Simon,

Thanks again for the prompt response.

I suppose we should 'take this from the top' to borrow a musical saying. Your email below states that: "*The decision is made following evidence gathered from a range of parties, including the local councillor, the parish council, the community area manager and the owner"*. You list four parties here, three of whom are supportive of our bid; indeed the parish council has, having backed our bid at its full meeting on 28th May, nominated two local councillors, Mr Barstow and Mrs Hartless, to act as intermediaries between the council and the Springfield and Clift Residents Association (SCRA).  As you will know, Penny Bell, the Community Engagement Officer was most helpful in facilitating our bid.**So, just to repeat, three of the four parties you mention, unless you have received information to the contrary (perhaps you could confirm if this is the case), are supportive of our bid**. Now let's turn the the fourth party mentioned, the owner.

You will recall that you forwarded a copy of Mr Mullins's response to our bid some weeks ago. I say "Mr Mullins's response" deliberately as I cannot believe that his testimony was read and approved by the Leafy Lane Playing Fields (LLPF) organisation for the reason that it was replete with misinformation and disinformation. Not to put too fine a point on it, the document was complete nonsense. We had hoped that Wiltshire Council's Community Assets Team would see Mr Mullins's rant against everything and everyone, from the SCRA and "white middle class lives" to "Rudloe community being, listed by 'Wiltshire', largely as an area of high deprivation" and Box Parish Council's failings, for exactly what it was, not a reasoned and discerning response to our bid but rather an exposure of Mr Mullins's mentality. At the time, SCRA was not sure if a response to Mr Mullins's tirade was appropriate within the Community Assets Bid process, a response which would have exposed the document for what it was, as stated above, a tissue of misinformation and disinformation. Also, in view of the extent and depth of Mr Mullins's misrepresentations, this was not something we wished to waste our time on. However as, apart from your "gathered evidence", the only other reason you give for the rejection of our the bid is that "*There are other wooded areas and spaces for walks, sport and social interaction a relatively short distance away"*, let us now concentrate on just this aspect which Mr Mullins covered in his section 6 'Uniqueness of Asset'.

First, a little background some of which reiterates content from our original bid. Leafy Lane Wood is the only woodland at Rudloe, easily accessible from all the estates (the 'RAF' estates - Park Avenue, Portal Avenue, Trenchard Avenue etc, the original Rudloe Estate, Springfield & Clift Closes, Kidston & Highland Closes & Pine Close/Ashwood Road) which has been used consistently by the local community for recreation since the building of the estates after the war (the RAF estates) and from the early sixties onwards (the others). Mr Padfield, the owner prior to LLPF, did not discourage the public from using the playing fields and the woodland. In the woodland, paths were established, through their constant use, by locals over these years (the 1950s to 1996). Indeed, this state of affairs was affirmed from the establishment of LLPF Ltd  in their 1996 Certificate of Incorporation (as a limited company) and through a 1997 extraordinary general meeting: '*To advance and improve the education and physical, mental and social well-being of the community by the provision of sporting and recreation amenities, grounds and facilities****of all kinds****'*and ‘*To provide for the inhabitants of Corsham and surrounding areas in the interests of social welfare facilities for recreation and leisure time occupation****with the object of improving their conditions of life****'.*This position was reiterated to me by Mr Graham Cogswell, LLPF Project Manager, in a letter dated 13th January 1999, when he stated: "*We believe that our proposals enhance the site for all users and are based on national guidelines. An extended dog walking area is being provided around the site. We have always intended that the site be sensibly****used by the whole community***". The foregoing confirms, we believe, that Leafy Lane Wood is and was, certainly since the genesis of LLPF, a community asset.

Now, to the supposed "other wooded areas and spaces" that the Community Assets Team (CAT) states are available. Most unfortunately, the CAT has apparently simply taken Mr Mullins's misinformation here without seeking to determine the true status of these "other wooded areas and spaces". This brings into question the whole bid process (see last para) - that the CAT has not sought to gather evidence on its own behalf.

Let us first look at the highlighted (in blue on the map originally provided by Mr Mullins but given as 'evidence' by the CAT) woodland areas to the north and west of the A4. All of these areas are privately-owned by: the Maidments, the Taraskevics and the Hartham Estate. None is accessible to the public through their being private, largely inaccessible (in view of their density and in two cases their steepness) and their use as pheasant feeding/shooting areas. Indeed, I have spoken with two owners today, Mrs Maidment (four of the areas) and Mrs Taraskevics who are most indignant that these misrepresentations have been made in the first place by Mr Mullins but more notably have been repeated by Wiltshire Council CAT. The one wooded area not covered by the foregoing is Rudloe Firs which is also privately owned but whose ownership is not known (not even by the Maidments whose land surrounds it). This is an area of woodland which contains the water towers  which supply Rudloe and surrounding areas and the entrance to an old stone mine. Whilst this woodland is private, it is largely open and is used, principally by dog-walkers from the north/west side of Rudloe Estate.

Now turning to the areas between the A4 and the B3109, the two areas highlighted close to the Bradford Road (B3109) are, once again, private and not accessible to the public. The area highlighted at Tunnel Inn crossroads is private, owned and operated by Woodland Adventurers, and not accessible to the general  public. Box Hill Common is also highlighted; as it is a 'common', this is of course accessible but this is not Rudloe, it is Box Hill. It is about 1.5km walking distance from a central point in Leafy Lane (adjacent to Leafy Lane Wood) to Box Hill Common (significantly, it is half this distance, at 0.75km, from Mr Mullins's abode at The Bassetts in Box). The small area of woodland close to the junction of Pinker's Lane (as it is known by locals) and Beech Road at Box Hill, whose ownership is not known but is probably private, is 0.75km from Rudloe and is not suitable for any kind of reasonable walk. Quarry Wood is highlighted, 1.8km walking distance from Rudloe and privately-owned by Tim Barton of Manor Farm, Wadswick; this is accessible to the public but this is on the periphery of Box, not at Rudloe. Ley Woods, whose ownership is not known (by me) at Box are also highlighted but this is Box woodland, 2.5km away from Rudloe. Similarly, Box Millenium Wood and the inaccessible, and private, area of woodland above Box Tunnel are also highlighted - also Box, not Rudloe. None of these woodland areas for reason either of privacy or location can be described as (easily) accessible by the Rudloe community or an area where the Rudloe community can engage in social interaction.

Now turning to the area east of the B3109, Bradford Road, the two areas adjacent to the B3109, closest to Rudloe, are owned by the MoD and are inaccessible. I don't believe that the MoD would be too pleased with Wiltshire Council repeating misinformation that these woods are accessible to the public. The large area (with the inverted V area of meadow) is, to the south of the 'cinder path', owned by Tim Barton, private and inaccessible. The remainder, which is the former limestone spoil heap and HMS Royal Arthur training area, is owned by the MoD and currently accessible but only to the fittest of people as it is quite a climb (that's why it was used as a military training area). The highlighted Kingsmoor Wood is privately owned by Tim Barton with warnings posted as it is a pheasant feeding/shooting area. Once again, Mr Barton would not appreciate Wiltshire Council repeating misinformation that it is accessible by the public. Hunt's Wood, now adjacent to Wadswick Green, is also private and largely inaccessible. The remaining highlighted area adjacent to the B3109 and the furthest south on the map is farmland, not a wood, and is not accessible by the public.

None of the areas highlighted on the map, apart perhaps from Rudloe Firs (see following information) whose ownership and status is unknown, are suitable for walks, sport and social interaction for the Rudloe community. Regarding Rudloe Firs, this is on the north-western periphery of Rudloe and nowhere near as easily accessible for the Rudloe community as Leafy Lane Wood. In addition, Rudloe Firs is only accessible by crossing the busy and fast (in spite of a 50 mph limit) A4 and so is effectively separated from the Rudloe community.

To summarize, **all 'other' parties mentioned by you are, as far as we are aware, supportive of our bid**  and **Wiltshire Council CAT appears not to have sought information through its own auspices but simply repeated misinformation instituted by Mr Mullins**. SCRA would be most interested in the evidence gathering process undertaken by the CAT and evidence of this gathering process (which could perhaps be obtained using an FoI request?).  On the face of it, there appears not to have been any such process (however we stand to be corrected) and so, in spite of your saying that there would be no grounds for appeal, in this case, the CAT appears not to have made any substantial effort to determine the facts surrounding the bid. This being the case, SCRA would say (unless and until information is produced to the contrary) that the Community Assets Bid process for Leafy Lane Wood has been invalidated by the Community Assets Team itself and so SCRA would wish to appeal the decision or have the bid process reprised.

Sincerely

Paul Turner

Springfield & Clift Residents Association

29 Springfield Close

Rudloe SN13 0JR

 01225 810408

07803 295291

From: Simon.Day@wiltshire.gov.uk  
To: wirepuller@hotmail.com  
CC: daviro44@hotmail.co.uk; stephwood2502@gmail.com; howardmanthey@aol.com; liznjohn.roger@tiscali.co.uk; juliet.powell7@btinternet.com  
Subject: RE: Notification of Decision not to list Leafy Lane Wood as an Asset of Community Value  
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 2015 13:52:35 +0000

Paul,

 Please find attached map to show nearby wooded areas outlined in blue.

 Regards,

Simon.

***Simon Day***

*Area Technical Support Manager (North)*

*Economic Development & Planning*

*Wiltshire Council*

*Tel: 01249 706634*

*Email:*[*simon.day@wiltshire.gov.uk*](mailto:simon.day@wiltshire.gov.uk)

*Web:*[*www.wiltshire.gov.uk*](https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/)

**From:** Paul Turner [mailto:wirepuller@hotmail.com]   
**Sent:** 24 July 2015 13:45  
**To:** Day, Simon  
**Cc:** rob davies; Steph Wood; Howard Manthey; Liz Roger; Juliet Powell Rudloe Dev  
**Subject:** RE: Notification of Decision not to list Leafy Lane Wood as an Asset of Community Value

Simon,

 Thanks for the prompt response.

I maintain that the statement, repeated from the decision: "There are other wooded areas and spaces for walks, sport and social interaction a relatively short distance away". is erroneous. So that we may correctly ascertain the rationale for the decision, would you please identify these other wooded areas.

 Regards

 Paul T

From: [Simon.Day@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Day@wiltshire.gov.uk)  
To: [wirepuller@hotmail.com](mailto:wirepuller@hotmail.com)  
CC:   
Subject: RE: Notification of Decision not to list Leafy Lane Wood as an Asset of Community Value  
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 2015 12:00:15 +0000

Hi Paul,

 The legislation makes no grounds for appeal of a decision when the authority rejects a nomination. The decision is made following evidence gathered from a range of parties, including the local councillor, the parish council, the community area manager and the owner. The emphasis in the legislation is on the authority’s opinion on whether an asset furthers the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. There are other wooded areas and spaces for walks, sport and social interaction a relatively short distance away. I understand the owners remain open to offers from a range of parties and if that is the case and you and the parish council remain interested in purchasing the site I wish you luck in your negotiations.

 Regards,

Simon.

***Simon Day***

*Area Technical Support Manager (North)*

*Economic Development & Planning*

*Wiltshire Council*

*Tel: 01249 706634*

*Email:*[*simon.day@wiltshire.gov.uk*](mailto:simon.day@wiltshire.gov.uk)

*Web:*[*www.wiltshire.gov.uk*](https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/)

**From:** Paul Turner [<mailto:wirepuller@hotmail.com>]   
**Sent:** 24 July 2015 12:29  
**To:** Day, Simon  
**Cc:** rob davies; Steph Wood; Howard Manthey; Liz Roger; Juliet Powell Rudloe Dev  
**Subject:** RE: Notification of Decision not to list Leafy Lane Wood as an Asset of Community Value

Simon,

 Thanks for the notification which, as you will imagine, SCRA will find very disappointing.

 Can we appeal this decision and if so, could I lodge that appeal immediately? There would be a number of reasons for the appeal but I will just give one now which is your statement: "The ready availability of other similar amenities in the local area means that although the Leafy Lane woodland appears to have had some use by the local community; there is currently insufficient evidence to conclude that it furthers social wellbeing and is likely to do so in future". This statement is erroneous - there is/are no other woods adjacent to the Rudloe estates (other than Rudloe Firs which is at the north-western periphery and beyond the A4). But particularly the statement "there is insufficient evidence". What evidence was sought? I could, purely by stationing myself in the wood tomorrow morning (shall we say), gather 'evidence' from scores of users that the woodland furthers social wellbeing.

 I look forward to your response.

 Sincerely

 Paul Turner

29 Springfield Close

Rudloe SN13 0JR

01225 810408

07803 295291

<http://www.rudloescene.co.uk/>

From: [Simon.Day@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.Day@wiltshire.gov.uk)  
To: [wirepuller@hotmail.com](mailto:wirepuller@hotmail.com)  
CC: [David.Bowater@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:David.Bowater@wiltshire.gov.uk)  
Subject: Notification of Decision not to list Leafy Lane Wood as an Asset of Community Value  
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 2015 10:43:46 +0000

Dear Paul,

 Please find attached letter notifying you of the decision not to list Leafy Lane Wood as an Asset of Community Value.

 Regards,

***Simon Day***

*Area Technical Support Manager (North)*

*Economic Development & Planning*

*Wiltshire Council*

*Tel: 01249 706634*

*Email:*[*simon.day@wiltshire.gov.uk*](mailto:simon.day@wiltshire.gov.uk)

*Web:*[*www.wiltshire.gov.uk*](https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/)