

Consultation

Ran from 29th September 2014 to 26th October 2014 via Citizen Space

Organisation/ Department	Issue Raised & Date	FE Response & Date
Shropshire CC Environment Dept	-	-
Shropshire CC Archaeological Dept	-	-
Wistanstow CP	-	-
Craven Arms CP	-	-
Clungunford PC	Clungunford Parish Council is supportive of your proposals in so far as they affect Clungunford Parish. The only concern, which I believe already to be in your thinking, is that felling should not take place in way that produces sudden and dramatic changes to the landscape, as clear felling often does. In other words, it would be desirable to leave some tree cover for the sake of appearance.	The Plan has proposed devoting a significant proportion of the woodland area for alternative to clearfell. 30/10/14
ActonScott CP	-	-
Diddlebury CP	-	-
Natural England	The plan contains no mention of the importance of promoting deer management control to facilitate the potential regeneration of broadleaves. Our experience in the area leads us to believe that without management of these species, natural regeneration of broadleaf trees will be difficult. Also we advise that a clear policy advocating squirrel control management would help enable broadleaf regeneration to be sustained in the long term. Natural Regeneration Policy: The silvicultural section of the plan states that if the natural regeneration is not sufficiently prolific (less than	The Plan now assesses the woodlands against the Habitats Regulations for Site and Species. By identifying the neighbouring SSSI and SAC and how the proposals could influence these sites it addresses this requirement. As stated a reversion to native broadleaf cover and move away from clearfelling the Plan proposes a vision of a woodland which has a low impact on the landscape and its neighbours. The possibility of EPS within the woodland is identified, measured and will be assessed again at an operational level.



	<p>2,000 stems per hectare), then enrichment planting at 2,500 stems per hectare would be carried out which we would support. We welcome this, however one complication may arise which is, what is the policy if there is a high proportion of ash regeneration? Ash is the most prolific regenerating broadleaf species in this part of Shropshire and what would the policy be if the regeneration was principally ash in view of the disease issues? Natural England would advise that to support the objective of a diversified (more resilient) species structure, where ash regeneration is prolific additional planning is considered.</p>	<p>Developing a more diverse, resilient woodland not so reliant on ash and alder regeneration, has been addressed by a prescription of small group replanting of site suitable native species. The issue of grazing pressure of deer and its limiting impact on regeneration has now been identified and if considered detrimental will be addressed at an operational level.</p> <p>30/10/14</p>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>We support the approach identified in the Plan for the folly. We are encouraged to see reference to the need to 'conserve heritage features' and would suggest that this is amended to read 'conserve and enhance heritage assets' to be in line with the terminology in the NPPF. Where reference is made to the need to engage with county archaeologists, we would also advise you to include a reference to 'local conservation officers and English Heritage, where relevant'. Whilst there is one designated asset currently, in the future it is possible that other assets will become designated. There is also the need for the Plan to consider undesignated heritage assets, in particular archaeology. We support the reference to the value of heritage landscapes and the opportunity for further enhancement through appropriate tourism.</p>	<p>The recognition of the designated and undesignated cultural and heritage assets within the woodland has been made and now sits aligned with the NPPF.</p> <p>Meeting Objectives now acknowledges a need to engage with local conservation officers and English Heritage where appropriate.</p> <p>30/10/14</p>
<p>Shropshire Hills AONB</p>	<p>We welcome and support the proposals outlined in the plan. Two comments are provided for consideration: Natura 2000 site: Saddle Hill and May Hill are located on land steeply sloping to the River Clun and Clun SAC approximately 1.5km downslope. This area has many runoff pathways that connect directly to the Clun SAC and are factor contributing to unfavourable condition. Clearfell/thinning operations should limit soil mobility and prevent sediment and nutrient release. Threats: Berry mill wood extends to the River Onny. Although only represented on a short section, common alder is likely to be the dominant species lining the river. Phytophthora alni is a known issue on the River. Should this be considered as a threat?</p>	<p>The Plan has proposed devoting a significant proportion of the woodland area for alternative to clearfell. This will develop a more diverse and thus resilient woodland whilst ensuring dramatic changes to the landscape are limited. This is particularly important in the cultural and visually significant Wenlock Edge woodlands (Berry Mill & Strefford Wood) and in Saddle Hill and Berry Hill which will contribute to the recovery of the Clun SAC though soil and nutrient stabilisation by limiting soil erosion. P. Alni threat has been acknowledged with enrichment planting proposed to mitigate threat.</p> <p>30/10/14</p>

CPRE		
National Trust		
Shropshire Wildlife Trust		
RSPB		

Strefford Wood Shoot		
Saddle Hill Shoot		

Flounders Folly Trust		
Callow Hill		
Alcaston Coppice		
B & J Davies Bucknell Ltd		