is mainly carried out by the group. Council carry out tree safety work in the mature woods - one of the woodlands has newer planting. Objective is to enhance biodiversity, encourage public use. Existing trees managed with standards, new wood is coppice with standards - when grown. Part SSSI, rest local nature reserve. Some firewood - not enough to sell so given away.
<b>In EWGS</b>	No
<b>Certified</b>	No

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Woodscape</b>
<b>Location</b>	Huddersfield, Yorkshire
<b>Region</b>	Yorkshire & The Humber
<b>Year formed</b>	1991
<b>Motivation</b>	To preserve woodlands and keep open for recreation
<b>Support - establishment</b>	BTCV
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	Council, BTCV, White Rose Forest
<b>Support - networks</b>	No, member of Woodland Trust network
<b>Perception of support</b>	Good - insurance, tools, advice
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Small grants, jam making, council pays for insurance, tools and materials kept on land provided rent free by council. HLF funded ecological study. No produce sold. Membership £1 p.a.
<b>Legislation</b>	Not aware of any
<b>Aims and activities</b>	To keep woods tidy, carry out thinning
<b>Urban/urban</b>	urban
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	mixed broadleaves
<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	notice board
<b>Definition of community</b>	Very mixed local area
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	walking, dog walking, through route
<b>Management</b>	The group has no formal lease or management agreement. Monthly meeting to plan tasks, no management plan, little coordination with council. Group keeps paths clear, deals with dumping, some thinning. No methodical planned aims.
<b>In EWGS</b>	Probably, no involvement by group (through council)
<b>Certification</b>	No

### Appendix 3 : Supplementary Interview : Not included within analysis

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Friends of Chopwell Wood</b>
<b>Location</b>	Rowlands Gill, Tyne and Wear
<b>Region</b>	North East
<b>Year formed</b>	1991
<b>Motivation</b>	To prevent privatisation of Chopwell Wood. FC own the woodland and there was a rumour that the Conservative Government were looking to sell off woodland. Friends group campaigned for Woodland Park status
<b>Tenure</b>	FC own the woodland and they manage it too. No formal management agreement. There is a management committee and a "gentleman's agreement". Problem with the constant need to fill in forms, do risk assessments. Used to have volunteers working with professionals, now the volunteers have to be qualified and have first aiders, so struggling to get volunteers who will go through all the training.
<b>Support - establishment</b>	FC and local community
<b>Support - ongoing</b>	FC - Friends of Chopwell Wood support them financially from time to time as well!
<b>Support - networks</b>	Gateshead Voluntary Organisations Council - advice. BTCV some advice and insurance. Woodland Trust own woodland on other side of the River and visit each other occasionally and share correspondence but it is sporadic.
<b>Perception of support</b>	Mainly encouraging.
<b>Funding - ongoing costs</b>	Sale of Christmas Trees with a partner (commercial tree grower). The trees are grown elsewhere - firs in West of Scotland, spruce & pine in Northumberland - not from Chopwell Wood - not allowed to plant them because it is an Ancient Woodland. Charcoal. Grants - e.g. Local Heritage Initiative, Arts Council, Awards for All. Unusually this Friends of Group actually fund work in the woods for FC if they can't find the money to do it! Ideas go to the committee from either FC or from the Friends of Group and if agreed the group funds the work. They have paid for improvements to drainage, trails and put barriers in.
<b>Legislation</b>	Health and Safety and a permit for everything.
<b>Aims and activities</b>	Conservation, education, recreation.
<b>Legal structure</b>	Currently Voluntary Community Group but in process of getting charitable status. Revising constitution to fit. Under new charity law they are legally obliged to register as a charity if their income exceeds £10,000 and it does!
<b>Membership</b>	250 addresses but doesn't specify individuals or families. 200 voting members, all are Friends of, 15 on committee of which 6 are officers. Membership fee £5 individual or family, some pay more as a donation. £20 membership for 5 years.
<b>Urban/urban</b>	Urban fringe
<b>Woodland - size</b>	360ha
<b>Woodland - stocking</b>	Mixed woodland. It was a plantation long before FC owned it. Mix of conifers and deciduous but the plan is over next the 50 years to go back to deciduous.

<b>Engagement with wider community</b>	70% of membership is local, other members spread across the country. Next to a large urban conurbation so percentage of population unknown. Hold events, sale of christmas trees with crafts marquee. Contact with local schools/libraries and Tourist Information centres. Talks for local organisations, mountain bike track, sculpture trail, heritage walks.
<b>Definition of community</b>	Mixed - council housing, private housing (large and small). Terraced mining cottages.
<b>How does community use the woodland</b>	Dog walking. General recreation, downhill mountain bike track, two orienteering courses.
<b>Management</b>	FC lead - group can make suggestions. FC, group do conservation tasks & path maintenance, coppicing using hand tools. FC do it themselves or use sub-contractors. The group has paid professionals themselves to do work on their behalf. Objective is conservation. FC encouraging natural regeneration, group asked for some conifers to be left. ASNW. Site of nature conservation importance. Coppice produce is used within the woodland - willow weaving, hazel fencing and it is not sold.
<b>In EWGS? Certified</b>	FC woodland so probably no. Believe it is.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank all those groups who took the time to answer our questions and to the people and organisations who have supplied us with help and information for this study.