

EIA Screening – Afforestation at Ashlawn Road, Rugby

Appendix A: Log of issues raised through EIA screening and Rugby Borough Council’s pre-application consultation

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
1	Cllr New, Paddox Ward	07/09/2012	Location / process	There are other more appropriate sites should have been considered for the tree planting to mark the Jubilee.		<p>Forestry Commission can only consider proposals on their own merits. It is the applicant’s role to consider alternatives and select the site and proposals they wish to be assessed.</p> <p>In this instance Rugby Borough Council (RBC) undertook a consultation exercise on the creation of a Jubilee woodland (which included a plan illustrating the proposed tree planting at Ashlawn Road) prior to the submitting the proposal to the Forestry Commission. It is RBC’s responsibility to consider the information gathered through this exercise and consultation determine if they wish to proceed with an proposal/application at this site as the elected representatives of the local community.</p> <p>We have also gathered views on the proposals as part of the EIA Screening process. We have also reviewed and considered the concerns raised about the tree planting through RBC’s consultation (please see Appendix D and points 57 to 61 in this log).</p>
2	Cllr New, Paddox Ward	07/09/2012	Landscape	Tree planting will remove unique and extensive views across the Rainsbrook Valley.	Impact is not significant.	<p>The site lies within the Dunsmore Plateau Fringe (DPF) which is defined in the Warwickshire Landscape Character Appraisal (2006). The Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines document (1993)¹ indicates that the DPF would be enhanced by <i>‘large scale woodland planting on rising ground – the siting and design of the new woods will need to be carefully planned, however, and the aim should be to try and frame views rather than completely close them off. New planting should be targeted where possible, on hilltops and rising ground. Particular care should be taken to shape the lower margin of the new woods in very gentle curves’</i>.</p> <p>The site is on rising ground where tree planting would be consistent with the guidelines. The fall of the slope (20 metres) and managed open space to retain visits will help to retain views out of the site across the valley reducing the woodland’s impact.</p> <p>The proposal has been subject to a landscape impact assessment and the woodland design incorporates 40% of managed open space which has been sited within the woodland to retain views out from the site and to help retain a feeling of openness in some areas such as by the Rainsbrook and in the centre of the site (please see Appendices C.1 and C.3 and C.4). The edges of the woodland blocks will also be planted with shrubs to soften the impact of the main blocks of trees.</p> <p>While it is not relevant to our Opinion it is worth note that we would encourage and anticipate the management of these edges under a coppice regime that would after points of regular cutting expand the openness/vistas and maximise the ecological benefit of the open space (see for example the United Kingdom Forestry Standard Guidelines on</p>

¹ While these predate the Landscape Character Appraisal we do not believe there has been a significant change in landscape and land use to suggest these guidelines should no longer apply.

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
						<p>Forests and Biodiversity).</p> <p>We have gathered views on the proposal from both the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (reference 37) and Natural England (reference 55) on the landscape impact. No concerns have been raised.</p> <p>Finally, while access to the site is currently tolerated by the tenant farmer there is no formal right of access for people to enter the land. Views over the valley from the north (Ashlawn Road) and the east (Onley lane) are cut off by the existing tree and hedge lines. Opening the site to the public will enable more people to visit the site and its views – which will be preserved through the use of open areas in the woodland's design.</p> <p>As a consequence of the location and the woodland's design – specifically the use and location of open ground to preserve the views out of the site - we have concluded the tree planting will not have a significant impact on the views across the Rainsbrook Valley.</p>
3	Cllr New, Padox Ward	07/09/2012	Visitor safety	As well as affording views the openness affords visitors a feeling of safety.	Impact is not significant.	<p>It should be noted that there is no formal right of access to the land. Access is tolerated by the current tenant farmer and therefore this proposal - to create a wooded country park the public have access to should overall encourage more visitors to the site. Nevertheless due to the established permissive access tolerated at the site we have considered the proposal's impact on visits to the site.</p> <p>Countryside Commission Technical Report CCP457: <i>Growing Confidence: a research project into public perceptions of risk in woodlands in the urban fringe</i> (Professor Jacqui Burgess, 1995) demonstrated that perceptions of risk have an impact on have woodland access, especially for women. The report also explained that actual risks are small: "what is perceived to be real is real in its effects". So while an impact is recognised an assessment of the impact's significance must be made. We have considered several points:</p> <p>Firstly, opening the site to permissive access across in its entirety in the first instance and then designating the site for public access should encourage greater use of the site for recreation. This would be a positive impact and the more people, that visit the site the more people will feel safe to visit the site.</p> <p>A seminar organised by Forest Research in 2004 considered the accessibility of woodlands and natural spaces. One of the conclusions from the workshop was that: "The more that spaces are used by responsible citizens, the safer they become." This proposal will create a designated open space we believe if anything it should encourage more visits by responsible citizens which will increase the feeling of safety.</p> <p>A further point we have considered is that many people do enjoy taking recreation in woodland and may choose to visit the site because of its woodland features. The Annual Report from the 2011-12 survey to monitor engagement with the natural environment (MENE) shows that 358 million visits were made to woodland/forest sites (13% of visits of</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
						<p>visits to the natural environment) compared to 241 million visits to farmland (9% of visits to the natural environment). This is clear indication that people enjoy walking and recreating in woodland.</p> <p>Secondly, the woodland's design seeks to ensure visitors feel as safe as possible by retaining a large area of the site remaining as open space (40%) so that people can see well head of them.</p> <p>Another conclusion from the Forest Research seminar was that "Those who become involved in decisions about particular spaces should be more likely to visit them regularly, and to bring their families, neighbours and others." We understand that in due course (it will take some time for the woodland to develop) the applicant as the local authority managing a site with public access will look to manage the site with stakeholder input (including the woodland users) this could involve the reconfiguration of the open space.</p> <p>In light of these considerations we have concluded that while creation of the woodland would have an impact on some individuals choice to visit the site this impact is not significant given the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal's aim is to encourage public access to the site. • The number of people who choose to visit woodlands for recreation. • The mitigation that the use designed open space in the woodland provides.
4	Cllr New, Padox Ward	07/09/2012	Maintenance	<p>Maintenance of the trees will not be kept up to and the woodland will becomes dark and crowded that will lose the feelings of openness and safety visitors to this land currently value.</p> <p>If it is likely that the scheme is given the 'green light' despite our reservations, I urge you to communicate with and involve the local community and the ward Councillors at every stage of the planting scheme, as without the support of the local community, I doubt any wood will be cherished or protected from vandalism, damage or potential harm.</p>		<p>RBC have produced a management plan for the woodland through it early years (Appendix C). This recognises the constraints to successful tree establishment and sets out the steps we would reasonable expect a land manager to take to ensure the successful establishment of the woodland and appropriate management of the open space.</p> <p>The management plan contains a commitment to engage with the community in the ongoing use and management of the woodland after the initial establishment (also see point 3).</p> <p>Providing the resources for the tree planting and their maintenance is a matter for the applicant. However, the proposal is being considered under the EIA regulations because the proposal has been submitted as a grant application under the English Woodland Grant Scheme. While the grant application and funding is of no concern to the EIA Opinion, it is worth noting that, if the grant application is successful, the grant agreement will provide funding to support the creation and initial maturing of the tree planting. It will also place conditions on the land owner to maintain the trees, in this case, for the next 30 years.</p>
5	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Landscape	<p>Loss of visual amenity would therefore be detrimental to the landscape character of the location. The applicant's poor quality drawing shows extensive planting in blocks that extend from Onley Lane and covers 75% of the available land for afforestation, 25% remaining for the</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please see reasoning at point 2.</p> <p>The crematorium/cemetery is a separate proposal which is not relevant to our Screening of the proposals to afforest the land as shown in Appendix C.1.</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				provision of a crematorium and cemetery.		
6	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Landscape	The drawing is seriously inaccurate and should the planting extend as far as the applicant is indicating the visual amenity to the South and West will be lost forever.	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at point 2 . The woodland's design has been modified since the initial draft and the indicative design is presented in Appendix C.1. This has been informed by landscape analysis (see Appendices C.3 and C.5) and makes use of areas of open space to retain the views out of the site, for example particularly from the north west corner of the site which is the highest point and therefore affords the best vantage point across the valley.
7	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Bio-diversity	We are concerned the proposal absorbs rather than compliments the Great Central Nature Reserve and the existing habitat of species.	Impact is not significant.	The indicative planting design (Appendix C.1) buffers the Great Central Nature Reserve with a margin of open space. This is consistent with the wishes of the Warwick Wildlife Trust (point 45). RSPB also consider the proposals may be of benefit to the Nature Reserve (please see point 40). In addition, changing the land use and intensive farming should benefit the Nature Reserve because any drift from chemical inputs to the fields subject to the woodland proposal will cease.
8	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Biodiversity	<p>a) We would support strengthening the nature reserve with native species of trees by reclaiming the defunct picnic area in the lower left hand corner of the drawing and removing invasive plants or poor quality trees of low ecological value to encourage and enhance new healthy living walks in the locality. There are also poor quality areas of paddock which are rarely used, which could also be incorporated nearby ensuring any loss of acreage in the landscape area is recovered elsewhere.</p> <p>There is also a site within the Hillmorton Manor Farmland landscape at Kilsby Lane where biodiversity offsetting for tree planting has already been given outline planning permission.</p>		We have concluded that the proposal will benefit rather than absorb the Great Central Nature Reserve (please see the reasoning at point 7) and can only assess the proposals at this site. Other areas of land earmarked for tree planting maybe eligible for grant aid under the English Woodland Grant Scheme (EWGS) and may require an Opinion and our consent under the EIA regulations for forestry projects.
				<p>b) The site also contains a number of ponds some with a population of common toads and smooth newts and historic data of some spring time ponds able to sustain great crested newts.</p>	Impact is not significant.	The woodland's design – to create a native and natural woodland – is sensitive to the variation in the site conditions. The wetter areas along the edge of the river Rainsbrook will not be planted – and will become an area of open wetland and are able to flood and pond as the climate dictates. We are aware of only one pond on the site (which lies out side (to the north) of the tree planting proposal). The management plan (Appendix C) makes provision for scrapes close the river Rainsbrook which may create ponds/season ponds. The applicant will need to comply with best practice guidelines to safeguard and Protected Species present on the site (see reasoning at point 52) and this will mitigate against significant impacts.

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				<p>c) The current arable fields contain skylarks, buzzards, kestrels and barn owls which benefit from the open landscape when hunting field mice, field voles and shrews and insects. There are also good records of long eared bats in the locality which feed on airborne insects like moths which benefit from local flowering shrubbery.</p>	Impact is not significant	<p>We understand that breeding skylarks are present in the area but this proposal will not remove arable land from the immediate area (see Appendix B) which will remain farm land. This land will continue to support birds such as yellow hammer and skylark where the land's management allows them to nest and breed.</p> <p>We have considered comments from RSPB (point 40), Wildlife Trust (point 45) and County Bird Recorder (point 42) in deciding if the impact on birds will be significant. These comments recognise that proposals may have some impact on the population of farmland birds but there is no evidence to suggest this impact will be significant. On the whole the proposal appears to be something that will benefit bird populations overall (see point 39).</p> <p>The woodland includes a high proportion of shrubs (and managed open space) which will provide food and habitat for field mice, field voles and shrews (and consequently raptors) and also any bats in the local area. Older hedgerows and hedgerow trees will be retained so where these support raptors they will continue to do so. The management plan for the woodland establishment (Appendix C) makes provision for nest boxes to be installed on the site for raptors and during the initial establishment phase the food for raptors will increase.</p>
				<p>d) An over intensive planting of trees into the upland stretches of the landscape would therefore be a net loss of habitat.</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>The tree planting is to create a native woodland with 40% open space to maximise the bio-diversity. All areas – whether woodland or open space should increase the ecological value of the land – changing the land use from intensive arable farming. Arable farmland will remain available in adjacent land and across the Rainsbrook Valley (see Appendix B). We therefore foresee no significant impact in terms of a decline in bio-diversity and anticipate this area of woodland will overall help to increase bio-diversity in the area.</p>
9	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Bio-diversity	<p>The very limited number of borough residents who were surveyed over a short time period were asked if they wanted a wildlife wood, they were not asked if they wanted a commercially viable forestation project of densely planted trees to hide a development. We would therefore request that a planting regime is undertaken that enables good canopy spread and root development and allows sufficient light to penetrate the canopy to assist ground cover plants to develop and offer a diverse habitat for species and plants to flourish, this would allow for a net gain regarding biodiversity.</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>The proposal is to create a woodland of predominantly native species. This will follow guidelines for the creation of such woods with up to 40% of open space. The planting will be at 1,600 stems per hectare (roughly one tree every three metres, rather than a minimum of 2,200 stems per hectare for a commercial forest). The tree planting will avoid straight lines in order to create natural appearance as quickly as possible.</p> <p>These principles are consistent with guidelines on the creation of new native woodland and will maximise the woodland's potential for bio-diversity.</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
10	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Access	The drawing [initial plan of the tree planting ~June 2012] indicates three points of access we believe 2 should remain as pedestrian and bridleway, the third could provide access by cycle or disability scooter access if linked to the to Sustrans route 41 via Onley Lane to Ashlawn Cutting, this would be at existing gate entrances. Low impact car parking should be limited to Onley Lane field or new parking in Onley Lane by or in the Defunct Picnic area.		The proposals do not include a change to the car parking at Onley Lane or to the access points with the main access proposed from the north. The Council would need to consider appropriate access to the site, but we consider opening the land to public access is a positive change from the permitted access currently tolerated around the field edges.
11	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Drainage	Retention of ditches and flowing water courses is essential the applicant intends to use part of the site for burials. Over a period of time coffins disintegrate releasing ammoniac nitrates into the ground water, EA advice indicates such releases must be allowed to escape into flowing water where they can be easily diluted. If ditches and streams are not maintained and kept clear of leaf and timber fall they will end up as standing water and pollute the surrounding countryside and the plantation site.		Crematorium and cemetery is not relevant to the proposal to create a new native woodland. The drainage from any proposed crematorium and cemetery will need to be considered as part of a planning application for the crematorium and cemetery. The woodland proposal does not modify the existing drainage at the site.
12	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Maintenance	We believe the applicant's approach to landscape management of the site to be naïve. The council believes it can plant this high level of trees by using boy scouts and girl guides, then leave the project dormant for five years and then hand it over to Warwickshire Wildlife Trust volunteers. Volunteers have voiced their concerns stating that with their current work commitments on the Great Central Nature Reserve they will not have the capacity to take on another large project. The Woodland Trust advise that on-going maintenance of weeds and invasive species is required. Regular topping up with bark chippings to retain moisture on the site is also needed to enable the trees to flourish. Ditches, ponds and streams must be maintained to a high standard.		We are content that the applicant has a valid plan to secure the establishment of the woodland and how this is resourced is a matter for them (please see point 4). However, the management plan (Appendix C) anticipates the use of RBC staff in the maintenance. We understand that local school days (five) and that one community day are currently planned to ensure some degree of community engagement and that the community do have the opportunity to get involved with creation of the woodland but creation and maintenance of the woodland is not dependent on this resource. Ongoing maintenance of weeds and invasive species is certainly required and there control is addressed in the management plan (Appendix C). While bark chippings provide a mulching medium to control weeds and retain soil moisture we would not insist on their use by those creating woodland and the management plan makes provision for ensuring a weed free spot around the three for the first three years by chemical or manual means. This is standard practice to establish new woodland.
13	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	Maintenance	We believe the council should be negotiating a viable service level agreement with agreed partners based on a sustainable land management plan and a deliverable biodiversity action plan.		We have passed this suggestion back to the applicant to consider but it is not relevant to the EIA Screening and our Opinion under the EIA regulations.
14	Cllr Sandison, Eastlands Ward	07/09/2012	General	We would suggest that an Environmental Statement is required for this identified enhancement site of sub regional importance, which falls into the Solihull, Coventry and Warwickshire local nature improvement area which has recently been approved by the Secretary of State for the Environment.		The site lies within a Local Nature Partnership (LNP) rather than a Nature Improvement Area. While the LNP is still in the stages of development we understand, at this early stage that this woodland proposal would form part of the LNPs action plan for 2013. Based on the woodland design, associated landscape analysis and the management plan we have concluded on the basis of the reasoning in

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
						this document that the proposals will not have a significant effect on the environmental and therefore an Environmental Statement is not required.
15	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Access	RBC SAY no public access five yrs - then "permissive access". MUST guarantee 30 years?	Not a significant impact.	<p>Permissive access will be allowed over the land from the time of tree planting. We understand that the site will not be formally designated with public access until five years after tree planting, rather than that there will no public access until this time.</p> <p>While not relevant to the EIA Opinion it should be noted a requirement of certain elements of the grant aid applied for mean that the applicant must provide permissive access for 30 years.</p>
16	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Access	No car parks/accesses for public shown on plan/map? How? Where? IMPACT?	Not a significant impact.	No additional car parking is planned as part of the proposals (though we understand that the applicant may consider this at some point in the future if a need is identified and it is supported by those that visit the site. Car parking would be provided at the Rugby Club and the recycling centre to the north (or the Crematorium / Cemetery should planning consent be awarded).
17	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Planting design	RBC "not densely planted forest" But min 1600 per ha. RBC 60% trees 40% open spaces, rides glades?	Not a significant impact.	<p>Please see the reasoning at point 9.</p> <p>Planting broadleaved trees at 1,600 stems per hectare is consistent with guidelines for creating new woodland in the UK. As with all new native woodland we expect the tree spacing to be varied and follow long-standing guidance on creating native woodland (Forestry Commission Bulletin 112: Creating New Native Woodlands) that mimics nature as far as possible. In line with this principle we also permit up to 40% of a new native woodland to be managed open space.</p> <p>This open space will provide scope for access as well as maximising the woodland's ecology – the ecological benefits of managed open space within woodland are well documented (for example in the United Kingdom Forestry Standard Guidelines on Forests and Biodiversity).</p>
18	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Process	RBC NO public consultation exercise. NO publicity for FC?		Please see the reasoning on point 1 and Appendix D.
19	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Access	RBC "permissive use" not designating "public open space".		Please see reasoning at point 15.
20	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Food security	Great shortage of food, CRIMINAL to use grade 2 land!	Not a significant impact.	<p>We recognise food security as an important concern and that the loss of this arable land will have some impact. However when the following points are considered we have concluded the proposal has a significant impact on food security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planting scheme would remove 47 hectares of Grade 2 land from productive agriculture. This is 1% of Grade 2 land in the Rugby Borough and 0.2% from Warwickshire as a whole. Whether the impact is reversible is a consideration when deciding if an impact is significant. The creation of woodland at this site is not an irreversible change. The creation of the native woodland at the site would not comprise the ability to revert the land back to

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
						arable production should this be essentially required in the future.
21	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	N/A	Farmer tenant forced off the land. Or bribed - how much?		<p>This comment is not relevant to the environmental impacts but relates to English Woodland Grant Scheme eligibility.</p> <p>To clarify the grant application is not eligible for Woodland Creation Grant if there is a contested Notice to Quit. This is a specific legal process. We understand the tenant is not contesting leaving the land (though the applicant will need to provide confirmation of this). Any financial settlement between the land owner and tenant would be a matter for them, not the Forestry Commission and not the EIA process.</p>
22	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Visitor safety	Land is open safe for public enjoyment - wood would be dangerous abused by persons using the cover of the trees for their own advantage.	Impact is not significant.	Please see point 3.
23	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Landscape	RBC says "desolate" - nothing could be further from the truth. It is a beautiful open valley. It is simply not the right location for the wood.	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please see point 2.</p> <p>We recognise the value local people and landscape assessment have placed on this landscape. However, the woodland has been designed to retain the views across the open valley (see Appendix C.4) while the hedgerows already present in the landscape mean that the tree planting will not be incongruous in terms of views on to the site. The predominant land-use in the valley will remain arable farming (as indicated in Appendix A) and to that end we do not consider the tree planting will have a significant impact on the landscape.</p>
24	Rugby in Plume	28/08/2012	Process	<p>I am most concerned at the lack of publicity for this application. Even the Councillors in Rugby were misinformed about the need for a consultation, and EIA, and the public have been misled.</p> <p>A further month should be made available for the consultation as carrying it out through the August holiday period with no publicity at all is not a worthwhile and true consultation. I also believe that if I had not raised the issue there would have been no public consultation at all. Suddenly this and many other applications have appeared on the web site - there were hardly any others before I brought up the subject of how these Diamond Jubilee Woods were being established without any due process and public consultation.</p>		<p>Please see reasoning at point 1 and Appendix D which explains and reviews the consultation under taken by the applicant. The EIA screening has been subject a 28 day consultation which we consider sufficient for time for interested parties to bring forward proposals.</p> <p>Grant applications for afforestation are subject to screening under the EIA regulations and consultation on the grant agreement. However we cannot determine when this will take place because different applications are received and processed at different times. All follow due process when they reach the appropriate stage.</p>
25	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Access	This site is part of our history and culture and has been used extensively by local residents for the best part of seventy years for informal recreational purposes such as walking, dog walking, kite flying, sledging in the winter, pond dipping, bird and butterfly watching, photography and sketching. It is also in frequent use by horse-riders from the two nearby riding establishments. Whilst some Rugby	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please also see reasoning at point 3.</p> <p>We see no reason why this proposal would compromise these activities. The proposal would provide public access to the site beyond the current permissive access around the field edges by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allowing permitted access across the entire site while the trees are establishing.

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				Council Officers state that there are no formal rights of access by the public to the land it was the Council who constructed a kissing gate enabling direct public access to these farmland fields.		<p>2. Formally dedicating the site as open space to providing the public with a right of access across the entire area after the trees are established.</p> <p>We therefore do not believe the proposals will have a significant impact on recreation and access.</p>
26	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Access	<p>Access to the site however is not easy and can only be achieved by walkers. Currently the site is accessed either through the kissing gate or via the adjacent nature reserve. There is a gate from Onley Lane but only a couple of cars can park here at any one time and as the Lane is very narrow and is dangerous for walkers and cyclists, it is rarely accessed through this route.</p> <p>The RBC consultation documentation on the Diamond Wood states that "the site will be accessed via the proposed cemetery/crematorium in the north and also from Onley Lane, where car parking will be available." As the proposed cemetery/crematorium plans are still waiting to come before the planning committee, it is premature of RBC to be confident that this access will be available. Onley Lane is not a suitable lane to be used to access this site for the reasons described above. As Barby and Onley Parish Council's clerk states in her e-mail to RBC 20th June 2012 regarding the proposal to plant a 50,000 tree wood:</p> <p><i>"They [Barby and Onley Councillors] do have concerns over any increase in traffic using Onley Lane which is a very narrow in many parts, and it is particularly difficult to exit Onley Lane to either turn right or cross Ashlawn Road. If there is likely to be additional vehicular traffic using Onley Lane, then a roundabout or a traffic light system is required."</i></p> <p>Transcribed exactly as written in the e-mail sent by Barby and Onley Parish Council to RBC.</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>The proposal involve no change to car parking with parking available at the Rigby Club, recycling centre and limited car parking will remain at Onley Lane. The applicant has indicated a willingness to review the capacity for car parking at this location in the future is this is consistent with the desires of the woodland users.</p> <p>The main access to the site for tree planting will be from the Ashlawn Road rather than Onley Lane and we have concluded the proposal will not have a significant impact on traffic.</p>
27	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Food security	<p>The Rainsbrook Valley, consists of Grade 2 arable farmland, one of the best agricultural soil qualities, so it is very productive (Grade 1 is the highest quality soil and Grade 5, the lowest). In the country as a whole <u>less than a third of all soil</u> is in the top grades 1, 2 and 3a. In Warwickshire just 15% of soil is recorded as Grade 2 quality soil. We</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please see the reasoning at point 20.</p> <p>We can only consider the impact of the proposals brought forward for this site, not other locations. It is for applicants to identify the sites they wish to afforest – see reasoning at Point 1.</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				<p>believe that this best quality agricultural soil should be used for growing food. As we all know, there is an increasing pressure on world food stock and local food production, due to the expanding world and local population (Rugby increased by 14% in the past 10 years); changing weather patterns, (even America recording drought in their large wheat growing areas for two years in succession) and an ever increasing demand for food. We have to become more sustainable, we cannot rely on food from abroad alone and must consider more sustainable solutions here at home on economic as well as moral grounds. We need to protect the agricultural land we have around this Borough for our own and future generations in the whole of Britain.</p> <p>We do have several sites in the Borough which would be far more suitable for planting a wood than the proposed site. For example the Mast site on the East of the town, where the soil quality is Grade 4.</p>		
28	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Landscape	<p>The proposed site for the Diamond Wood in Rugby, off Ashlawn Road is located on a very special piece of landscape known as the Dunsmore plateau fringe. The southern escarpment provides a strong visual amenity for all the communities in the Borough. In 2006, Warwickshire County Council surveyed all the countryside surrounding Rugby. The outcomes of their findings are in their document, Landscape Assessment of the Borough of Rugby. They said of this site:</p> <p><i>“To the south of the town, the importance of the southern escarpment cannot be over-emphasised.”</i></p> <p>They emphasise that the southern escarpment landscape has not changed for more than a century. They state that the landscape here is highly visible and also highly vulnerable to change. Its strong condition and cultural pattern of fields and hedges, which have not changed for more than a century, can easily be lost, causing</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please see the reasoning at point 2.</p> <p>Only 60% of the land will be planted with trees with the remaining area managed as open space for bio-diversity and to preserve views over the Rainsbrook Valley. This will mitigate against a significant impact for visitors to the site.</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				<p>irreparable harm to the landscape.</p> <p>This is in stark contrast to their findings for the landscape surrounding the rest of the town, which they state has already lost much of its landscape character. In the north of the town they state that the landscape is in a particularly weak condition, and in large areas to the west and east of the town the landscape is in decline. These findings give emphasis to the uniqueness of this site which should be preserved, as it is, for the residents of the Borough of Rugby now and in the future. Once lost this special landscape will never be regained.</p>		
29	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Drainage	<p>Unfortunately the proposal to plant a Diamond Wood in the south of this site cannot be seen in isolation from the proposed plans to build a cemetery and crematorium on the northern part of the same site. This is because the Environment Agency classifies the proposed cemetery site as an "overall Intermediate to High risk site." As a consequence they request certain monitoring procedures to ensure effective drainage systems are in place. Currently a drainage ditch runs through the centre of the site from the base of the escarpment down to the edge of the Rains Brook. This drainage will be crucial in diverting undesirable discharges from graves. It is not clear from the plans showing where the trees will be planted on the proposed Wood layout that this ditch or any other necessary drainage required to secure ground and surface water safety will not be disturbed by the uninformed planting of trees.</p>	Not relevant to the EIA Opinion.	Please see the reasoning at point 11.
30	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Biodiversity	<p>This site is an important habitat for several protected species. We are concerned that by extending the Woodland from the Great Central Way/Ashlawn Cutting Local Nature Reserve on to this site, some native species and their habitats will be endangered.</p> <p>The arable land on this site is home to birds such as yellow hammers and skylarks which are on the "Red Alert List" for birds of conservation concern. It is a Warwickshire Biodiversity Action Priority to increase their population size. DEFRA reports that between 1970 and 2010, populations of breeding farmland birds decreased by 50 per cent, whilst woodland birds only decreased by 19 per cent.</p> <p>In RBC documentation on the Proposed Wood it states that:</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please see the reasoning at point 7 for a conclusion on the impact on the Great Central Way/Ashlawn Cutting Local Nature Reserve.</p> <p>See response to reference 8(c) for view on the impact on the farmland birds. We also note that the overall land use in the valley will remain arable farming (see Appendix B) and therefore consider that the impact on farmland birds will not be significant.</p> <p>The open space and shrub layer within in the woodland will create additional habitat and food source for a wider range of birds increasing bio-diversity in the area overall.</p> <p>The deep pond to the north of the proposals area is not effected by this proposal, lying 230 metres outside the project area. The Woodland Management makes provision for the creation of scrapes near the Rainsbrook which will provide pond habitat for animals such as common toad.</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				<p>"The array of habitats will also encourage a rich diversity of bird life from lesser-spotted woodpeckers, jays, song-thrush and owls" Other woodland birds will also inhabit these woods such as crows, jackdaws and magpies.</p> <p>None of these birds are a protected species or on a Red Alert List so we believe we should not destroy the habitat of the rare declining farmland birds in favour of the far more common scavenging woodland birds.</p> <p>The common toad is present in the deep pond on this site. It is a UK31 priority species. As you will no doubt be aware, the common toad has been:</p> <p>"[In] serious decline, demonstrated among many populations across large areas of South, East and Central England where 50% or more of the toad populations <i>"in rural areas have experienced declines ... including extinction or near-extinction of some populations"</i> (Joint Nature Conservation Committee).</p> <p>Its habitat should be protected.</p>		
31	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Maintenance and Visitor safety	<p>Rugby Borough Council does not have a good record of managing their Woods effectively. Cock Robin Wood which is approximately three quarters of a mile from the proposed Diamond Wood site was planted approximately ten years ago. It is now an overgrown, vandalised, dank and dark area no longer enjoyed by residents and to be avoided at all costs, particularly after dark when it has an undesirable reputation. The woodland planting scheme which has been distributed by the Council for the proposed Diamond Wood is almost identical to the Cock Robin Wood. The RPRV members are very concerned that the proposed Diamond Wood will be just as badly managed and another area enjoyed by Rugby residents for informal recreational purposes will be lost.</p> <p>The women in the RPRV group and a majority of females who signed our petition and who regularly exercise on the fields on the proposed Diamond Wood site say that whilst they feel safe walking in the openness of the fields they would be very concerned for their safety in the proposed Wood and would be reluctant to use it.</p> <p>Rugby Borough Council documentation highlights</p>	Impact is not significant.	<p>Please see the reasoning at point 4. The management plan (Appendix C) gives us no reason to think the scheme will fail.</p> <p>Please see the reasoning at point 3 for our conclusion on safety/use of the site after tree planting.</p>

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				the fact that the Council does not meet its targets to provide sufficient publicly available open spaces. The plan to fill this well-used and well-loved open space in the Rainsbrook Valley with small trees and shrubs will remove a rare piece of accessible open land from general daily use. The proposed Wood will impact negatively on the current safe access to informal recreational exercise for the majority of residents and their families and particularly for lone women.		
32	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	04/09/2012	Process	<p>The Woodland Trust and Forestry Commission emphasise the need to involve communities in the development and planting of these Woods. We understand and agree with the reasoning behind this principle; where the local community has an ownership of the plans and has been involved in planting the trees then there is a shared aim to ensure the Woods flourish and succeed.</p> <p>Unfortunately Rugby Borough Council has managed their consultation process on the Diamond Wood very badly. As representatives for the community who are most affected by these plans we expected to be consulted prior to the launch of this project. Disappointingly we have not been contacted at any time by the Council Officers involved. This lack of genuine engagement with the community is a major weakness of the whole consultation process and needs to be redressed. The communities we represent feel marginalised by the Council, their views have not been sought, and they believe that the proposed Wood is “a done deal”. The Council are telling them that they have to have a Wood on this land, where the trees will be planted, how it will be planted and what it will look like when it is finished, rather than negotiating the way forward in partnership. Not surprisingly the residents we represent have no ownership of this proposal.</p>		EIA screening has provided people have an opportunity to comment on the proposals to create a new woodland and has accounted for the concerns raised by the pre-application consultation (please see reasoning at point 1 and Appendix D).
33	Cllr Roodhouse, Paddox Ward	02/09/2012	Process	As a local Councillor for the area for the proposed wood, I wish to register my disappointment at Rugby Borough Council and its poor engagement with local residents including Councillors.	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at points 1 , 33 and Appendix D.
34	Cllr Roodhouse, Paddox Ward	02/09/2012	Maintenance	I am deeply concerned that the Council does not have a management plan for the medium to long-term it is not involving us in lay out design all as stipulated in Forestry Commission best practice guides.		A management plan has been prepared for the woodland’s establishment phase – please see reasoning at point 4 .

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				The Rainsbrook valley has a superb view and the concerns are that the wood will dramatically alter the landscape if not managed correctly.	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at point 2 and Appendices 2 and 6.
35	Butterfly Conservation	04 August 2012	Biodiversity	Looked at area can't see a problem with plantation. However, would ask that rides and clearings are incorporated into plan.		The woodland design incorporates 40% of open space in the form of margins, rides and glades. Please see Appendix C.1 for a plan showing the woodland's indicative design.
36	Butterfly Conservation	01 August 2012	Biodiversity	I normally don't object to tree planting on arable land normally a good thing. However two people who know the area better than me have said the following: a) That the Rainsbrook Valley isn't the ideal venue to be planting more trees, open land down to the brook far preferable.	Impact is not significant.	Concern on the impact on landscape and suitability of the site have been addressed under point 2. The incorporation of managed open space and the proportion of farm land that will remain in the valley mitigate against the proposal having a significant impact on the landscape. We can only assess the proposal and site brought forward by the applicant (see point 1). The woodland design incorporates a margin of managed open space along the edge of the Rainsbrook
				b) What we are short of in Warwickshire is unimproved hay meadows - so why trees at all?		We can only consider the proposals brought forward. However, the site's history of intensive arable farming would make it inappropriate for restoration as improved hay meadow.
				c) If it is to be trees - will they be the right mix of native species?		The woodland will consist of at least 80% native species to meet the guidelines for native woodland (FC Practice Note on Managing Ancient and native woodland). A range of species will be planted to ensure the woodland is robust to any plant health threat and climate change.
				d) If it has to be trees the plans seemed to show that the rides and glades needed to be bigger to gain maximum advantage?		The woodland design includes 40% open space that includes rides, glades and opens spaces to maximise the woodland's ecological diversity.
				e) The existing fields have Skylark and Yellowhammer and other rarer birds using them?	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at point 8(c).
				f) What mix would be planted in the rides and glades?		The seed mix sown in the areas of open space will be agreed with the FC with advice from the Wildlife Trust – this approach is document in the woodland management plan (Appendix C).
				g) What impact will this have on Ashlawn Cutting if any?	Not a significant impact.	We foresee no significant impacts on the Ashlawn cutting and its important habitat – please see reasoning at point 7.
37	CPRE Warwickshire	22 August 2012	Landscape and access	CPRE Warwickshire campaigns for a beautiful and living countryside; we seek to ensure that it is protected for all to enjoy for now and future generations. We value the countryside for its beauty (from grand landscapes down to small wild flower meadows), its tranquillity (from remote hill tops to woodland walks next to big towns) and its diversity (from rugged fells to the patchwork of copses and fields that characterise the Warwickshire		Comments on the creation of native woodland with woody shrubs and opens space are noted.

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				<p>landscape).</p> <p>The creation of this new woodland, with 40% open ground, 15% woody shrubs and a mix of native trees, close to the town of Rugby, replacing intensively farmed land, accessible to all and completely rather than partially available for people to walk within, would seem to us to be an ideal way of improving the landscape.</p> <p>We would therefore support Rugby Borough Council's proposal to create this new woodland.</p>		
38	RSPB	06 August 2012	Biodiversity	<p>While skylarks (and other specialised birds of arable farmland) almost certainly occur in the field proposed for woodland creation, the numbers affected are likely to be small. In EIA terms, I think it would be appropriate to assess the skylark population as of very local (not county) significance, and similarly with the significance of the impact. This proposal is unlikely to have any measurable effect on the overall skylark population beyond a very on a local (district) scale.</p>	Impact is not significant.	View on the local impact on skylark is noted.
39	RSPB	06 August 2012	Biodiversity	<p>In my opinion, the likely beneficial impact of woodland creation in this area will significantly outweigh the adverse impacts on existing wildlife, especially if the applicant/woodland manager concentrates on planting native species and manages the habitat with an objective of maximising its value for wildlife. There are several red and amber listed bird species that are likely to benefit, including song thrush, dunnock and willow warbler in the short term, and perhaps others in decades to come as the woodland matures. Insect populations in and around a woodland of this size will undoubtedly be higher and more diverse than in the current agricultural habitat, benefiting many birds and other species groups like bats.</p>		Views on the proposal's potentially positive impacts are noted. The proposals intention to create and manage a native woodland with extensive open space to maximise the bio-diversity and the species that can thrive on the site.
40	RSPB	06 August 2012	Biodiversity	<p>Another point in its favour is the fact that it adjoins a well-vegetated disused railway line to the west and Rainsbrook to the south, both of which provide existing wildlife corridors probably of some considerable importance in the local arable-dominated landscape. Woodland creation next to these existing features will probably have considerable benefits in terms of linking, buffering and extending the local ecological network.</p>		Please see the reasoning at point 7 for conclusions on the impacts on the Ashlawn Cutting Nature Reserve.
41	RSPB	06 August 2012	Biodiversity	<p>In summary, the RSPB considers this proposal will have a locally significant net benefit for wildlife in</p>		The site is likely to be subject to the Local Nature Partnership action plan for 2013 (please see reasoning at point 14). It should therefore be

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				the area south of Rugby and we recommend that it should be approved (without prejudice to any other considerations such as loss of BMV agricultural land, archaeology or landscape impacts, on which we have no comments). If possible, the applicant should be encouraged to draw up a management plan in consultation with appropriate bodies (e.g. Forestry Commission, the Wildlife Trust, the Woodland Trust) with nature conservation as a core objective.		subject further management decision that will involve the input from a range of stakeholders, including the woodland users.
42	County recorder for birds	13 August 2012	Biodiversity	Regarding the woodland creation in Rugby there are no particularly special farmland birds in that area that I'm aware of, although Skylark, Linnet and Yellowhammer do still breed in nearby fields and are probably present. The proposal should benefit birds in the long run so we don't have any particularly objection. The flood plain area used to be a prime habitat for breeding waders until it was ploughed, although this habitat would probably not be recoverable I should like to see the land immediately bordering the brook developed as a corridor of summer hay meadows, perhaps with some wetland. A similar scheme is proposed for a section of RBC land 1.5 km to the east along the same brook and it would be nice to eventually link this up.	Impact is not significant.	Views on possible impacts on birdlife are noted. The woodland design incorporates a margin of managed open space along the edge of the Rainsbrook and the proposals include provision for scrapes to create wetland habitat in this area.
43	County recorder for birds	13 August 2012	Biodiversity	The older hedgerow trees in the area do support breeding Kestrel and Little Owl and I would advise putting up nest boxes in any mature trees, as new plantations often provide ideal breeding grounds for voles and mice, at least in the early stages.	Impact is not significant.	The proposal includes installation of nest boxes on mature trees around the site and we would encourage the use of raptor posts on the site during the tree's establishment phase. This is documented in the management plan for the woodland's establishment phase (Appendix C).
44	Planning Archaeologist, Warwickshire County Council	23 August 2012	Historic Environment	Whilst there are no known archaeological sites within the bounds of the proposed tree planting, archaeological fieldwork recently undertaken immediately to the north of this site has identified features dating to the Romano-British period which may suggest the presence of a farmstead or other settlement. Finds dating to the Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age periods had also been recovered to the north of this site. There is therefore a potential for features related to the known Roman activity, and other previously unidentified archaeological features, to survive across the proposed planting area. Any such features are likely to be disturbed by the proposed planting, and the subsequent root growth etc. I do not consider that the archaeological implications of the proposed planting can be	Impact is not significant.	The existing historic environment record information referred to in the desk-based assessment for the crematorium to the north of the site does not record any significant heritage assets in the proposed woodland area. While the assessment work connected with the development to the north of the proposed woodland has added to the knowledge about the archaeology of the area. However, the work to date (more may happen) does not indicate the presence of significant features which the tree planting would have a major impact upon. The use of the land for arable farming over its recent history has not revealed any features of archaeological interest while the management of the land for arable production has the potential to damage archaeological remains (see for example English Heritage's document: " Ripping Up History "). It is reasonable to conclude that tree planting will have no more a impact than the current use of farming on the land. There is an area of historic environment interest in the centre of the site – the location of an old farm house. The woodland's design accounts for this with the area being left unplanted to safeguard against any harm to

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				adequately assessed on the basis of the information available at this time. I would therefore recommend that a programme of archaeological evaluation be undertaken across the site in order to provide information which will inform the assessment of the archaeological impact of the proposed planting. I would be happy to advise further on the arrangements for such work.		any feature of archaeological interest. RBC have also committed to making the site available to a local archaeological group to walk over the site after sub-soiling so that any features of interest that can be identified after sub-soiling the site can be recorded prior to major tree planting. In conclusion, because there is no information to indicate the presence of important archaeological features within the proposals area and given the current arable farming on the land the impact on archaeology of creating a woodland at this location is not considered to be significant.
45	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	<p>a) It should be noted that there have been skylarks seen on the open fields so retaining open areas field margin on the edges of the woodland where feasible would assist to meet their needs.</p> <p>There may be further points which we will raise in discussion re detail of the woodland plan.</p>	Impact is not significant.	The woodland margins will be managed open space – and we note the RSPB comments at point 38 and butterfly conservation at point 35 .
				<p>b) It would be beneficial to have open space on the west side of the proposed woodland, which is just east of Ashlawn Cutting. As you will be aware, this disused railway has limestone grassland with scrub, which is of high value for butterflies, reptiles and grassland flora. Warwickshire Wildlife Trust is investing considerable time in controlling the scrub to ensure that the valuable areas of grassland are retained. Whilst part of the section next the proposed woodland is quite dense scrub in places, it is hoped to control this over time to retain open grassland.</p>	Impact is not significant.	This advice has been accounted for in the woodland's design – please see reasoning at point 7 .
				<p>c) It has been noted that butterflies do bask on the current open farmland (blue butterflies have been seen sunning there/sheltering) and retaining part of the area as reasonable sized open glades would be very helpful to ensure this option continues, giving options for species to move between the sites to find optimum niches at different times of year and weather conditions. There is also some concern that tree planting of woodland adjacent to this reserve may have an impact re further seeding onto the reserve in the medium-term.</p>	Impact is not significant.	This advice has been accounted for in the woodland's design – please see Appendix C.1 and reasoning at point 36(g) .

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				d) We would request at least a 15 – 20 metre open area on the west fringe of the woodland, with a further buffer area of woodland edge species leading to tall woodland species. A suggestion would be to scrape off the top soil to reduce fertility and to seed the open area with grassland cuttings from Ashlawn Cutting.		This recommendation has been accounted for in the woodland's design (Appendix C.1) and the management plan for the woodland establishment phase (Appendix C) which indicates the applicant will take advice from the Wildlife Trust when deciding the seeding mixture for the areas of open space.
46	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	It would be useful to make the ride areas of good width through the woodland. Although it will feel very open initially, it will soon thicken up and the rides become more shaded. The Trust is re-widening rides by scalloping in our woodlands at Ryton, to ensure sufficient light and warmth within the woodland. Starting with wide rides will be beneficial to long term management. I would suggest having some larger glades, with south facing aspect, to maximise opportunities for butterflies and woodland/grassland flora.		Accounted for in the woodland's indicative design with the rides at least 10 metres wide with wide glades in places (see Appendix C.1). The woodland need not be a static feature so future management could accommodate scallops on the east /west aspect.
47	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	The point re planting wet woodland towards the Rainsbrook is sensible given the ground conditions. A mixture of some woodland near the brook and some open sections, especially at each boundary where it is more open, will enhance this. The management of the scrub and grassland near the brook will need detailing. If there are any water voles present, they need unshaded grassland along the brook edge, and cutting should be phased in sections to give a range of vegetation condition along the brook.		This point has been accounted for in the woodland's design with river edges left unplanted and the tree species at the bottom of the slope being wetland species – please see Appendix C.1.
48	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	Overall it would be of benefit for biodiversity to have a more naturalistic design, with scalloped edges and curved rides and walkways, giving maximum niches and mixture of options re shelter, sun etc.		This has been accounted for in the woodland's design with open space to provide views out of the site and create rides and glades to create open space and edge habitats – please see Appendix C.1.
49	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	Considering creating some pools near or beside the Rains Brook, with open canopy above /around them, would be of benefit for amphibians and biodiversity generally.		The management plan for the woodland's establishment (Appendix C) makes provision for the creation of scrapes by the river.

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
50	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	Regarding species mix, I would propose maximum level of native species from biodiversity aspects and working closely to the Warwickshire landscape guidelines. The species mix for National character Area Dunsmore and Feldon Character area should be used. Sweet chestnut should be fine if required in the species mix. Including willow/shrub species of willow in the mix near Rainsbrook section would be good to get lower shrub level growth, if suitable for FC grant support. Obviously the management of the woodland in the longer term, re whether it will be high forest, managed for timber production, coppice or a mixture will need to inform the species mix. The inclusion of hornbeam, and beech should be carefully considered re not key species of the area. Having a variety of areas through the woodland would maximise interest and suitability for a range of species.		See response to point 36c . Inclusion of a proportion of sweet chestnut could be accommodated as an honorary native species and a tree species that will add to the woodlands resilience to climate change or plant health risks.
51	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	We have not undertaken a species search, however if this has not been done, a review of information available would be good practice.	Impact is not significant.	The Biodiversity Activity Records (BARS) show that common frog, grass snake, and badger all may be present in the Ashlawn cutting. There are also old records that indicate great crested newt could be present. We believe the proposals to convert intensively managed arable land with native woodland and open space habitats will benefit these species. The applicant will need to comply with best practice guidelines and any licensing requirements to ensure protected species are safeguarded.
52	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	The soil may need testing. Woodland soils contain a different mixture of bacteria, fungi etc. than grassland soils. This will affect the take and development of the woodland.		This recommendation noted. We believe the mixture of tree species, dominated by locally native tree species, is appropriate to the site and current alerts with regard to plant health.
53	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	12 August 2012	Biodiversity	Additional note: The hedgerow along Ashlawn Cutting on the west side of the woodland could be laid and managed to a low height to provide flight paths for butterflies.		This recommendation is noted and has been passed to the applicant but we do not consider it to be a significant impact.
54	Natural England		Biodiversity	I am forwarding this to my colleague, as I think perhaps this would be something for her to consider as it is "biodiversity" and there are no SSSI issues for me to raise. My earlier comments to a colleague (Glenys Tucker) were that I know this land, (it is next to the Great Central LNR on my morning walking circuit) and is currently an arable field on the south side of Rugby, with minimal biodiversity interest. It is right on the county border with Northants, on		We can only assess this proposal on its own merits. The potential of other sites for woodland creation does not indicate woodland creation at this location will result in significant impacts or that woodland creation at this location has no merit.

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
				<p>the south facing slopes of the Rainsbrook valley.</p> <p>The fields are currently under ELS, which runs until Dec 2015.</p> <p>The idea of woodland is ok, but it would be good to see how it fits with the opportunities for woodland expansion identified by Warks WT and Dave Lowe the County Ecologist in the habitat linkage work they have been doing. It seems rather isolated from other woodland to me, and I wonder if there may be better opportunities elsewhere, but I suppose this is governed by land tenure, so beggars can't be choosers.</p>		
55	Natural England	9 October 2012	Landscape	<p>Natural England have no particular concerns to raise from a landscape perspective about this site. I have been through the Dunsmore and Feldon Character Area Description and woodland management and expansion, in appropriate areas, is flagged as an opportunity for the future. Warwickshire County Council's landscape guidelines should be taken into consideration when considering new woodland to ensure that it is planted in the most appropriate area.</p> <p>http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/landscapeguidelines</p>		Response noted.
56	Residents for the Protection of Rainsbrook Valley (RPRV)	30 th September 2012	Historic Environment	<p>The following information has come to the attention of our Group (RPRV). We are not sure if you are aware that an archaeological find of Roman remains has been identified on the proposed Jubilee Wood site. In fact from the information I have seen the Roman remains will be directly where trees will be planted and further investigations on other parts of the site have been planned by Warwickshire County Council archaeologists. We ourselves only found this information on the 21st September when we read the Officer's Report on the Cemetery Crematorium Planning Application to the Planning Committee - 26.09.12. I attach a full copy of the report and have also put together an extract for ease of access to the parts referring to the archaeological find.</p>		Please see reasoning at point 44.
<p>The following points and impacts were identified through RBs pre-application consultation.</p>						

Reference	Submitted by	Date	Topic	Issue	FC decision where an impact is identified	Reasoning
57	RBC's pre-application consultation	40 letters of objection.	Noise	Noise from machinery to manage the woodland will have a negative impact (and disturb those grieving at the cemetery / garden of rest)	Impact is not significant.	The land's current use for arable farming will result in the use of heavy machinery during tilling, seeding and harvesting operations. These operations will create noise which is far more frequent than work to manage the woodland. Therefore we have concluded the impact of managing the woodland in terms of noise pollution is not significant.
58	RBC's pre-application consultation	45 letters of objection	Food security	Loss of grade II farm land from arable production	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at point 20.
59	RBC's pre-application consultation	38 letters of objection.	Landscape	Negative impact on landscape	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at point 2.
60	RBC's pre-application consultation	37 letters of objection.	Bio-diversity	Negative impact on farmland bio-diversity	Impact is not significant.	Please see points 42, 43 and 41.
61	RBC's pre-application consultation	6 letters of objection.	Safety	Creating a woodland at this location will make the site less safe.	Impact is not significant.	Please see reasoning at point 3.