

Issues Log Wallshield

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|----------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| 1 | English Heritage | 13 th Sept | <p>Comments from EH are based on the impact of the proposed woodland on the setting of the World Heritage Site (WHS). UNESCO documentation makes clear that setting plays a role in the appreciation and understanding of Roman Military planning. EH key issue is considering the impact on the appreciation and understanding rather than visibility from the wall.</p> <p>Reducing the openness would harm the appreciation of the role the area north of the wall played in control of the Roman wall. EH concluded in terms of WHS that the 'harm is less than substantial' but that the proposal is 'not desirable'.</p> | <p>No impact on the footprint of the actual planting site. Consider impact to be visual from outside the site – on the wider landscape.</p> <p>L VIA assessed the impact from a number of key viewpoints (along Hadrian's Wall and Military Road). These views include those suggested by M Collins (EH) in an email of 10/2/14.</p> <p>Whilst assessing a number of sites the most significant results were where the visual sensitivity is high, the magnitude of change and effect on visual amenity is considered moderate. In others the effect on visual amenity is considered minor/neutral</p> | <p>No significant impact – visual impact ranges from moderate to no effect</p> |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|----------|--------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| 2 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | <p>Landscape, Landscape character Assessment the Ridge and Commons, landscape character type recommendation is that large-scale planting of new woodland should be discouraged.</p> | <p>There is a gap in understanding as to where the proposed planting will be visible from. In order to consider this further a detailed planting plan is required with either 1- An independent LVIA 2- Agreement of parties submitting comments relating to Issues 1-4</p> <p>Scope of LVIA agreed at on-site meeting involving FC, NNPA and EH on 5/2/14. Including key viewpoints to be included, methodology etc</p> <p>Completed LVIA points out that 'although the site appears larger than the adjacent forestry blocks on plan, the ground views are less problematic because it is.. 'a rolling landscape' and 'the proposed forestry is partially hidden by the landform'.</p> <p>In conclusion though the landscape sensitivity is high, the magnitude of change is medium and the landscape effect is moderate.</p> | <p>No significant impact – It is concluded that, since the plantation will increase in height gradually over time to maturity, is essentially of a temporary nature being a harvest crop, is partially concealed from many viewpoints by the local rolling topography and is relatively modest in size from wider views, the proposed forest development would therefore would not give rise to significant landscape and visual effects.</p> |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|----------|--------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| 3 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | Change in key landscape characteristics. | See Issue 2 | <p>No significant impact – landscape effects are moderate.</p> <p>See Issue 2.</p> |
| 4 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | <p>Site visible from numerous receptor sites along the Pennine Way and Hadrian's wall path this is claimed to have an effect on the value tourism in the area</p> | <p>No impact on the footprint of the actual planting site. Consider impact to be visual from outside the site – on the wider landscape.</p> <p>LVIA assessed the impact from a number of key viewpoints (along Hadrian's Wall and Military Road). Whilst assessing a number of sites the most significant results were where the visual sensitivity is high, the magnitude of change and effect on visual amenity is considered moderate. In others the effect on visual amenity is considered minor/neutral.</p> | <p>No significant impact – with landscape effects that are moderate there is no evidence that this will impact on tourism.</p> |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|----------|--------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| 5 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | Policy Outcome 2.1 in conflict with outcome of inspiration and tranquillity | Any issues regarding tranquillity could be considered similar for different woodland types. It will all be dependent of future management regimes and activities. Any impact relating to visual impact to be considered alongside Issues 1-4. | No significant impact- Visually the impact is moderate to no effect. In terms of tranquillity there is no evidence to suggest that forestry will have a major impact compared to other land management operations. |
| 6 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | Ecology Wader records show Curlew, lapwing, etc are present and breeding on farm and land either side of proposed planting. Increase in predators could effect populations of breeding birds. Possible aquatic ecosystems on site. | No evidence provided to identify nesting sites within the proposed planting area. There are nesting sites on adjacent areas (HLS agreements in place e.g. Edges Green) but new woodland would not significantly increase the areas of 'predator' habitat in the local area. Further submissions provided by R Mayhew (NNPA) in e-mail 3 March 2014 and N Douglas (RSPB) 6 March. However this did not provide any new evidence of nesting sites on the actual scheme parcel, rather, it indicates sightings of birds within the wider landscape. | No significant impact within scheme boundary nor on adjacent sites. |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|----------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 7 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | Access removal of 60 ha mapped access land from CROW. No provision for PROW on proposals. | Provision for access to include existing PROWs, road infrastructure, and appropriate access points to the site. All existing PROWs at Wallshield lie out with the revised planting area. Also no evidence of significant local use of the area for access. | No significant impact. |
| 8 | NNPA | 30 th Sept | Archaeology impact upon setting of WHS | See Issue 1 No evidence of archaeological features within the footprint of the proposed scheme that are likely to be adversely effected by proposed scheme. | No significant impact – visual effects range from moderate to no effect |
| 9 | RSPB | 24 th April | Waders breeding on and off site. | See Issue 6 | No significant impact within scheme boundary nor on adjacent sites. |
| 10 | Henshaw Parish Council | 20 th April | No concerns | Comments Noted | No significant impact |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| 11 | Neighbouring land owner | 8 th Oct 2013 | <p>Domestic Water Supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • spring on planting site NY3715 5708 • secondary spring at NY3716 5706. <p>Planting operations will disturb water supply through drainage works.</p> | <p>The location of the water supply point is not within the proposed planting site.</p> <p>Current proposal is to reduce planting within this catchment area to a minimum.</p> | No significant impact |
| 12 | Neighbouring land owner | 8 th Oct 2013 | <p>Landscape Surrounding of Scotch Coulthard with non natives and loss of direct sunlight from high ground to south. Loss of view of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Wallshield Crag 2- Longer views to the south | <p>Applicants' proposal is to reduce planting north of crag, so will be visible from property. Planting area too far from property to have any significant impact on direct sunlight.</p> <p>LVIA assesses proposals as having moderate/ minor visual effects as 'forestry present in the view' already. Also proposal 'would not occupy the entire view' so 'some longer views out would be retained'</p> | No significant impact |
| 13 | Neighbouring land owner | 8 th Oct 2013 | Access to CROW land | See Issue 7 | No significant impact |
| 14 | Neighbouring land owner | 8 th Oct 2013 | Wildlife presence of ground nesting birds and waders. | See Issue 6 | No significant impact within scheme boundary nor on adjacent sites. |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| 15 | Neighbouring land owner | 8 th Oct 2013 | Forest drainage affecting the Tipalt Burn; potential flooding and reduced flow. | UKFS Forests and Water guidelines to be followed to maintain water quality and quantity in Tipalt burn. | No significant impact |
| 16 | Natural England | 10 th Oct 2013 | Archaeology field options include ELS archaeology option on 2 parcels | Confirmation that ELS options lie outside the boundary of the revised scheme. | No significant impact within scheme boundary |
| 17 | Natural England | 10 th Oct 2013 | Wading Birds. Parcels 1 and 2 next to area of grassland wading birds options on adjacent property. Proposed planting negative impact on adjacent land by predators'. Revised scheme (Dec 13) no longer adjacent. Confirmation from Natural England that they have 'no objections'. | See Issue 6 | No significant impact within scheme boundary nor on adjacent sites. |
| 18 | Natural England | 10 th Oct 2013 | Natural England objective. Proposed woodland not an objective for Natural England Hadrian's Wall corridor.. | Whilst not a NE objective, there is guidance but no specific policy that prevents woodland being created within this corridor | No significant impact |
| 19 | Natural England | 10 th Oct 2013 | Aim to have native woodlands along watercourses. | Current planting proposals provide for areas of native woodland along the water courses. | No significant impact |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 20 | Ward Councillor | 11 th Oct 2013 | Scale of planting was questioned and its impact on the landscape. | See Issue 2 | No significant impact – landscape effects are moderate at its highest |
| 21 | Land owner | 11 th Oct | Wallshield Farm not sustainable economically. Also due to issues caused by 'Chaff' dropped by RAF on site, rendering the site unsuitable, in the landowners' opinion, for grazing livestock | Outside role of FC to decide on whether individual farms are viable or not. Tree planting is not irreversible, land could be returned to agricultural use if required. | No significant impact |
| 22 | Environment Agency | 21 st Oct | White Clawed Crayfish not present in Tipalt Burn. Advises that sediment is not released into any watercourse and open space is maintained alongside watercourses. | UKFS Forests and Water guidelines to be followed in order to maintain water quantity in Tipalt burn. | No significant impact |
| 23 | Joint Local Access Forum | 11 th Nov | Concerns over 1- Eventual loss of access land, once woodland established and land re-assessed under CROW 2- Creation of break in 2 areas of Open Access Land | See Issue 7 | No significant impact |

| Issue No | Organisation | Date Submitted | Concern or Comment | FC note /Response | Conclusion (does the concern indicate a significant impact) |
|----------|----------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|---|
| 24 | Ramblers Association | 18 th Nov | Concerns over reduction in open access land and continued access to woodland. Content that present PROW provision and access to crag is maintained. | See issue 8 | No significant Impact |