



Photo: McCoy Wynne

Community Forests and Planning Policy

Baseline review • April 2013

England's community forests





Photo:
Monty Rakuson

Contents

Introduction	4
Background	4
Baseline contact	4
Issues	5
1 Capacity	5
2 Collective voice	5
3 Identity and profile	5
4 Are Forest Plans up to date?	5
5 Status of Community Forests in development plans	5
6 Green infrastructure	6
7 Development funding	8
8 Delivery	9
9 Green belt	9
Appendices	
1 Template: checklist for structured interview	12
2 Emerging issues	12
3 Summary of baseline interviews	14
4 Summary of planning policies	19



Photo:
Mccoy Wynne

Introduction

In September 2012 it was agreed by England's Community Forests and Woodland Initiatives to consider how they were engaging with the preparation and implementation of planning policy and what lessons could be learnt for the future.

The Mersey Forest offered to undertake the baseline work and their Planning Policy Manager took the lead.

Three main areas of interest were initially identified:

- Work undertaken to date;
- Prospects emerging through Community Development Levy (CIL) and new development plans;
- How could the Community Forests best use the "material consideration" status within paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework to best effect.

Background

A scoping e-mail was circulated to members on 13 September. This provided the basis for the preparation of a template to guide telephone discussions to collect baseline information. The template was circulated on 3 October (Appendix 1)

Telephone interviews were conducted between October and January.

For summaries of the interviews undertaken, see Appendices 2 and 3.

Baseline contact

Progress on contacting each of the initiatives was as follows:

Community Forests

Forest of Mercia - 16 October
Great Western Community Forest - 18 October
Red Rose Forest - 6 November
South Yorkshire Forest Partnership - 15 November
Forest of Marston Vale - 23 November
The Mersey Forest - 4 December
Greenwood Community Forest - 21 January
Thames Chase Trust - 8 February
Forest of Avon Trust - 18 October

Forestry Initiatives

White Rose Forest - 11 October
Green Light Trust - 27 November

Tom Ferguson has been The Mersey Forest's Planning Policy Manager since 2009, following a long career working at St. Helens Council as a Development Plans Manager.

Tom works on influencing and shaping policy strategy at local and national level, to enable the future delivery of The Mersey Forest Plan and to support wider green infrastructure investments.

Issues

The following list of emerging issues was presented as a preliminary attempt to identify areas for possible development. These issues were discussed and endorsed at the Community Forests and Woodland Initiatives Conference in Birmingham on 28 February 2013.

Issue 1 Capacity

While there was recognition of the importance of engagement with the planning process, it was also apparent that there are serious limitations on staff resources and time. This will need to be borne in mind when considering subsequent issues and actions.

Issue 2 Collective voice

It was recognised that a collective voice could be valuable in a number of ways:

- Influence policy at national level (Forest Of Avon Trust);
- Provide guidance to developers for example reference was made to the National Forest Guide to Developers (Forest of Mercia);
- Support to the Forests themselves e.g. intelligence network on emerging trends and opportunities and best practice (Green Light Trust).

Issue 3 Identity and profile

Issues were raised in relation to:

- The continuing need to communicate the Community Forest concept (Forest of Marston Vale) and reinforce its relevance, including the importance of trees in improving development marketability;
- The risk of identity being weakened as tree planting becomes increasingly subsumed within green infrastructure and the emergence of Local Nature Partnerships (LNPs), for example review of South Yorkshire Forest plan put on hold with creation of LNP;
- Possible need to reconfirm core objectives. For example while Marston Vale is vigorously pursuing the original 30% planting target, does this remain relevant or appropriate within the other forest areas?

If it were decided to fine tune/reinforce the Community Forest core message, the baseline survey may be able to assist in highlighting examples of key achievements and future relevance. For example:

- Integrating substantial new residential development into the urban fringe landscape with associated woodland benefits
- Supporting the evolving agenda relating to green infrastructure and LNPs.
- Providing a strong locally based spatial identity
- Providing advice, expertise and support to local communities
- Delivery of multifunctional environmental improvements on the ground.

Issue 4 Are Forest Plans up to date?

Most of the plans have undergone one review. One has just completed a second review, while another, having commenced a second review in 2011, has placed this on hold pending clarification of its future relationship with the establishment of a Local Nature Partnership

The extent to which they remain material considerations in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework is a possible issue for consideration. One of the Forests encourages reference to the Forest and Forest Partnership rather than the Plan. However, another considers that their plan review in adopting a much broader remit than the original ensures it remains relevant with no subsequent need to review.

The latest versions of the Forest Plans are as follows:

Mercia (Under review)	1990
Watling Chase	1995
Greenwood	2000
Thames Chase	2000
Marston Vale	2000
Forest of Avon	2002
Great Western	2002
Red Rose	2006
South Yorkshire	2006
Merseyside	2013

Issue 5 Status of Community Forests in development plans

From the interviews there seemed to be a perception of a trend away from specific and individual policies in local plans supporting the Forest, to more generic, possibly green infrastructure-based policies which may or may not refer to the Forest in the policy itself as opposed to the reasoned justification (South Yorkshire, Red Rose Forest, Forest Of Avon, Great Western Forest).

However there were examples of strong support for the Forest (e.g. Marston Vale, Mercia, Liverpool) including in the case of Marston Vale and Thames Chase reference to the Forest in the Allocations document and Proposals Map.

It was decided to examine the emerging development plans in each Community Forest area and the policy references are set out in Appendix 4.

For each of the ten Community Forests considered 31 plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 were examined. This is not a complete coverage: it excludes, for example, emerging plans which were withdrawn or had not progressed beyond options stage. The policies referred to relate to adopted Core Strategies and Allocations DPDs or the latest version at January 2013.

The policies were classified as follows:

- Policy relates to natural environment and specifically refers to the Community Forest;
- Policy relates to Green Infrastructure and specifically refers to the Community Forest;
- Policy relates to natural environment and while the Community Forest is not specifically referred to, the supporting text makes clear it does apply to the Forest;
- Policy relates to Green Infrastructure and while the Community Forest is not specifically referred to, the supporting text makes clear it does apply to the Forest;
- No specific references to the Community Forest.

Some broad conclusions were drawn:

- All except one of the Forests have at least one of their partner authorities making specific policy support to them in a core strategy policy;
- 21 of the 31 plans examined contained direct or indirect policy support for the Community Forest;
- 12 plans contain direct policy support either in the context of the natural environment or green infrastructure and one of these – Central Bedfordshire (Marston Vale) provides support in both categories;
- 15 plans support the Forest directly or indirectly in relation to green infrastructure;
- Nine plans make no reference to the Community Forest.

Issue 6 Green Infrastructure

The relationship of the Forests and the Green infrastructure agenda is evolving. The exact nature of that relationship varies across the national Community Forest partnership.

Forest of Marston Vale

The Bedfordshire and Luton Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan was produced in 2007 by a Green Infrastructure Consortium which includes the Marston Vale Trust. The plan reinforces the status of the Forest.

“ *An integrated approach to enhancement and management is required. This is particularly important in relation to planning for sustainable landscapes in and around the major growth area locations in Bedfordshire and Luton. As an exemplar, the Forest of Marston Vale was designated to bring integrated landscape renewal within an area extensively changed by the brick industry but also central to a major growth area.* (para 2.3.3)

The Forest Plan is the key local delivery document in terms of green infrastructure across the Marston Vale area – a driver is the Forest target to achieve 30% woodland cover by 2030 (2.3.13)

Read more Bedfordshire and Luton strategic Green Infrastructure Plan

http://www.bedsandlutongreeninfrastructure.org/pdfs/Beds_and_Luton_Strategic_Green_Infrastructure_Plan.pdf

Great Western Community Forest

The Green Infrastructure Strategy for Swindon 2010-2026 was prepared by the Great Western Forest on behalf of Swindon Borough Council. The strategy includes references to specific projects including the major urban extensions.

This includes Wichelstow to include “extensive green infrastructure networks both within the development site and off site landscape enhancements, the latter to be developed through the offices of the Great Western Community Forest.

Read more A Green Infrastructure Strategy for Swindon

http://www.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/forwardplanning/ep-planning-localdev/Documents/green_infrastructure_3_main_report%5b1%5d.pdf



Red Rose Forest

Red Rose Forest has contributed to the development of the Greater Manchester Green Infrastructure Framework as well as influencing GI thinking at the regional level. It has also developed GI plans for the Irwell River Park, Manchester and Salford City Centre, and hospitals as well as producing the Trafford Forest Plan.

South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

The South Yorkshire Community Forest was commissioned to produce a green infrastructure strategy covering the sub-region, to be developed in partnership with the local authorities of Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield.

Subsequently a board representing the four local authorities approved the strategy recommendations and gave the Forest Partnership custodianship of the ongoing strategy.

The Mersey Forest

The Mersey Forest has been instrumental within NW England in promoting green infrastructure at the regional and sub-regional levels. A methodology has been developed which enables the analysis spatially of green infrastructure functionality in relationship to need.

The Forest was commissioned to prepare a Green Infrastructure Strategy for Liverpool which was commended in the RTPI Awards for 2011 and has recently published a draft Strategy for the Liverpool City Region.

The methodology has also been applied on a contractual basis in green infrastructure strategies in Ayrshire and Carlisle.

Issues

Within the green infrastructure agenda there are both potential risks but also opportunities for the Community Forests.

Some of the concerns expressed reflecting local circumstances included:

- Potential loss of Community Forest identity and the importance of tree planting within a much broader agenda
- Lower level of community involvement in green infrastructure strategies compared to forest plans
- Constraints on staff resources limiting ability to prioritise green infrastructure involvement and effective involvement on an ongoing basis

- Maintaining profile and involvement within the Green Infrastructure delivery mechanisms as they evolve, particularly if the commitment to the implementation of green infrastructure strategy weakens.

On the other hand as indicated from the examples above it is apparent that the Community Forests are finding ways to engage positively with green infrastructure and in doing so are:

- Reinforcing the strong link between Forest Plans and green infrastructure strategies;
- Emphasising the importance of trees and woodlands as critical green infrastructure;
- Demonstrating the importance of Forest partnerships as resources in the preparation and delivery of green infrastructure strategies.

A key challenge is to ensure that there is clarity and commitment to the role of the Forests and the benefits they confer as part of this wider process.

There is another emerging challenge. One of the issues to emerge in discussion with the White Rose Forest was the relationship not just between the Forest and green infrastructure but the extended relationship with Local Nature Partnerships and Local Enterprise Partnerships. The Forest is exploring how the formal relationships between these initiatives might be improved.

This is consistent with the Natural Choices White Paper which encourages LEPs and Local Nature partnerships to work together; and with the Government Forestry and Woodlands Policy Statement which encourages LNPs to identify, where appropriate, forestry as a local priority and LEPs to take advantage of the opportunities provided by Government policies to realise the potential of local woodland assets. The possible strengthening of the LEPs role in strategic planning as outlined in the Chancellors Autumn Statement is an added dimension.

The baseline study did not specifically explore the links between Community Forests with LNPs and LEPs but it is suggested this is certainly an issue to be given further consideration.

Issue 7 Development Funding

Several of the Forests have been successful in securing contributions for Forest delivery from the granting of planning permission for new development. These include:

Great Western Forest

In 2006, Swindon produced a Developer

Contributions Development Control Guidance note, which was updated in 2010.

Read more Developer contributions - 2010 update

http://www.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/Documents/developer_contributions_2010_update_dcg_n_-_final_nov_2010%5b1%5d.pdf

Red Rose Forest

In 2004 Trafford BC produced a Supplementary Planning Guidance Note entitled "Developer contributions towards the Red Rose Forest" The SPG set out requirements for new tree planting in relation to the number of new dwellings or area of new industrial floor space being proposed and an associated sum of money for each tree required.

In February 2012 this was updated as Supplementary Planning Document 1 Planning Obligations. Under the general heading Green Infrastructure trees have been taken as a basis to guide the appropriate provision of green infrastructure due to their multifunctionality and the multiple benefits they bring beyond simply improving an area's appearance.

Read more Developer contributions towards Red Rose Forest

http://www.trafford.gov.uk/cme/live/dynamic/DocMan2Document.asp?document_id=1DEB7993-E7AD-4C24-B492-16FF63A92688

Supplementary planning document

<http://www.trafford.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/strategicplanning/localdevelopmentframework/supplementaryplanningdocuments/documents/SPD1-planningobligations-Feb2012.pdf>

However, with the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy there is concern within the Forests that this could threaten future income streams.

There is acceptance of the potential importance of the CIL but the two concerns being raised are:

- The limitations on expertise and manpower within the forest teams to adequately engage with the local planning authorities on the process of infrastructure planning, and
- The more serious concern is whether environmental matters generally and tree planting more specifically will secure sufficient priority when in competition with other infrastructure demands such as roads and schools for the available funding

This will be an area to watch. For example the Newark and Sherwood CIL Charging Schedule came into effect in September 2011 and concentrates on transport related infrastructure. The Bolton CIL Infrastructure schedule includes under Green Infrastructure an identified shortfall to deliver the trees and woodland strategy forming part of the Red Rose Forest Initiative. Although the schedule is not yet part of the Council's programme for spending on infrastructure, it is encouraging that the Forest is at least part of the "pool" of possible candidates for funding.

Marston Vale have been advised that the total infrastructure cost to deliver the forest would be unacceptable for inclusion in the CIL infrastructure schedule and that submissions should relate to individual projects.

Issue 8 Delivery

Engagement with the planning process is important not only in order to embed forest related development within planning policy but also the ability of the Forest to support the subsequent implementation of that planning policy.

Although this was not rigorously examined there are several examples of Core Strategies where the Community Forest is specifically named as a delivery partner e.g.

- St Helens and Warrington (Mersey Forest)
- Bury, Trafford, Manchester and Wigan (Red Rose)
- Rotherham and Sheffield (South Yorkshire)
- Havering (Thames Chase)

Being involved in what actually happens on the ground is the ultimate stage of involvement in the planning process and two examples are mentioned:

- The Great Western Community Forest is closely involved with planning policy development and implementation in Swindon. Planning permission for a development of 4500 houses at Wichelstowe south of the M4 requires off site mitigation on farmland which the Forest is delivering through landscape and nature conservation
- In The Wicker area of Sheffield the Forest Director chairs the Sheffield Waterways Strategy which has been involved in investigations to shape planning proposals, fund research, demonstration projects and capital works. Through an associated river stewardship company the Forest has been instrumental in influencing the response to the flooding of 2007, brokering integrated solutions and their implementation

Issue 9 Green Belt

Two issues relating to Green Belts have emerged.

The first is relatively minor. Paragraph 92 of the NPPF referring to Community Forests is placed within Section 9 entitled Protecting Green Belt Land. It could be implied that Community Forest Plans as material considerations only relate to Green Belt areas.

However the Glossary defines Community Forest as "An area identified through the England Community Forest Programme to revitalise countryside and greenspace in and around major conurbations"

The interpretation will be of particular importance to the one Community Forest not within a Green Belt area

The second issue could be of considerable relevance for the Forests over the coming years. As the momentum to increase house building develops it is quite likely that areas of Green Belt within Community Forest areas may come under pressure. This was not specifically explored in the baseline discussions and will be influenced by local circumstances.

For example, within the Mersey Forest area the Core strategies of several partner authorities are clearly identifying the need for Green Belt review to meet the medium to longer term housing needs of their areas. As part of the Mersey Forest plan update a form of wording was agreed recognising the identification of targeted areas for woodland within the Forest Plan did not prejudice a future review of development options within the Green Belt while recognising the potential for a positive relationship between any development and Forest Plan objectives

How the Forests engage with what is likely to be a controversial debate at both national and local levels is an issue for consideration.

Summary of key issues

- The need to recognise limitations on staff resources and time particularly in relation to engaging with planning processes
- Importance of continuing to promote and reinforce the Community Forest message at the national level and with partner planning authorities
- Recognition and dissemination of the key role which Community Forests are performing and can further develop within the evolving policy context. In particular bringing locally based expertise to supporting the integration of new residential development and the development and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategies and Local Nature Partnerships

- Are the Forest plans sufficiently up to date?
- There are encouraging examples from all forest areas of recognition in development plan policies. The issue is how best to extend this and influence the more detailed plans relating to allocations and action areas for example
- Increasing involvement in green infrastructure planning while maintaining the identity of the Community Forest. Within this context consider the most appropriate means of increasing engagement with their local LNP and LEP.
- Working with local authority partners to ensure Community Forests are recognised as local infrastructure in order to engage in the allocation of CIL funding
- Being recognised within the planning process as key delivery agencies with an established locally based record of achievement
- Possible need to clarify the forests position and role in relation to future urban fringe/ Green Belt release for housebuilding
- Don't overlook the implications of national sector led guidance on health and the outcome of Taylor Review on planning policy guidance
- Confirm the importance of making contact with the appropriate officers in planning while recognising the opportunity costs involved and constraints on overstretched staff resources
- Help to understand planning system required
- Opportunities to access CIL/S106 funding need to be pursued
- Important that woodland management requirements be included within funding secured through planning process
- National guidance to CF would be welcomed
- Resource implications arising from proposed top slicing of CIL to neighbourhood planning areas
- Suggestion made whether a community forest or parts of it could be a neighbourhood plan

Summary of issues raised at Community Forests Conference

- NPPF recognised as a very useful context for the community forests
- If possible the Forests need to update plans to make sure that they are current-whether these be Community Forest plans or GI plans or both.
- We should have confidence in our message and not worry too much as to whether we are talking about community forestry or green infrastructure. We can always get community forestry hooks into green infrastructure if needed and vice versa.
- Recognised that while there are potential negative aspects the green infrastructure agenda provides opportunities and the approach should be positive
- We should look at developing a pilot with a 25 year horizon to demonstrate how advanced planting can assist later development as well as produce other GI benefits. Potential to look at a trust land ownership model with endowments. We would need to see how this would fit in with housing allocations etc and whether this is a realistic option when dealing with developers and communities in the context of the new planning system
- Potential for massive land use change should be recognised



Photo:
Mccoy Wynne

Appendices

Appendix 1 Template Checklist for structured interview

Name of Forest/Trust

- Contact

Local planning authorities covered

- Formal partnership
- Other arrangement
- Link officer contact if applicable

Forest Plan

- Do you have a Forest Plan
- Name
- Date
- Dates of any earlier version
- Provide link

Local plans

- If you don't know I can do any chasing
- Name and date of current statutory plan
- Name and status of any emerging statutory plan

Links between Forest Plan and statutory plan

- Does the statutory plan make reference to the Forest/Trust or Forest Plan
- Are there any policies specifically supporting the Forest Plan (provide reference)
- Are there any Supplementary Planning Documents supporting the Forest
- Any inputs to Design guidance
- Have you agreed with the planners any qualitative standards for tree planting in new developments
- Are there any non statutory documents such as Open space or Green Infrastructure Strategies which support the Forest
- Are these referred to and/or supported by statutory plans
- Any references to the Forest as a delivery mechanism to assist implementation of the statutory plan

Good practice

- Any examples of good practice which could be more widely disseminated
- Any problems encountered or issues arising in relation to strengthening links between the forest and planning policy

Liaison

- Any formal or informal arrangements for regular liaison between Forest/Trust and local planning authority officers to discuss synergy of policy and/or ways that Forest can assist implementation of planning policy
- Any mechanisms involving liaison with local politicians in relation to the above

- Is the Forest/Trust consulted on planning applications and if so do you formally respond

Funding

- Are there any examples of planning policy securing funding to implement Forest Plan policies
- Examples may include planning conditions or
- S106 agreements

Current developments

Do you have any current involvement seeking to influence:

- Most recent development plan
- Infrastructure plans
- Community Infrastructure levy

Site development examples

- Do you have any specific examples of sites which have been through the whole development cycle: planning policy; development; implementation and woodland management
- If so obtain details and any publication/links

General

- Thoughts on how to improve involvement with planning process
- Constraints on doing so

Appendix 2 Emerging issues

Forest of Mercia

- Capacity restraint on maintaining regular dialogue with planning authorities
- Desirability of being supported by a generic document directed at planners such as produced for the National Forest.

Read more Guide for developers and planners

<http://www.nationalforest.org/document/information/develop.pdf>

- Positive reference to Forest in South Staffs Core Strategy

Great Western Community Forest

- References to Forest Plan in statutory plans becoming less influential. Compare Swindon Local plan policy ENV 19 with Core Strategy Policy CT3
- Developer contributions through SPG/SPD very important as mainstay for team funding. Positive example of s 106 contribution

Read more Developer contributions - 2010 update

http://www.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/Documents/developer_contributions_2010_update_dcg_n_-_final_nov_2010%5b1%5d.pdf

- Importance of close working relationships with core funding LA partner taking advantage of growth generated funding
- Recognises the potential importance of CIL and trying to influence CIL process but not anticipating much success or priority being attached to environmental schemes
- Need for dedicated officer-capacity limitation for level of engagement need to seek benefits through involvement with planning

Red Rose Forest

Positive example of SPD funding in Trafford

Read more Planning obligations technical note 4

<http://www.trafford.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/strategicplanning/localdevelopmentframework/supplementaryplanningdocuments/documents/SPD1-planning-obligations-TN-4.pdf>

Planning obligations February 2012

<http://www.trafford.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/strategicplanning/localdevelopmentframework/supplementaryplanningdocuments/documents/SPD1-planning-obligations-Feb2012.pdf>

South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

- Forest plan review on hold due to creation of Local Nature partnership-issue of how they relate
- Forest Plan mentioned in two of partner LDFs but only indirectly through Green Infrastructure in another two although this includes reference to role in delivery
- Important role for Forest in preparation and coordination of delivery of South Yorks Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Capacity for involvement in policy development consultation diminishing
- Discussion on CIL being undertaken through Local Nature partnership
- Challenge remains to get officers to take tree cover seriously
- Risk of tree planting becoming subsumed within green infrastructure
- Loss of key partner support

Forest of Marston Vale

- Strong commitment to ensuring 30% tree

planting target is built into statutory plans. Strong mention of forest in Central Beds Core Strategy and emerging Allocations DPD and Proposals Map

- Significant funding secured through negotiation with applicants ,Central Bedfordshire Obligation SPD but concern that status and priority of tree planting in CIL expected to be lower

Read more Supplementary planning document

[http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/Images/Planning%20Obligations%20Supplementary%20Planning%20Document%20\(North\)_tcm6-3655.pdf](http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/Images/Planning%20Obligations%20Supplementary%20Planning%20Document%20(North)_tcm6-3655.pdf)

- Need to reinforce promotion and understanding of Community Forest
- Need to hold local authorities to account
- Need to argue role of trees in improving development marketability
- Is there an issue of status of NPPF and Forest Plans in non Green Belt areas

Thames Chase Trust

- Continue working with partners to ensure Forest bedded into updates of planning policy
- Maintain and develop involvement with green infrastructure delivery mechanisms

White Rose Forest

- Significant involvement in Leeds City Region Green Infrastructure Strategy but current concern that implementation not a political priority
- Current emphasis on trying to forge links between Green Infrastructure and economic priorities
- Involvement in and relationship between Forest ,GI Strategy, LNP and LEP

Forest of Avon Trust

- Reference to Forest in Local Plans is weakening
- A joint SPG in 2005 "Planning and the Forest of Avon-a guide to developers " now dated
- Capacity issues
- A collective voice to influence policy development at national level would be useful

Green Light Trust

- Would welcome supporting framework including intelligence on emerging trends and opportunities and examples of best practice demonstrating collaboration,

meeting broader benefits, delivering medium and long term sustainability

Appendix 3 Summary of baseline interviews

Forest of Mercia

Rebecca Banks - 16-10-12

The forest covers 92 sq miles and includes parts of the authorities of Staffordshire CC, South Staffs Council, Lichfield DC and Walsall MBC. Looking to develop formal partnership with Staffordshire and South Staffs.

Link officers are mainly on the environmental rather than planning side.

A Forest plan was produced in 1990 and is under review. An electronic link could be made available

The extent of reference to the Forest in all the relevant statutory plans was not clear. However there are several positive references in the South Staffs Submission Core Strategy of June 2012; these include para 3.12 Cross Boundary issues; the Vision for the North –Eastern Area; Core Policy 2 Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment and Policy HWB 2 Green Infrastructure. Attention drawn to South Staffs SPD.

Not sure on any references to the Forest as a delivery mechanism in statutory plans.

Good practice example: Forest won tender to undertake development and management of site as an all-age environmental education centre using s 106 funding.

Consulted on planning applications, receiving weekly list from S Staffs. Respond occasionally on major applications.

General issues

Difficulty of maintaining regular dialogue
Attention drawn to National Forest document for planners. Would something similar be appropriate for the Community Forests

Great Western Community Forest

Jon Wilshaw - 18-10-12

The local authorities are Swindon Council, Vale of White Horse DC and North Wiltshire DC There is no formal arrangement. Closest links are with Swindon who remain the main funding partner. Links with White Horse who no longer fund and N Wilts who provide minor funding are limited
Officer links are maintained but not formally.

The strongest are with Swindon, with the Forest located in the planning office.

The Great Western Community Forest Plan first version was published in 1994. It was revised in 2002 for the period to 2027. It is becoming less influential

Only Swindon Local Plans remain relevant with existing and emerging Local Plans containing policies supporting Community Forest. The Local Plan 2011 contains saved policies and the Core Strategy for the period to 2026 is at pre-submission stage, to be adopted in 2014.

Swindon adopted a Community Forest SPG in 2004. Swindon GI strategy was prepared by the Great West Forest on behalf of Swindon BC and contains references to the role of trees and Community forest as a delivery mechanism. The GI strategy is strongly linked to the statutory plan which gives the Forest some status as a delivery mechanism.

Read more Green Infrastructure Report

http://www.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/forwardplaning/ep-planning-localdev/Documents/green_infrastructure_3_main_report%5b1%5d.pdf

A good practice case study relating to a GI corridor has been submitted to Landscape Institute. A second is under preparation

No formal liaison mechanisms exist with Swindon planners but liaison strong due in part to the Forest being located in planning office.

All planning applications in Swindon are viewed with Forest landscape architect responsible for commenting where relevant.

Mainstay of team is s106 funding which goes into a cumulative pot for use in supporting the aims of the forest. It is not spatially restricted.

Developers negotiations are influenced by developer contribution guidance which includes a tariff for community forest. Been in place for about 6 years, updated in 2010.

Read more Developer contributions update 2010

http://www.swindon.gov.uk/ep/ep-planning/Documents/developer_contributions_2010_update_dcgn_-_final_nov_2010%5b1%5d.pdf

The S106 funding is used to pull in additional funding. A gearing of at least 50:50 is estimated but not fully quantified.

The Forest involvement in CIL development is not strong but recognises the importance of securing alternative to replace s106. Trying to influence process but not anticipating much success or priority being attached to environmental schemes
Case study at Wichelstowe, a development of 4500 houses s of M4. Planning permission requires off site mitigation on farmland which the forest is delivering through landscape and nature conservation proposals.

Read more **Wichelstowe**

<http://www.wichelstowe.co.uk/Design/Green-Spaces/South-of-the-M4>

Key issues

- Importance of close working relationships with core funding LA partner in an area with considerable development generated funding.
- Potential importance of CIL
- Need for dedicated officer-limited staff resource for level of engagement needed to seek benefits through involvement with planning

South Yorkshire Forest

Tom Wild - 15-11-13

Partner authorities Rotherham, Barnsley, Sheffield and Doncaster (recent member of partnership) Formal agreement in place with link officers (in planning or planning related) and link cabinet members.

Forest Plan 2003 with full review 2006. Further review commenced 2011/12 following expansion to include Doncaster but put on hold with creation of Local Nature Partnership.

Forest plan mentioned in Sheffield and Rotherham LDFs; indirectly through Green Infrastructure in Barnsley and Doncaster.

No SPDs but attention drawn to Policy G3 in Sheffield under preparation. Not aware of any direct reference to Forest involvement in plan delivery.

Green Infrastructure strategy for South Yorks important. Forest prepared this under contract and is now its custodian with responsibility to co-ordinate delivery. Highlighted as good practice example with particular reference to the extensive consultation.

Forest has been involved in consultation/influence relating to policy document preparation. However the capacity for this has dwindled, resourcing being a major issue with lack of core funding. Not involved with planning application consultations.

Cabinet member links a strong mechanism subject to continual reinforcement as elected members change and vagaries of local politics e.g. in Doncaster with Labour lead member but Conservative mayor.

No planning related funding. No core contributions (key issue). Forest sustained by contract funding. Discussion on CIL/Infrastructure not done directly but through South Yorks LNP. Green Infrastructure a strand within the LNP. LNP has Board with groups responsible for project areas such as CIL and delivery programmes.

Forest-GI-LNP-Sub-region the key current development contract

Wicker area in Sheffield City Centre identified as a good site development example. Tom Wild is chair of Sheffield Waterways Strategy which has been involved in investigations to shape planning proposals, funded research, demonstrations and capital works. Through the River Stewardship Co. has been instrumental in influencing Environment Agency response to 2007 flooding, brokering integrated solutions, delivery and implementation.

Challenge to get officers to take tree cover seriously. Risk perceived of tree planting becoming subsumed within broader Green Infrastructure approach, reinforcing importance of a coordinated voice with partner authorities including Forestry Commission.

Marston Vale

James Russell - 23-11-12

Covers two local authorities: Bedford Borough Council and Central Bedfordshire, although originally constituted with three before re-organisation and demise of County Council. Marston Vale Trust created in 1998. No specific link officers but contact maintained with a number of key officers.

Forest Plan 1995 very prescriptive. Reviewed in 2000 with a much broader remit with no subsequent need to revisit.

Strong forest policies in earlier local plans. The Forest has maintained close involvement with planning to ensure maintenance of commitment to Forest through LDF process.

Central Beds Core Strategy adopted with strong mention of Forest. In addition the Allocations DPD currently going through examination shows the Forest on the Proposals Map.

Bedford Borough Council less specific but still supportive.

No SPDs (would only make sense for the total forest area and LAs not always in total agreement).

Forest has promoted strongly the original 30% tree planting target and originally liaised directly with developers through the planning application process securing the target by:

- On site planting
- Off site planting on land under developers control
- Financial contribution to Forest

Planners became sensitive to the Forest negotiating directly and insufficient justification for the 30% target.

Forest lobbied through the regional planning process and secured a specific 30% target in the

Regional Spatial Strategy-now no longer part of the planning context.

County wide Green Infrastructure Strategy has reinforced status of Forest. However the Forest do not perceive this as having a higher status than that secured through the planning process nor in terms of the much higher level of community involvement that went into the Forest plan as compared to the GI Strategy. Reference made to comments by Planning Inspector in relation to this.

Planning negotiation and delivery highlighted as good practice while reinforcing importance of the 30% target and getting this message across.

Also argued importance of promoting Forest identity recognising that planners can have difficulty in understanding the community forest concept given absence of clear guidance. Has used concept of community forest as an incipient/evolving AONB

Note problem in Marston Vale where no Green Belt but the NPPF places Community Forests in a Green Belt context

Significant funding secured for forest delivery through developer contributions including s106 agreements

Marston Vale concerned that CIL could lead to a reduction in funding. Pre 2003-4 Forest secured funding/delivery by direct negotiation on planning applications. Subsequently Central Beds produced a Tariff Obligation SPD in which tree planting is one of many contribution requirements. This is still delivering benefits. However the status and priority of tree planting within the CIL is expected to be lower

MV is engaged with authorities in preparation of CIL. Being advised that total forest infrastructure delivery cost is unacceptable and should restrict to individual projects. Uncertainty as to how this will pan out

Role of Marston vale as a delivery mechanism through land ownership with landbank secured through combination of s106, gift and developer contribution

Key issues

- Reinforcement of central message of 30% target and benefits of woodland planting
- Hold local authorities to account
- Argue trees role in improving development marketability

The Mersey Forest

Paul Nolan - 4-12-12

The local authorities forming the Mersey Forest are Cheshire West and Chester, Halton, Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens and

Warrington. It is a formal partnership with nominated link officers (not necessarily in planning departments) and lead elected members.

The Mersey Forest Plan was first published in 1994 and updated in 2001. It is undergoing its second review and will be republished in 2013.

Of the seven core strategies, six are at an advance stage, including two adopted. Of these four make specific policy references to the Forest and the majority also identify the Forest as a delivery partner.

The St Helens Core Strategy commits to the preparation of a Forest Park AAP. The forest is a partner in its preparation along with the Parish Council and LA.

Green Infrastructure

There are two Green Infrastructure strategies in the Forest area . A sub-regional framework, which includes Cheshire West and Cheshire and one for Liverpool. The latter was prepared for Liverpool Council and PCT by the Mersey Forest applying a methodology which the Forest has developed and has also applied contractually in Carlisle and Ayrshire.

The Forest has been at the forefront of promoting green infrastructure in the north-west. A sub-regional GI framework for the Liverpool City Region prepared by the Forest is currently out for consultation.

Good practice

A professional planner with local authority experience in the area is employed part time to assist in bedding GI and forest policies into development plans in the Liverpool City region The Liverpool Green Infrastructure Strategy which was designed to support the preparation of spatial policy in the City was commended in the RTPI Annual Awards 2011.

Liaison

Considerable effort in regular dialogue with link officers and local planning officers
Do not comment on planning applications but do respond to consultations on policy documents including all core strategies.

Funding

Some limited funding secured through s106 linked to Trees and Woodland SPD in Sefton and Ellesmere Port.

Also manage funding derived from s106 United Utilities pipeline application for landscape enhancement in St Helens.

Recognise importance of linking into infrastructure planning and CIL requirements. Still at early stage in Forest area but will give it some priority.

Site Development Examples

The Mersey Forest has been involved as a key partner in the landscape transformation of South St Helens following the demise of coal industry. Included at former Bold Power Station new wooded landscape leading to large scale residential investment and enhancement of property values in surrounding area. The Forest currently involved in supporting the development of the area as a Forest Park Issues.

How to ensure woodland planting and community forest objectives are profiled sufficiently to secure CIL funding when in competition with other infrastructure priorities.

Greenwood Community Forest

Malcolm Hackett - 21-1-13

The local authorities are Nottingham County Council, Ashfield DC, Broxtowe BC, Gedling BC, Mansfield DC and Newark and Sherwood DC. The partnership is an informal one.

The Forest Plan was produced in 2000. A partial update in 2008-9 was not published. References are encouraged to the Forest and Partnership rather than the Plan.

As a small team resourcing is a major issue which limits the extent of involvement in the planning process. The Forest has sought recognition in the various development plans. The Broxtowe, Gedling, Nottingham City Aligned Core strategy makes specific reference to the Community Forest in its Spatial Strategy and Green Infrastructure policies.

Not aware of any SPD's referring to the Forest. The Forest is referred to in the Newark & Sherwood and Mansfield Green Infrastructure strategies. It is also referred to in the 6C's Strategy prepared to support the former Growth point initiative. The future of this document is in some doubt. In general GI is being promoted at the district rather than sub-regional level. The Forest is also referenced in the Broxtowe and Ashfield Open Space Strategies.

Not aware of the Forest being identified as delivery mechanism in Development Plans. Liaison is ad hoc. Member and officer representation at Board level but links with planning not strongly developed.

Consultation is focused on policy development. Planning application consultation not pursued to avoid potential conflicts of interest as a partner.

Not aware of any significant contribution through planning condition or s106 to Forest delivery nor of future CIL implications.

Key Issues

No planning expertise within team. Development of Local Nature Partnership and a potential biodiversity offset project. However the exact implications for Greenwood and the role which the Forest may have is an issue at least partly influenced by the informal partnership arrangement rather than a Trust

White Rose Forest

Guy Thompson - 11-10-12

Formed 2000 with Joint Venture Agreement in 2002

Partner authorities: Kirklees Council, Calderdale MBC, City of Bradford MBC, Barnsley MBC, Leeds City Council, Wakefield MDC, Craven District Council, Harrogate BC.

Three key areas were discussed:

White Rose Forest and partners lobbied for inclusion of Green Infrastructure policy in Regional Spatial Strategy. Forest organised workshop for local planners to raise awareness of GI and secure policy inclusion in Local Development Frameworks. Final outcomes in policy consequence of local authorities and to some extent link officers, but they are not necessarily in planning departments. Involvement in Leeds City Region GI Strategy prepared by consultants.

On Steering Group with local planners, acknowledged but no significant degree of involvement subsequently. The LEP's Green Economy panel are responsible for overseeing the GI Strategy. Concern not much happening to implement, partly related to current political emphasis on job creation.

The current emphasis of WRF is to forge links between GI and economic priorities. The current position is to merge the Forest partnership into the Yorkshire West LNP by the creation of a Director level Board. Hopefully, some sort of formal linkage to the LEP Green Economy Panel for the LNPs Chair could then be secured.

GT keen to pursue biodiversity offset mechanism ideally through an agreed spatial biodiversity framework identifying hotspots for protection and improvement.

Forest of Avon Trust

Jon Clark - 18-10-12

Local authorities are South Gloucestershire, Bristol City, North Somerset and Bath and North-east Somerset.

Formal partnership ended 3 years ago. Liaison continues but no formalised links. The updated Forest Plan was published in 2002 and is available on CD. Unlikely to be reviewed.

Local Plans refer to the Forest of Avon plan but the influence is weakening. Partners were supportive and in 2005 all four adopted as SPG a guide "Planning and the Forest Of Avon-a guide to developers". However it is less used now.

There are no strong statements in the plans identifying the Forest/Trust as a delivery mechanism.

A green infrastructure strategy was produced with the local Wildlife Trust. The trust seeks to influence through green infrastructure but resources restrict the priority attached to this work.

Weekly planning application lists are received and are responded to as resources permit.

Funding has been received through some s106 monies related to specific site developments.

A collective voice to influence policy development at the national level would be good. However the key problem is shortage of staff resource.

Green Light Trust

Mark Pritchard - 27-11-12

The Trust operates at a sub-regional level, focussing on Suffolk and Norfolk but operating also in Cambridgeshire, Oxfordshire and Essex. The Trust does not have a Forest plan and does not engage regularly with individual planning authorities or secure funding through planning process. It recognises that the statutory plans offer hooks for the activities of the Trust. The Trust is considering the potential for more formal recognition not least if this opens opportunities for funding.

Reference made to document Suffolks Greenest County programme as an example of a strategic approach which whilst not planning led has many resonances in terms of desired outcomes.

Creating the Greenest County

Role is one of interface between planning authority and developer or local community which could be a fee paying consultancy arrangement. Neutral position supporting community to become empowered and developer to recognise environmental/tree planting opportunities/responsibilities. No direct involvement with GI strategy preparation-issue of capacity.

Contacts maintained with local authorities e.g. with County Council cabinet elected member for environment: as broker linking community with Planning Brief preparation

Key issues

Would welcome supporting framework such as:

- An intelligence network identifying emerging trends and opportunities

- Examples of best practice case studies demonstrating collaboration, meeting broader benefits, delivering medium and long term sustainability
- Specific experience e.g. on business park environmental delivery

Thames Chase

Peter Wilkinson - 8-2-13

The funding partners are Havering, Thurrock, Essex County Council and Forestry Commission. The Forest area also includes Barking and Dagenham and Brentwood. The second version of the Forest plan was published in 2000. Discussions are taking place with partners in relation to a further review consequent to the NPPF.

References to the Forest are included in the Core strategies of:

- Barking and Dagenham - references to Thames Chase in Core strategy, plan now under review
- Havering - several policies refer to Thames Chase including Proposals Map and the site specific Allocations DPD
- Havering - Core Strategy includes reference to Forest as a delivery mechanism
- Brentwood - contains a policy specific to Thames Chase and the Forest is involved in discussions for retaining links in plan review now underway
- Thurrock - no specific policy
- The development plans make reference to the London Green Grid which adds weight to the forest references within it

The all London Green Grid is the Green Infrastructure Strategy for London and was adopted by the Mayor in March 2012 as Supplementary Planning Guidance. There are eleven sub areas and Area Framework 3 Thames Chase, Beam and Ingrebourne covers the Forest. The forest is directly involved in the Green Grid and the chair of Thames Chase Trust chairs the Working Group for Area Framework 3. The key issue is maintaining connection and meaningful involvement in the evolving delivery process.

The main liaison arrangement is with the three funding partners of Havering, Thurrock and Essex through a delivery group (also including the Forestry Commission) which meets every two months. Discussions are in progress to secure greater involvement with planners in Barking/Dagenham and Brentwood and in particular to influence their planning policies.

The NPPF reference to Community Forests is helping to reinforce the need for engagement. There are no specific SPG/SPD documents directing s106 funding into the forest. However there are a number of examples of developments where s106 monies have been

secured to deliver Forest objectives
While CIL funding has been talked about there are no significant developments to date.

There are examples of Forest involvement in the delivery of major planning projects in the area particularly in relation to the restoration of waste management facilities. The two largest projects are Beam Parklands (53ha) and Ingrebourne Hill (44 ha). To date large scale housing developments have been avoided by robust Green Belt policies.

Red Rose Forest

Tony Hothersall - 6-11-12

There is a formal partnership involving Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Salford, Trafford and Wigan. The Forest also works in Rochdale, Oldham, Tameside and Stockport, but rarely on any issues affecting planning.

The first Forest Plan was published in 1994 and updated in 2006. The Forest is mentioned in core strategies. References to good practice included the Salford Tree Audit and Trafford Forest Plan, a broad-brush GI plan.

Funding for the Forest has been secured through the Trafford Forest SPG.

APPENDIX 4 SUMMARY OF PLANNING POLICIES

For each of the nine Community Forests the appendix identifies and quotes current policies relating to the forests.

Specifically:

1. The policies quoted relate to the Plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and generally referred to as Core Strategies. The policies relate to the adopted plan or the version in preparation at January 2013. The actual stage is identified in the Appendix.

2. A classification of the policies is provided as follows:-

- a. Policy relates to natural environment and specifically mentions the Community Forest
- b. Policy relates to Green Infrastructure and specifically mentions the Community Forest
- c. Policy relates to natural environment and while the Community Forest is not specifically mentioned in the policy, the supporting text makes clear it does apply to the Forest
- d. Policy relates to Green Infrastructure, and while the Community Forest is not specifically mentioned in the policy, the supporting text makes clear it does apply to the Forest
- e. No policy reference to the Community Forest
- f. Other policy references e.g. Infrastructure

Community Forests	Core Strategy Local Plan (January 2013)	A	B	C	D	E	F	Policy
Marston Vale	<p>Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy (Adopted Nov 2009)</p> <p>Bedford Core Strategy (Adopted April 2008)</p> <p>Bedford Allocations and Designations Plan, (submitted May 2012)</p>	•	•					<p>CS16 Landscape and Woodland The Council will: Continue to support the creation of the Forest of Marston Vale recognising the need to regenerate the environmentally damaged landscape through woodland creation to achieve the target of 30% woodland cover in the Forest area by 2030</p> <p>CS17 Green Infrastructure The Council will: Take forward priority areas for the provision of new green infrastructure in the Forest of Marston Vale (including the Bedford and Milton Keynes Waterway, the Ivel Valley, the Greensand Ridge, the Flit Valley and the Chilterns)</p> <p>CP24 Landscape Protection and Enhancement The Marston Vale will be the focus for landscape enhancement and restoration and the Council will continue to support the Forest of Marston Vale.</p> <p>Policy AD25 Forest of Marston Vale In appropriate circumstances (and within the area designated in the proposals Map) the council will expect proposals to address the areas of the project as set out in the Forest Plan 2000 and seek contributions towards its implementation, including the 30% woodland cover target.</p>
Mercia	South Staffs Core Strategy (submitted June 2012)		•	•				<p>Core Policy 2 Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment. The Council will support development or other initiatives where they protect, conserve and enhance the Districts natural and heritage assets including ecological networks internationally, nationally and locally important designations. Particular support will be given to initiatives to improve the natural environment where it is poor and increase the overall biodiversity of the District including the development of green infrastructure links and to improve the historic environment where it is identified as at risk.</p> <p>Development or initiatives will generally be supported which:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not have a detrimental impact upon the interests and significance of a natural or heritage asset. • The supporting text identifies the natural and heritage assets which include the Forest of Mercia

Mercia (Cont)								Policy HWB2: Green Infrastructure Development proposals that are consistent with and could contribute to the delivery of local green infrastructure initiatives and strategies including the Council's Green Space Strategy, Forest of Mercia, Cannock Chase AONB Management Plan, Staffordshire Biodiversity Action Plan and the vision set out in the West Midlands Green Infrastructure Prospectus will be supported
Great Western Forest	Swindon Borough Local Plan (Pre Submission Dec 2012)	•			•		•	Policy INI Infrastructure Provision Lists infrastructure provision all development will make provision for. Par 4.218 of supporting text confirms that the Community Forest is one of the Infrastructure items covered by the policy. Policy EN2 Community Forest Development shall contribute towards the aims and objectives of the Great Western Community Forest (GWCF) in Swindon. This will be achieved by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensuring a net increase in tree cover through the planting of new woodland and trees• Creating or enhancing habitats for biodiversity, including built structures in accordance with Policies EN1and EN4; and• Ensuring access to local woodlands and opportunities for communities and businesses to benefit from GWCF Policy ENV1 Green Infrastructure Network <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development shall protect and enhance green infrastructure and assets as identified in Appendix 5. This includes the requirement that development must provide for the protection and integration of existing trees, hedges and woodlands• Appendix 5 includes the Community Forest Plan
The Mersey Forest	St Helens Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted Oct 2012)	•			•			Policy CQL2 Trees and Woodlands The multipurpose value of trees, woodlands and hedgerows will be protected and enhanced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementing the Town in the Forest Initiative, Mersey Forest Plan and Bold Forest Park Area Action Plan Policy CQL1 Green Infrastructure Mersey Forest not specifically mentioned in the policy, but identified as a Key delivery item

Community Forests	Core Strategy Local Plan (January 2013)	A	B	C	D	E	F	Policy
Mersey Forest (cont)	Halton Core Strategy (Post Submission Changes July 2012)					•		
	Knowsley Local Plan (Proposal Submission November 2012)				•			<p>CS 8 Green Infrastructure includes Knowsley Council will work with partners to help deliver local and sub-regional programmes, initiatives and strategies to enhance Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>No specific reference to Mersey Forest, although paragraph 2.32 confirms Knowsley is part of the Mersey Forest initiative</p>
	Warrington Local Plan Core Strategy (proposed submission draft June 2012)		•		•			<p>CS 5 Overall Spatial Strategy – Strategic Green Links</p> <p>The council will work with partners to develop and adopt a strategic approach to the care and management of the Boroughs green infrastructure. A key focus of these effects will be on reinforcing and maximising the environment and socio-economic benefits from those Strategic Green Links which connect through the wider sub-region such as</p> <p>The Council is committed to supporting wider programmes and initiatives which seek to connect the Borough's Strategic Green Links with employment areas, residential communities and Green Infrastructural assets including the Manchester Mosses, Mersey Forest, Walton Hall Estate and the potential significant country park in the Arpley area when landfill operation have finished and restoration is complete. Paragraph 44 identifies the Mersey Forest as a delivery partner for CS5.</p> <p>Policy QE3 Green Infrastructure The preface to the policy in the vision in 2027 for Being Natural and Durable states "The green infrastructure network, which includes the countryside and the Red Rose and Mersey Forests provides an attractive setting for residents, visitors and investors. Paragraph 11.22 identifies the Mersey Forest as a delivery partner for QE3.</p>
	Liverpool Core Strategy Submission Draft	•						<p>Strategic Policy 27 – Supporting Green Infrastructure Initiatives The City Council will support and help deliver the aims and objectives of local and sub regional green infrastructure initiatives and programmes that seek to enhance and create green infrastructure in Liverpool and which deliver a wide range of environmental, economic and quality of life benefits for local communities within the City including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mersey Forest • Green Infrastructure framework for Liverpool City Region • North Mersey side Biodiversity Action Plan • Liverpool City Regional Ecological Framework

Red Rose Forest	Bolton Core Strategy – Adopted March 2011					•		
	Bury Second Draft Publication Core Strategy (October 2012)				•			<p>Special Policy EN3 – Creating and Enhancing a network of Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Development Management Policy EN4 – Protecting and Enhancing the Green Infrastructure Network</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.6; states Council are partners in the Red Rose Forest project, and for landscape, biodiversity and climate change adaptation reasons will continue to seek, promote and implement opportunities to increase woodland cover.</p> <p>Red Rose Forest is identified as a delivery partners for Policies EN3, EN4, EN5 and EN6</p>
	Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan (Adopted July 2012)				•			<p>Policy EN9 Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Red Rose Forest identified as a delivery partner for policy EN9 and EN15 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</p>
	Salford – Core Strategy (Withdrawn Nov 2012)							
	Trafford Core Strategy (Adopted Jan 2012)				•		•	<p>L8 Planning Obligations</p> <p>The following list sets out what the Council will seek contributions towards through the Trafford Developer Contribution, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Green Infrastructure, such as tree planting • Paragraph 17.3 refers to existing Red Rose Forest planning obligations to be replaced by Council's Local Infrastructure Plan <p>Policy R2 Natural Environment</p> <p>Paragraph 22.9 refers to Red Rose Forest, and it is identified as a delivery agent.</p> <p>Policy R3 Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Paragraph 23.11 refers to preparation of a Trafford Forest Plan and Red Rose Forest identified as a delivery agent for Policy R3</p>

Community Forests	Core Strategy Local Plan (January 2013)	A	B	C	D	E	F	Policy
South Yorkshire	Rotherham Local Plan Publication Core Strategy June 2012 and Focussed Changes January 2013				•		•	<p>Policy CS19 Green Infrastructure Paragraph 5.6.12 “the South Yorkshire Forest Partnership is currently revising its Forest Plan and this document will be considered in the development of the local Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.6.10 also refers to production of the South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategy by the South Yorkshire Forest Partnership</p> <p>Policy CS20 Landscape Paragraph 5.6.60 The South Yorkshire Forest Plan (2002) recognises the importance of high quality environment for economic regeneration and investment and improved quality of life and identifies landscape restoration, importance and management zones.</p> <p>South Yorkshire Forest identified as delivery partner to increase percentage of the area in Borough covered by woodland.</p>
	Barnsley Core Strategy (Adopted September 2011)					•		No reference to Forest Partnership or Plan.
	Sheffield Core Strategy (Adopted March 2009)						•	<p>Policy CS10 Business and Industry in the Upper Don Valley Paragraph 6.33 “The City Council will work in partnership with local landowners, community groups, the South Yorkshire Forest Partnerships and Yorkshire Forward”.</p> <p>Policy CS12 Blackburn Valley Paragraph 6.40 “The Valley is also a priority of the South Yorkshire Forest Plan..... Paragraph 6.41 Initiatives in environmental enhancement would be made in partnership between the Council, developers, the South Yorkshire Forest Partnership and other environmental and local community groups and funding will be sought from forestry resource grants, lottery funding, landfill tax credits and the voluntary and business sectors. The South Yorkshire Forest Partnership referred to in Appendix as a delivery mechanism for policies</p> <p>CS49 Education And Leisure In The Upper Don Valley CS73 Strategic Green Network</p>

	Doncaster Core Strategy (Adopted May 2012)								No reference to Forest Partnership or Plan.
Greenwood Community Forest	Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategy (Publication Version June 2012)		•						<p>Policy 2 The Spatial Strategy 7. Strategic Green Infrastructure will be provided or enhanced in conjunction with the locations for major residential development identified above, the Strategic Rivers Corridors of the Trent, Erewash and Leen Rivers, Canal Corridors, the Greenwood Community Forest and Urban Fringe Areas. Further detail is set out at Policy 16.</p> <p>Policy 16 Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Spaces</p> <p>1 A strategic approach to the delivery, protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure will be taken.</p> <p>2. The approach will require that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing and protected Green Infrastructure Corridors and assets are protected and enhanced. Priority for the location of new or enhanced strategic Green Infrastructure will be given to locations for major residential developments, the strategic River Corridors of the Trent, Erewash And Leen Rivers, Canal Corridors, Greenwood Community Forest, And Urban Fringe Areas Development Proposed through the Core Strategy should enhance the Strategic Green Infrastructure network (either on site or off site or through contributions as appropriate)
	Ashfield Preferred Approach Local Plan 2010-2023 (September 2012)			•	•				<p>Policy EV7 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows The Greenwood Community Forest is referred to in paragraph 8.83, 8.84 and 8.85.</p> <p>The Green wood Strategic Plan is listed as part of the evidence base for policies SPK51, SPV1 and SPH1 relating to Green Infrastructure in different parts of the District.</p>
	Mansfield Core Strategy - Preferred Options In Preparation								
	Network And Sherwood Dc Core Strategy (Adopted March 2011)					•			No specific reference

Community Forests	Core Strategy Local Plan (January 2013)	A	B	C	D	E	F	Policy
Watling Chase Community Forest	Hertsmere Borough Council Core Strategy (Adopted January 2013)	•						<p>Paragraph 2.18 refers to location within Watling Chase Community Forest</p> <p>Policy CS15 Promoting recreational access to open spaces and the countryside The Council will work with its partners and relevant agencies to safeguard, enhance and facilitate access to parks, open spaces, rural visitor attractions and to the wider local countryside...The provision or enhancement of visitor and appropriate facilities in the countryside, including Watling Chase Community Forest ,Gateway Sites and Historic Parks and Gardens will be encouraged where...</p>
	Welwyn Hatfield Emerging Core Strategy October 2012			•				<p>Policy CS11 Protection of Critical Assets The Council is committed to protecting and enhancing the Boroughs natural and historic environment which compromise the individual natural and heritage assets and the network of green infrastructure...</p> <p>Paragraph 12.15 Part of the Borough is located within the boundary of the Watling Chase Community Forest area, where the aim is to achieve major environmental improvements in terms of the provision of green infrastructure such as planting trees, areas for nature, landscape enhancement and the provision of public open space around urban areas</p> <p>Policy CS12 Infrastructure Delivery links SPDs, S106 and CIL to green infrastructure plan 2011</p>
	London Borough Of Barnet Core Strategy (September 2012)		•					<p>Policy CS7 Enhancing and Protecting Barnet's Open Spaces In order to maximise the benefits that open spaces can deliver and create a greener Barnet we will work with our partners to improve Barnets's Green Infrastructure. We will create a greener Barnet by (among others):</p> <p>Reflect the policies and objectives in the Watling Chase Forest Plan when assessing development proposals in the area covered by the Community Forest</p> <p>Paragraph 12.8.2 The Watling Chase Community Forest forms part of Barnet's green infrastructure. The Community Forest established in 1991 covers an area of 188 km2 and extends from the northern part of Barnet into south Hertfordshire. The aim of the Community Forest as set out in the Watling Chase Community Forest Plan, is to see much of the area under positive and appropriate management by 2025. This will include a substantial increase in trees and woodland achieved through management of existing woodlands and new planting</p>

Thames Chase Forest	<p>Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (Adopted 2008)</p>	•	•					<p>CP7 Recreation and Leisure The Council will, in partnership with other bodies, seek to retain and increase access to recreation and leisure opportunities by:</p> <p>A) Improving opportunities for informal recreation in the countryside, particularly through the implementation of the Thames Chase Plan...</p> <p>B) Supporting implementation of the following complementary initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thames Chase • Green Grid • Green Arc • London Outer Orbital Path • Blue Ribbon Network • Thames Chase Forest Circle <p>Paragraph 1.6 confirms that The Thames Chase Plan sets out information and policies and proposals concerning the Community Forest and that 'The Council supports the aims of the Thames Chase project'</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2 recognises Thames Chase as a key delivery partner Several Development Control Policies DC22,DC42,DC58,DC60 and DC72 refer to Thames Chase, and in particular:</p> <p>DC22 Countryside Recreation Opportunities for informal recreation in the countryside will be increased by ensuring that all developments located within the Thames Chase make a positive contribution to the implementation of the Thames Chase Plan by improving, for example, access, recreation opportunities, the landscape and nature conservation</p>
	<p>Havering Site Specific Allocations Development Plan (Adopted 2008)</p>	•						<p>SSA 4 – Arnold's Field Community Woodland This former mineral extraction/landfill site should be restored and a community woodland created in line with the Thames Chase Plan</p> <p>SSA 5 – Warwick Lane Landfill Site Community Woodland This former mineral extraction/landfill site should be restored and a community woodland created in line with the Thames Chase Plan</p> <p>SSA 6 – Rainham Quarry Community Woodland</p> <p>Sites also shown on Proposals Map</p>

Community Forests	Local Plan Core Strategy (January 2013)	A	B	C	D	E	F	Policy
	Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (Adopted December 2011)		•					<p>Paragraph 4.32 confirms “The Thames Chase Community Forest has been identified as an asset of regional significance for the retention, enhancement and provision of Green Infrastructure for its value as an area of landscape, ecological and recreational importance”. This is part of the justification for...</p> <p>CSSP5 – SUSTAINABLE GREEN GRID Which also includes specific reference to the Thames Chase Community Forest as an area for sustainable management of wood fuel</p>