

Appendix 5.6. The questionnaire sent to land managers in England, Scotland and Wales to survey attitudes towards scrub conservation and management. Some modifications were made according to destination organisation (farmer, local authority, land agent, etc.).

THE NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE OF SCRUB

Questionnaire-based survey of landmanagers

Introduction

Purpose of the survey

English Nature (EN), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) wish to assess current knowledge about scrub and determine priorities for conservation and research on scrub. A consortium led by CABI Bioscience: Environment, including the British Trust for Ornithology and the Institute of Terrestrial Ecology has been contracted to assess the current state of knowledge in this area.

Definition of scrub

Scrub is difficult to define precisely because it is often an intermediate stage in the succession from open ground to woodland habitats. However, the definition given in the new Tir Gofal agri-environment scheme in Wales is typical: 'Vegetation dominated by native shrubs less than 5m tall, typically hawthorn, blackthorn, common gorse, elder, willow, birch or bramble' (Welsh Office/CCW 1999).

Questionnaire

1. Do you use a definition of scrub that differs appreciably from that given above? If so, what is it?
2. In the context of you/your organisation's activities is scrub a valued habitat in your area: YES/NO (if 'YES' please give reasons, if 'NO' see question 5)
Reasons:
3. Approximately what proportion of the land area you manage or advise upon could be described as scrub:
<1% 2-10% 11-20% >20%
4. What is the approximate area of scrub involved (ha)?
5. In some situations scrub is considered to be a nuisance. Do you have such cases
YES / NO.
6. If you answered 'YES' to question 5, what is the proportion of the total scrub in the area you/your organisation manage which is a nuisance:
<10% 11-25% 26-50% 51-75% >75%
7. If you answered 'YES' to question 5, please explain why the scrub is a nuisance?

8. Do you/your organisation actively manage scrub? YES / NO
9. If you answered ‘YES’ to question 8, please describe briefly the scrub types that you manage in order to:
- a) conserve existing scrub, maintaining it at a desired successional stage
 - b) enhance the value of existing scrub
 - c) increase the area of a particular scrub type
 - d) remove in order to conserve another habitat

Scrub type	a) conserve existing scrub	b) enhance value of existing scrub	c) increase area of a particular scrub type	d) remove in order to conserve another habitat (state which)
<i>Example 1: Hawthorn - lowland</i>				√(<i>chalk grassland</i>)
<i>Example 2: Hawthorn - upland</i>	√	√	√	

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

10. If you answered YES to question 8, what proportion (approximately) of the scrub on the land you manage or advise upon is managed:
0-25% 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%
11. Is this management a significant activity for you/your organisation in terms of manpower and other costs? YES/NO
12. Do you receive payments for scrub management (e.g. ESA, Countryside Stewardship, Tir Gofal etc.)? If so what is the source?
13. Do you have habitat/plant community maps for any of the sites you manage? If so, what categories do you use for scrub (e.g. only ‘scrub’, regardless of type, ‘Hawthorn scrub’, etc.)?
14. For those sites managed for conservation or enhancement of scrub, is management aimed primarily at the conservation of particular species (e.g. Duke of Burgundy fritillary, Nightingale, Whinchat) as opposed to conservation of the scrub type in general? If so, please list the species:

15. What techniques do you use for:

- a. scrub conservation - in order to maintain existing areas by arresting succession

- b. scrub enhancement - in order to increase diversity of existing areas or increase their extent

- c. scrub control - in order to prevent encroachment onto other habitats

- d. scrub clearance – in order to restore/create other habitat (e.g. grassland)

16. How successful are these techniques in achieving your aims? Please refer to the scrub types you have entered in the table in question 9.

Scrub type	Management	Success*
<i>Example: hawthorn on upland grassland</i>	<i>Exclude domestic livestock to encourage natural regeneration</i>	<i>4</i>

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

* Score on scale from 1 (unsuccessful) to 5 (very successful)

17. Do invading alien scrub species (e.g. Buddleja, Rhododendron, Laurel, Cotoneaster) pose a threat to any of the habitats you manage or advise upon? YES/NO
18. If you answered 'YES' to question 17, which alien species are involved and in which habitats?

19. What do you think we need to know in order to manage scrub more effectively?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire:

If you would like to receive the questionnaire by E-mail (WordPerfect or WORD format) please contact Heather Roberts (haj@ite.ac.uk).

Please return completed questionnaires by post or e-mail before **15 October 1999** to:

Prof. John Good or Mr Paul Stevens
Institute of Terrestrial Ecology
Bangor Research Unit
University of Wales, Bangor
Deiniol Road
BANGOR
Gwynedd LL57 2UP
Tel: 01248 370045
Fax: 01248 355365
e-mail: haj@ite.ac.uk

Your name:
Organization:
Address:

Tel:
Fax:
e-mail:

Appendix 6.1 The questionnaire used to survey attitudes towards scrub conservation and policy at a regional and county level. Some modifications were made according to destination organisation (FWAG, FRCA, country agencies, etc.).

THE NATURE CONSERVATION VALUE OF SCRUB

Questionnaire-based survey of project officers, regional staff and advisors

Purpose of the survey

English Nature, Scottish Natural Heritage and the Countryside Council for Wales wish to assess current knowledge about scrub, and determine research and policy priorities for its conservation. A consortium led by CABI Bioscience: Environment, including the British Trust for Ornithology and the Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, has been contracted to assess the current state of knowledge in this area. As part of this process, we wish to assess how scrub is perceived by those with responsibility for providing advice or awarding grants at the county or regional level.

Definition of scrub

Scrub is difficult to define precisely because it is often an intermediate stage in the succession from open ground to woodland habitats. However, the definition given in the new Tir Gofal agri-environment scheme in Wales is typical: 'Vegetation dominated by native shrubs less than 5m tall, typically hawthorn, blackthorn, common gorse, elder, willow, birch or bramble' (Welsh Office/CCW 1999).

Questionnaire

Please use a continuation sheet if required.

1. Do you use a definition of scrub that differs from that given above? If so, what is it?

2. What type of scrub work does your organisation fund/provide advice on? (please tick):

Management to:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| increase the area of particular scrub types | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| conserve existing scrub or enhance its value | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| control spread of existing scrub into adjacent habitats | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| remove existing scrub to restore/reinstate another habitat | <input type="checkbox"/> (please specify) |

3. What are the primary aims of your organisation in funding/providing advice on this work?

4. What order of priority do the following criteria have in influencing funding/advice on scrub management. Please complete each column corresponding to the types of management you indicated in Question 3, using the following scale:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Usually the primary criterion |
| 2 | Usually one of several major considerations |
| 3 | Usually only a minor consideration |
| 4 | Usually has no bearing on decision making |

The nature conservation value of scrub in Britain

Management to:	a) increase area of particular scrub type	b) conserve or enhance value of existing scrub	c) control the spread of scrub into adjacent habitat	d) remove in order to restore another habitat
Evaluation Criteria:				
LANDSCAPE CRITERIA				
<i>Value of scrub in contributing to the landscape character of the area</i>				
<i>Extent of scrub habitat (in general) in the surrounding area</i>				
<i>Extent of that particular scrub type in surrounding area</i>				
HABITAT CRITERIA				
<i>Rarity of that scrub type at regional or national level</i>				
<i>General conservation value of scrub as a habitat</i>				
<i>Potential conservation value of habitat which could be reinstated on that area</i>				
SPECIES CRITERIA				
<i>Scrub stand contains rare plant species</i>				
<i>Scrub stand contains rare invertebrate species</i>				
<i>Scrub stand contains rare bird species</i>				
<i>Scrub stand contains rare mammal species</i>				
<i>Scrub stand contains a range of rare species</i>				
SITE CRITERIA				
<i>Area of scrub stand</i>				
<i>Amenity/recreation considerations</i>				
<i>Archaeological/historical considerations</i>				
SCHEME CRITERIA				
<i>Land-owner/applicant has strong desire to include scrub management</i>				
<i>Scrub management is necessary to secure funding for a wider application</i>				
OTHER (please state)				

5. What changes in current policy (e.g. ESA, Countryside Stewardship, Woodland Grant schemes, nature conservation schedules) are needed to improve the efficacy of your organisation in undertaking and/or promoting scrub conservation?

6. What future policies would enable your organisation to maximise its impact on scrub conservation?

7. Would additional research or survey information aid decision-making within your organisation on scrub-related issues? YES / NO

If YES, what research or information would be useful? (Please prioritise on a scale of 1 – 5, where 1 = limited use, and 5 = essential).

Information	Priority

Is work on the future provision of this information currently underway in your organisation?
YES / NO / DON'T KNOW

If YES, please specify:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.