

Meeting: **Leicestershire Local Access Forum**

Date/Time: **Tuesday, 6 October 2015 at 5.30 pm**

Location: **Guthlaxton Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield.**

Contact: **Mr. B. Holihead (Tel. 0116 305 6339)**

Email: **ben.holihead@leics.gov.uk**

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS

Item

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------------|
| 6. | Reports from representatives on outside bodies. | (Pages 3 - 20) |
| | b. Heart of the Forest, Access and Connectivity Forum. | |
| | g. Charnwood Forest Steering Group (Roy Denney). | |
| 8. | Making Our Needs Known and Influencing Decision Makers (John Law). | (Pages 21 - 28) |
| 9. | Proposal for Future Permissive Access in Stewardship Schemes (John Law). | (Pages 29 - 41) |
| 16. | Any other items which the Chairperson has decided to take as urgent. | (Pages 42 - 43) |

REPORT - CHARNWOOD FOREST REGIONAL PARK STEERING GROUP

The group met on 1st October 2015 and I advised them of the death of Geoff Mason. After the election of a new Chairman the principle agenda item was discussing an action plan and the challenges in delivering it in financially difficult times.

We touched on what has been achieved – as a group we have produced a map of the area and after the failed lottery bid some partner organisations have moved on with their own schemes and to project the forest concept we need to ensure these are seen as part of our wider ambitions.

We looked at the current structure of the Steering Group and how to make best use of limited resources and progress particular areas of work. It was identified that currently there is a gap in communication between partners delivering actual tangible projects and the Steering Group and how better to align specific priorities.

The group discussed a potential new model for the Steering Group which would involve setting up a number of Delivery Boards that could act as a conduit for information between the steering group and partners delivering projects on the ground. This would enable the Steering Group to direct resources
Four distinct work streams were suggested -

- Tourism/Economy
- Social/historic – the story of Charnwood Forest
- Environment
- Development group – resources, funding, governance

I suggested bringing sports and leisure activities within the first heading and made the point that we should promote such events being badged at Charnwood Forest Park events to promote that Brand.

We discussed delivery groups being formed for each work stream made up of Partners/Stakeholders who have particular specialisms or interests in these areas which could meet separately and more frequently than the steering group and have a more direct link to actual projects being delivered within the regional park.

The frequency of meetings would be determined by each delivery group, linked directly to project needs. Steering Group meetings may then not need to be so frequent, possibly twice a year with the annual meetings of all stakeholders and interested parties continuing as at present

We then discussed funding and had received encouraging noises about resubmitting a landscape partnership bid to the lottery board in May 2017. We are to work up an overarching theme to give it a more cohesive feel than last time and then involve partners with appropriate projects to fit that scheme. The several ages of Charnwood going back 600M years was a suggested scheme emphasis

We discussed the venue, speakers and format of a Stakeholders meeting for later in the year and the provisional date is to be Thursday Nov 26th.

Roy Denney, Representative

Report to LLAF Oct 2015 - Heart of the Forest Access and Connectivity Working Group

John Howells and I attended the meeting on October 1st.

The main priority at present is connecting Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre to Newfields Road via Newfields Woodland. Planning permission has been granted. They are also looking to connect Newfields Road to Measham Road either through a new development which has been granted planning permission for housing development or via the Incline. Quotes have also been received to extend this cycle route to Moira Furnace subject to landowner agreement and funding being found. In the longer term they also seek to extend in the other direction connecting Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre to Ashby de la Zouch, either through another proposed housing development or via woodland and a park off Ridgway Road. Once these links are completed, there is a planned diversion of the Ivanhoe Way promoted route, re-directing it via Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre and proposed Newfields Link.

Also on the agenda is a Multi-user route through Willesley Wood and along Pastures Lane to Oakthorpe, and also through Oakthorpe Picnic site to Willesley Lane. The Woodland Trust and Leicestershire County Council have agreed in principal to the creation of the multi-user route across their land. They are still identifying and approaching other landowners. One known landowner is refusing to respond and seems unlikely to agree the route. Much of the actual route is on land not registered as being owned by anyone. There is an alternate but far less beneficial link which could be created through the Trust land and they will be sounded out about this. The suggestion was made that the tracks could be County Roads not maintained at public expense.

A link from Church Gresley to Tunnel Woods has been completed. An extension of this route to Rosliston is now being progressed by Derbyshire County Council.

Another ambition which may become a real possibility is the creation of a route between Moira Village Hall and Maybury Wood. Planning Application has been submitted for a housing development off Ashby Road and as part of the planning comments the National Forest Company and Ashby Woulds Town Council are requesting that a route be provided from Sweethill into Maybury Wood.

The group are looking at possibilities for some cycle routes to be upgraded to bridleways and for a new bridleway to be created across land south of the A42 to Ashby Road and then onwards to Minorca. This would then link to the existing Public Byway between Ashby Road and Swepstone Road to link to Minorca. Discussions with the landowners are underway but safety concerns have been raised where it crosses public roads.

They are also looking for a suitable route to use for a Countryside For All project and a proposed surfaced route round Willesley Lake seems a strong possibility.

£180,000 has been obtained for signage and interpretation boards. A project development officer has been appointed and this element of the project is now moving forward. One element still to be

decided is the nature of the maps on information boards. Concern was expressed by user groups about suggested tube map style presentation and an OS type map was thought more informative.

It was pointed out that the OS had now released an updated version of the National Forest map but had not consulted the NF and as such much possible information was still missing.

A restoration plan for the waste disposal area adjoining National Forest lands near Boothorpe was not well received as it had errors and omissions and had not reflected overtures made to them about paths etc. It did not show any links into the neighbouring areas. Members were to lodge further comment to the County Planners to try and have them insist on improvements.

Ideas for the creation of a 15 mile bridleway circuit were presented involving largely then uplift in status of footpaths. It was agreed this would be explored further but as it went out of the forum area it would be referred to the NF Access Group for development.

Then LCC Ashby canal team have decided to create the towpath between Measham and Snarestone even though they cannot afford to re-water the actual canal. At this stage it will just be a mown grass track.

The car park at Hicks Lodge is to be extended

Roy Denney, Deputy

Representative

**HEART OF FOREST FORUM
ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY WORKING GROUP
ACTIONS OF MEETING OF 1st October 2015**

Item	DESCRIPTION	For Action by
1	<p>Absence apologies from: Terry Kirby; Goff Lewis; Richard Groves; Ken Fairbrother; Alan Leather; James Lowe; Bryan Weston; Graham Knight; Mike Ballantyne; Jenny Southwell; Zoe Sewter; Alan Dowell and Debbie Warren.</p> <p>In attendance : Richard Dyason – OAD Parish Council; Gail Archer – Swadlincote TIC; Bethan Scragg – NFC; Chris Conway – LCC Country Parks; Roger Poole – Local Resident; Alan Blackburn – Local Resident; Dot Morson – S.Derbyshire Ramblers; John Howells – LLAF; Roy Denney – LLAF; Graham Morrison – HOFF Trail Network; Lynne Pass – LRBA / BHS; Mary Holland – LRBA / BHS; Geoff Pursglove – LCC Ashby Canal; Sam Lattaway – NFC; Marion Farrell – Groundwork; and Sam Ireson – LCC.</p>	
2	<p>Previous Meeting Actions:</p> <p><u>Willesley Lake</u> – Sam Ireson to write to the new owners to discuss reinstating access around the lake and update at next meeting.</p> <p><u>Obstruction of Public Footpath P107</u> – Sam Ireson reported that Legal Action is progressing. Group will be updated at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Minorca Restoration</u> – Discussions with the Planners and UK Coal are ongoing regarding the restoration of the site. The proposed N-W bridleway and E-W bridleway through the site are under discussion due to safety issues identified where they will exit onto Bosworth Road and Gallows Lane. Group to be updated at next meeting.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SI</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SI</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SI /RP</p>
3	<p>Live Projects Update</p> <p><u>Project Priorities</u></p> <p>A. Hicks Lodge to Moira Furnace –</p> <p><u>Section A Hicks Lodge to Newfields Road</u> – Alan Dowell was unable to attend the meeting. Bethan confirmed that this section would be completed this year.</p> <p><u>Section B Measham Road Housing Development</u> – Planning Permission has been granted for the housing development. Sam Ireson has been in discussions with the developer and LCC Highways officers regarding the provision of a cycle crossing. A designated crossing has been deemed unnecessary however provision is being</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">AD</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SI</p>

<p>made for cyclists with a 3m wide footway, dropped curves and on-road cycle markings. Sam Ireson to update the group at the next meeting.</p>	
<p><u>Section C Measham Road to Moira Furnace</u> – A Land Registry Search has identified that all of the land affected is within the ownership of Moira Furnace. Sam Ireson to write to the landowners to discuss the proposal.</p> <p>The £40K funding for the link is still available from NWLDC if the link between Ashby and Hicks Lodge is constructed by developers. Estimate for works is between £60k and £80k depending on surface specification, so further funding needs to be sought.</p>	SI
<p>B. Hicks Lodge to Ashby Link -</p> <p>The Planning permission for the housing development, which includes a link between Willesley Lane and Hicks Lodge has been refused for a second time. The developers have appealed and a decision is due next month. Sam Ireson to update the group at the next meeting.</p> <p>If the housing development does not go ahead, other options will continue to be explored.</p>	SI
<p>C. Willesley to Ivanhoe Trail Link –</p> <p>Sam Ireson carried out a preliminary Land Registry search which identified that Pastures Lane and the link to the picnic site is not registered. Roger mentioned that the land was once owned by British Coal and it may still be in their ownership. Sam Ireson to investigate further the landownership and report back to the next meeting.</p>	SI
<p>Roger Poole presented to the group the Woodland Trusts proposal to create a surfaced route around the lake at Willesley Wood. The group agreed in principal that they supported the project and a letter of support from the group should be sent to the Woodland Trust.</p>	SI
<p>Graham Morrison confirmed that he still wished to lead on the project and it was agreed that Graham and Sam should meet with Helen Shepherd of the Woodland Trust to discuss their proposal and whether they are still happy for the route along the southern boundary of the wood to be constructed.</p>	GM/SI
<p>D. Conkers to Rosliston Link</p> <p>Marion Farrell reported that the South Derbyshire Greenways Planning Document was progressing. Marion is currently looking at the best routes for the link. Update to be given at next meeting.</p>	JS / MF

	<p>E. Village Hall, Moira to Maybury Wood Link</p> <p>General approval for the housing has been given but discussions regarding the size of the farmhouse are ongoing. Bryan Weston to update group at next meeting.</p> <p>Interpretation and Orientation Masterplan</p> <p>Bethan reported that the Masterplan was the biggest element of the Black to Green project with £180K in funding. She is currently finalising the brief for the consultants. With regards the signage and waymarking element she has met with the landowners group and they are supportive especially the removal of the existing signage which is cluttering routes.</p> <p>One of the main issues is getting a coherent mapping style between landowners. Bethan would like to set up a small working group to discuss the potential mapping style. Anyone interested in the mapping working group to contact Bethan via email at bscragg@nationalforest.org.</p> <p>Another issue is whether an App. would be used or not. If you have any feedback on the use of Apps to find your way around or visitor interpretation, please contact Bethan.</p> <p><u>Other Project Updates</u></p> <p>Millennium Milepost</p> <p>Sam Ireson reported that Keith Drury, Sustrans Ranger has agreed to restore the Milepost. James Lowe the Sustrans Manager is considering the wording to be on the fingers and this will be discussed at a future meeting. LCC will arrange for the installation of the Milepost. Awaiting Landowner agreement regarding the location. Sam Ireson to update the group at next meeting.</p> <p>Hicks Lodge Access From Willesley Lane</p> <p>Alan Dowell was unable to attend. Update at next meeting.</p> <p>Alternative Route for Ivanhoe Way</p> <p>No action required until new link between Hicks Lodge and Newfields Wood is completed.</p>	<p>BW</p> <p>ALL / BS</p> <p>ALL / BS</p> <p>SI</p> <p>AD</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Maybury to New Albion Link</p> <p>Sam Ireson passed round a copy of the New Albion Restoration Plan. Some members identified errors and had comments to make. All to email comments to Sam Ireson to pass onto the Planning Officer ASAP.</p> <p>A Project Lead is required to look into possible links between Maybury and New Albion. Roger Poole stated that he was interested. If anyone else would like to assist Roger, please contact Sam Ireson.</p> <p>Countryside For All</p> <p>Sam Lattaway reported that the project is moving forward steadily and the proposed route around the lake at Willesley Wood is a good start. Sam Lattaway to update the group at the next meeting.</p> <p>Horse Riding Access south of A42 to Minorca Site</p> <p>Alan Blackburn reported that he has had initial discussions with the landowner Mr Fowkes and in principal he was favourable to the proposal, however does have concerns regarding motorbike access. The link is also part of the wider horse riding circuit being investigated by Roger and Alan. B. As previously mentioned discussions regarding horse riding access at Minorca are ongoing.</p>	<p>ALL / SI</p> <p>SI / RP / ALL</p> <p>SL</p> <p>AB / RP</p>
4.	<p>Funding and Bids:</p> <p>Bethan gave out a handout detailing the Black to Green funding. Bethan to send an electronic copy to Sam Ireson to distribute to the group.</p>	<p>BS / SI</p>
5.	<p>Future Project Proposals for Discussion:</p> <p>A. Proposed Bridleway Circuit</p> <p>Roger and Alan's proposal was discussed during the meeting. It was agreed that the project was worthwhile to look at. As it is predominantly outside of the HOFF area it was agreed that it would be better progressed as part of the National Forest Access Group with Roger and Alan reporting back to the Access and Connectivity group in progress.</p> <p>Sam Ireson offered to provide assistance on behalf of the County Council and Sam Lattaway agreed to offer assistance on behalf of the National Forest.</p>	<p>AB / RP</p> <p>SI / SL</p>

6.	<p>HOFF Update</p> <p>Bethan reported that the Landowners Group and the Community Engagement Group have met recently and they both have a renewed energy with the Black to Green project progressing.</p>	
6.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p><u>Connection of National Waterways Towing Path Network</u></p> <p>Geoff Pursglove presented to the group a project which he is progressing to create a permissive footpath to connect the existing Ashby Canal at Snarestone to Measham and the Ashby Woulds Heritage Trail. The group supported the proposal. If you have any comments please contact Geoff Pursglove directly.</p> <p><u>Ken Fairbrother</u></p> <p>Sam Ireson informed the group that Ken Fairbrother has decided to resign his position as the project he was leading on, the extension to Rosliston he successfully completed. Sam Ireson had thanked him for all his efforts on behalf of the group.</p> <p><u>Group Attendance and Representation</u></p> <p>Roy Denney asked whether representation on the group could be looked at as it is a very large group with some organisations sending 2 or 3 representatives which stops other interested parties joining. Sam Ireson agreed to look at representation and contact those organisations who send more than one representative.</p> <p>Sam Ireson to also contact Steve Palmer to discuss future attendance at the group.</p> <p><u>Hoff Trail Network</u></p> <p>Bethan passed on a message from Zoe Sewter regarding an error on the network map with the route in Swadlincote. Sam Ireson to send the details to Graham Morrison to investigate.</p> <p><u>Horsebox parking at Hicks Lodge</u></p> <p>Alan Blackburn informed the group that horsebox parking when visiting Hicks Lodge may possibly be available in the first two fields off Willesley Woodside. Landowners are the Wrights.</p>	<p>SI</p> <p>SI</p> <p>SI / GM</p>

	<p><u>Hicks Lodge Road Crossing Improvements</u></p> <p>Roy Denney requested an update on the improvements to the road crossing outside Hicks Lodge. Sam Ireson to provide update at next meeting.</p>	SI
7.	Date of Next Meeting: tbc	

Heart of the Forest Access and connectivity Working Group

Live Projects

Project	Project Description	Planning Reference	Current status	Action required	Project Lead
<u>PRIORITY A - Hicks Lodge to Moira Furnace</u>					
Section A - Hicks Lodge to Newfields Wood	Connecting Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre to Newfields Road via Newfields Woodland	14/00330/FUL	Planning permission approved. Funding secured. Construction due to commence September with completion proposed for Dec 2015	Alan Dowell initiating project.	Alan Dowell
Section B- Newfields Wood to Measham Road	Connecting section A at Newfields Road to Measham Road. Two options - 1. Through the new development or 2. Via the Incline.	13/00183/FULM	Planning Permission has been granted for the housing development. Sam Ireson has been in discussions with the developer and LCC Highways Officers regarding the provision of a cycle crossing.	Option 1. Contact with developers once they start to ensure sections 1&2 join together appropriately.	Sam Ireson
Section C- Measham Road to Moira Furnace	Trail link from Moira Furnace along the Public Footpath to Measham Road. Required to meet the link through the new housing development	Permitted Development	Designs and Costings have been completed. The estimate for the construction of a tarmac surface is £80k and a Toptrac Surface £66k Potential £40k from NWLDC subject to Link to Ashby not succeeding and NWLDC approval. Landowners for the route are Moira Furnace	Funding and Landowners permission required for the project to progress. Sam Ireson to contact landowners Moira Furnace to discuss proposal.	Sam Ireson

<p><u>PRIORITY B - Hicks Lodge to Ashby Link</u></p>	<p>Connecting Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre to Ashby de la Zouch. Two options - 1. Through proposed housing development or 2 via woodland and park off Ridgway Road</p>	<p>Willesley Housing Development 15/00196/FULM</p>	<p>Option 1. Link through and beyond proposed development. Awaiting outcome of Planning Appeal. Decision expected Oct / Nov 2015. Option 2 contingency if planning permission continues to be refused.</p>	<p>Awaiting decision of Planning Appeal.</p>	<p>Sam Ireson</p>
<p><u>PRIORITY C - Willesley to Ashby Wolds Heritage Trail Link(and Hicks Lodge via Oakthorpe Picnic Area)</u></p>	<p>Creation of a Multi-user route through Willesley Wood and along Pastures Lane to Oakthorpe, and also through Oakthorpe Picnic site to Willesley Lane.</p>		<p>The Woodland Trust and Leicestershire County Council have agreed in principal to the creation of the multi-user route across their land. Mr Redfern written to, no response to date. Sam Ireson has carried out a Land Registry Search and found that Pastures Lane and the link to the Picnic site is not registered. May still be in the ownership of British Coal.</p>	<p>Sam Ireson to carry out further landownership investigations. Sam and Graham to meet with the Woodland Trust to discuss the proposed surfaced route around the lake.</p>	<p>Graham Morrison</p>
<p><u>PRIORITY D - Conkers to Rosliston Link</u></p>	<p>Creation of a Multi-user route between Conkers and Rosliston Forestry Centre</p>		<p>Church Gresley to Tunnel Woods completed. Group agreed that the remainder of route to Rosliston was outside the remit of the ACWG and is now being progressed by a separate working group run by Jenny Southwell of Derbyshire County Council. Beginning to digitise the routes ready for a feasibility study.</p>	<p>Potential routes being investigated.</p>	<p>Jenny Southwell</p>

<p><u>PRIORITY E - Village Hall, Moira to Maybury Wood Link</u></p>	<p>Creation of a route between Moira Village Hall and Maybury Wood</p>	<p>14/00363/OUT</p>	<p>Planning Application has been submitted for a housing development off Ashby Road. As part of the planning comments the National Forest Company and Ashby Wouds Town Council are requesting that a route be provided from Sweethill to Maybury Wood.</p>	<p>Alan Leather and Roger Poole to report to group when outcome from Planning process known.</p>	<p>Alan Leather / Roger Poole</p>
<p><u>Heart of the Forest Interpretation and Orientation Masterplan</u></p>	<p>As part of the HLF Development phase consultants were commissioned to develop an Interpretation / Orientation masterplan proposing a range of solutions for navigating people around the Heart of the Forest</p>		<p>Masterplan document completed. Successful bid to HLF approx. £200k allocated to the Masterplan Work. Bethan Scragg has been appointed as the Black to Green Project Officer. Currently working on the brief to the consultants for the design phase.</p>	<p>Consultants to be briefed.</p>	<p>Bethan Scragg</p>
<p><u>Millennium Milepost</u></p>	<p>Refurbishment and installation of a Millennium Milepost along the Ashby Wouds Heritage Trail</p>		<p>Location for Milepost agreed.</p>	<p>Keith Drury (Sustrans Ranger) has agreed to restore the Milepost. James Lowe is currently considering the wording for the new arms. Sam Ireson in discussion with landowners regarding agreement to the installation.</p>	<p>Sam Ireson</p>

<p><u>Hicks Lodge Access from Willesley Lane</u></p>	<p>Installation of an access gate / squeeze gap opposite White Lodge to provide access on foot between Public Footpath P21 and the Cycle routes of Hicks Lodge.</p>		<p>Installation of access gate / squeeze gap agreed with Forestry Commission.</p>	<p>Forestry Commission to arrange volunteers to carry out the works.</p>	<p>Alan Dowell</p>
<p><u>Alternative route for the Ivanhoe Way</u></p>	<p>Proposed diversion of Ivanhoe Way promoted route. Diversion will remove the route and re-direct it via Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre and proposed Newfields Link.</p>		<p>Hicks Lodge to Newfields Link to be constructed before project can progress.</p>	<p>Once constructed Sam Ireson to ensure any signage changes are made on the ground, to LCC promoted route literature and Ordnance Survey</p>	<p>Roger Poole / Sam Ireson</p>
<p><u>Maybury to New Albion Link</u></p>	<p>Creation of route between Maybury and Albion Landfill Site</p>		<p>Proposed route(s) to be identified.</p>	<p>Restoration plan for the site was approved in January. Need to check that proposed paths across the site correspond with link trying to achieve. Lead require to look into potential routes for a link between Maybury and the site</p>	<p>Roger Poole / possible another</p>
<p><u>Countryside For All</u></p>	<p>Presentation by John Law to the group - The promotion of Countryside For All routes throughout the Heart of the Forest area.</p>		<p>Proposed route(s) to be identified.</p>	<p>Sam Lattaway to have a meeting with the Woodland Trust regarding Access for All routes within the National Forest especially around Willesley.</p>	<p>Sam Lattaway</p>

<p><u>Horse riding access south of A42 to Minorca site</u></p>	<p>Roger Poole raised the potential of increased bridleway access across land south of the A42 to Ashby Road and then onwards to Minorca</p>		<p>Alan Blackburn has had initial discussions with the landowner regarding the creation of a bridleway link south of the A42 to Ashby Road. This would then link to the existing Public Byway between Ashby Road and Sweptstone Road to link to Minorca.</p>	<p>Roger Poole and Alan Blackburn to progress the matter with the landowner.</p>	<p>Roger Poole / Alan Blackburn</p>
<p><u>Proposed Bridleway Circuit</u></p>	<p>Presentation by Alan Blackburn and Roger Poole for a proposed bridleway circuit</p>		<p>Agreed that the proposed route could be looked at with regards landownership and Public Rights of Way Orders. As the route is outside the HOFF area was agreed that it is worth progressing but should be more of a National Forest project with progress reported back to the HOFF</p>	<p>Sam Ireson to look at the proposed route and create a menu of Legal Public Rights of Way Orders which will be required.</p>	<p>Roger Poole / Alan Blackburn</p>

Heart of the Forest Access and connectivity Working Group

Project Proposals

Project	Project Description	Actions required / Needs	resources have/required	Proposer	Comments	Lead
<u>Car Park Albert Village - Equine step over to Hepworth (Albert Village) Lake Site</u>	Installation of an equine access structure adjacent to the existing cycle barrier	No access for horseriders at this point. Legal Status of the route and Funding for the structure need to be investigated		Mary Holland / Lynne Pass	Put on hold until bigger picture of improvements between Maybury and New Albion including Hanging Hill farm are considered.	
<u>Spring Cottage - Change status of Footpath to Bridleway linking Ashby Woulds Trail to Albert Village lake Bridleway</u>	Change of status from Public Footpath to Public Bridleway	Link Ashby Woulds Trail to Albert Village Lake Bridleway. Landowners agreement and Legal Order required to change status		Mary Holland / Lynne Pass	Put on hold until bigger picture of improvements between Maybury and New Albion including Hanging Hill farm are considered.	
<u>Equine bridge to link Maybury Wood to Hanging Hill Farm and Boothorpe Permissive Bridleway</u>	Installation of a bridge suitable for use by horse riders	Horseriders are currently unable to use the bridge. Legal status of the route and funding for the structure will need to be investigated.		Mary Holland / Lynne Pass	Put on hold until bigger picture of improvements between Maybury and New Albion including Hanging Hill farm are considered.	
<u>Access from Hanging Hill Farm to Boothorpe Permissive Bridleway</u>	Creation of a new link between Boothorpe and Hanging Hill Farm	Funding and Landowners agreement will need to be investigated.		Mary Holland / Lynne Pass	Put on hold until bigger picture of improvements between Maybury and New Albion including Hanging Hill farm are considered.	

<p><u>Equine Access parallel to Ashby Road / Willesley Lane from Bridleway to Hicks Lodge to junction at Willesley Woodside</u></p>	<p>Creation of new bridleway link.</p>	<p>Funding and Landowners agreement will need to be investigated.</p>		<p>Mary Holland / Lynne Pass</p>	<p>Put on hold until bigger picture of improvements between Maybury and New Albion including Hanging Hill farm are considered.</p>	
<p><u>Equine Access to Pit Triangle Woods and Feanedock</u></p>	<p>Creation of new bridleway access</p>	<p>Funding and Landowners agreement will need to be investigated.</p>		<p>Mary Holland / Lynne Pass</p>	<p>Put on hold until bigger picture of improvements between Maybury and New Albion including Hanging Hill farm are considered.</p>	
<p><u>Proposed Horse Riding Circuit</u></p>	<p>Creation of a horse riding circuit including Ashby, Heather, Sweptstone and Measham</p>	<p>Status of existing Public Rights of Way, landowners agreement and funding will need to be investigated</p>		<p>Roger Poole / Alan Blackburn</p>	<p>Roger and Alan to present the proposal to the group at the next HOFF meeting</p>	

Heart of the Forest Access and connectivity Working Group				
Completed Projects				
Project	Description	Outputs	Date completed	Main contact
<u>Network Identification</u>	Heart of the Forest Network agreed by the group	Map produced showing Network	Spring 2014	Graham Morrision
<u>Tunnel Woods</u>	A project to surface the trail from Church Gresley through Tunnel Woods (Priority link D) and to create xKM of new Bridleway	1km Newly surfaced trail. Xkm new bridleway created. £50k funding raised from Natural England and through Corporate sponsorship raised by the National Forest Company		Alan Dowell
<u>Network Survey</u>	Survey of the Heart of the Forest Trail Network providing information for Landowners and for the preparation of the Heart of the Forest Orientation and Interpretation Masterplan.	Maps and corresponding survey information produced. Circa 300+ volunteer hours and 30 miles of trails surveyed.	Summer 2014	Graham Morrision

REPORT - CHARNWOOD FOREST REGIONAL PARK STEERING GROUP

The group met on 1st October 2015 and I advised them of the death of Geoff Mason. After the election of a new Chairman the principle agenda item was discussing an action plan and the challenges in delivering it in financially difficult times.

We touched on what has been achieved – as a group we have produced a map of the area and after the failed lottery bid some partner organisations have moved on with their own schemes and to project the forest concept we need to ensure these are seen as part of our wider ambitions.

We looked at the current structure of the Steering Group and how to make best use of limited resources and progress particular areas of work. It was identified that currently there is a gap in communication between partners delivering actual tangible projects and the Steering Group and how better to align specific priorities.

The group discussed a potential new model for the Steering Group which would involve setting up a number of Delivery Boards that could act as a conduit for information between the steering group and partners delivering projects on the ground. This would enable the Steering Group to direct resources
Four distinct work streams were suggested -

- Tourism/Economy
- Social/historic – the story of Charnwood Forest
- Environment
- Development group – resources, funding, governance

I suggested bringing sports and leisure activities within the first heading and made the point that we should promote such events being badged at Charnwood Forest Park events to promote that Brand.

We discussed delivery groups being formed for each work stream made up of Partners/Stakeholders who have particular specialisms or interests in these areas which could meet separately and more frequently than the steering group and have a more direct link to actual projects being delivered within the regional park.

The frequency of meetings would be determined by each delivery group, linked directly to project needs. Steering Group meetings may then not need to be so frequent, possibly twice a year with the annual meetings of all stakeholders and interested parties continuing as at present

We then discussed funding and had received encouraging noises about resubmitting a landscape partnership bid to the lottery board in May 2017. We are to work up an overarching theme to give it a more cohesive feel than last time and then involve partners with appropriate projects to fit that scheme. The several ages of Charnwood going back 600M years was a suggested scheme emphasis

We discussed the venue, speakers and format of a Stakeholders meeting for later in the year and the provisional date is to be Thursday Nov 26th.

Roy Denney, Representative

MAKING OUR NEEDS KNOWN AND INFLUENCING DECISION MAKERS

REPORT

31/08/15

1. INTRODUCTION

England is a different place since the creation Local Access Forums and the UK economy has changed significantly. Highway authority budgets have been reduced, which is having an effect on PRoW and countryside access. Natural England’s resources have also been reduced which is affecting the support they provide to LAFs. However the LAFs workload continues to grow. LAFs continue to advise decision making bodies on local countryside access issues. Issues have arisen where a number of LAFs have raised their concerns relating to the same subject, often of national importance to countryside access, independently or at their Regional Chairs meeting. Unfortunately Natural England, in some cases has not recognised these issues should be considered as matters of major importance. An example of this is permissive access in stewardship schemes, where the announcement of the ending of funding was made in 2010. LAFs were not given the opportunity to advise on this or have an input on examining alternative options. This report examines how LAFs could ensure future matters raised as issues which effect national countryside access, do not go unnoticed and are treated as important matters by Natural England and DEFRA.

2. GUIDANCE FOR LAFs IN ENGLAND

The extracts below, from the “Guidance on the roles of Local Access Forums in England” issued by the Secretary of State in 2007, support the need to pull together the views of all LAFs on issues of national significance.

In 3.4 Advising and influencing decision makers it is stated in 3.4.1 *“In giving advice, forums should aim to **influence** section 94(4) bodies and thereby contribute effectively to the quality and robustness of decision-making. Influence will be enhanced where a forum provides **independent, constructive, relevant, inclusive, incisive and informed** advice which takes account of a broad range and balance of local interests and which assists section 94(4) bodies in carrying out their functions. Forums should consider other ways to maximise the usefulness (and therefore impact) of their advice. For example, advice should be delivered at the optimum point in the decision-making cycle and in ways which recognise and take account of the decision-makers needs, objectives, constraints and role.”*

In Annex C it provides examples of national, Section 94 bodies which include DEFRA, Natural England, Forestry Commission, Ministry of Defence, English Heritage and Sport England. Clearly although 3.4.1 specifies “local interests” the Guidance recognises that LAFs will be involved in and expected to advise on national access issues.

In 3.5.3 The guidance recognises *“Whilst all section 94(4) bodies are strongly encouraged to give feedback, forums should appreciate that these bodies will sometimes be constrained in providing detailed feedback. Also, for national bodies, there is the challenge of having to deal with over 80*

forums throughout England, which means that they will need to be selective in accepting requests to attend forum meetings and may not have the capacity to enter into detailed correspondence, or to respond to requests for information on specific local issues. This is an inevitable reflection of the number of forums which the national bodies have to deal with, and does not mean that they give less weight to the advice received from a forum.”

In order to alleviate this issue one voice from all interested Access Forums would benefit recipients as well as promote the view of the Forums on national issues

In 3.6.1 Proactively advising, it is stated *“Much forum work will inevitably be reactive and dependent on the timing of various initiatives or consultations. However, forums should adopt a proactive approach in setting their priorities and giving advice. Situations where a proactive approach can assist a section 94(4) body include giving “early warning” of a potential problem or identifying possible solutions to an issue from a novel or fresh perspective. A proactive approach can also increase a forum’s influence by enabling it to advise at an earlier stage in the decision-making process, before the options are narrowed down.”*

Thus, to enable the forums to proactively advise Section 94 bodies on national issues, the Guidance to LAFs supports the need to pull together the views of all forums in order to present as a single piece of advice to the relevant body. This should see the forums influence national policy development in relation to countryside access at the start and ensure that more workable and practical solutions are developed for a broad range of issues.

3. THE PROPOSAL

3.1. It is apparent that, when a matter is the concern of the majority of the LAFs, there is a need for a louder voice rather than a number of different LAFs saying the same thing to different people. With the loss of the LAF co-ordinators, Natural England’s reduced staffing levels and redefined role in the support of LAFs, it is necessary to look at how the LAFs can get their message over when it affects national policy. Examples of what could be considered national issues past, existing and future can be seen in appendix A. With 86 LAFs split into 8 regions it is difficult to have one voice (see appendix B).

3.2. The way forward may be to reinstate a modified form of the England Access Forum (EAF) to work on specific national and regional issues as the need arises. This may need a permanent administrative team to pull together a team to work on specific issues as they arise. A method of undertaking this task is displayed in appendix C. The method of funding the EAF is displayed in appendix D.

3.3. To ensure the LAFs have one voice on national and regional issues, it is important that a robust process is in place. This report describes one example of how this can be achieved. Other processes could be developed which are more effective. The South Lincolnshire and Rutland LAF together with its partner the Mid and West Berkshire LAF, are investigating whether other LAFs feel there is a need for “One Voice” and whether the process indicated is one which other LAFs support. It is felt that if this issue is left until another national or regional issue arises it will be too late to tackle it with a single voice. It is recognised that this report does not contain the detail required to adopt this process, as it is felt that if there is no interest in creating a “One Voice” approach for national and regional countryside issues there is no need for this process.

EXAMPLES OF NATIONAL & REGIONAL COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS ISSUES Appendix A**1. Previous Issues**

This relates to previous Issues where it is felt if the LAFs were involved from conception the outcome would have been more beneficial to countryside access:

- a) Paths for Communities - It is recognised that Natural England had a very short timescale to create the rules for this project.
- b) Permissive Access - Announcing End of Funding.
- c) HS2
- d) De regulation bill
- e) Lost Ways

2. Current Issues

- a) Permissive Access – Maintaining funding on routes which impact on Health and wellbeing.
- b) De regulation Bill – Ensuring guidelines are clear and are produced in a timely manner.
- c) Lost Ways – Encourage Natural England to provide adequate training for all LAFs.
- d) European Union – Nature Reserve Directives.
- e) Green Bridges - Advise Government to create legislation on ensuring Green Bridges are included over new roads, major road improvements and railways.
- f) Countryside For All – Create a “one Stop” web site for all Countryside For All routes throughout England, create a national approved method of measuring and displaying routes and standardise route symbols.

3. Future Known Issues

- a) Permissive Access funding - Dependant on the outcome of the referendum, through CAP or UK Government policy.
- b) Major transport schemes effecting a number of highway authorities

4. Possible Future Issues

- a) Lost Ways – Probability of further action taking place by Government if by 2026 there is a large number of Lost Ways registered with highway authorities but due to their reduced resources they are unable to process the claims, even after the improvements due to the Deregulation Bill.
- b) Forestry Commission – Further attempts to sell off Forestry Commission land.
- c) UK Government or CAP policy changes affecting PROW, open access land, countryside access or coastal access.

BREAKDOWN OF LAFs BY REGION

Appendix B

<u>Region</u>	<u>Number of LAFs</u>
East Mid's	9
East of England	10
North East	5
North West	10
South East	17
South West	12
West Mid's	10
York's and Humber	13

Information from Natural England national List of LAFs held on HUDDLE last updated 8th May 2015

SUGGESTED PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING A NATIONAL ISSUE, Appendix C**CREATING A TEAM TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON THE ISSUE**

A permanent team of three people (LAF members) are responsible for the England Access Forum administrative duties. They will only be expected to undertake tasks, if the Regional LAFs identify an issue, which they believe is potentially a national issue.

The duties of the EAF administrative team, upon notification from a Regional chair of a potential national issue, are:

1. Email all LAFs of the issue ask whether they agree that the issue is of national importance. If it is an issue that only affects a number of LAFs such as coastal access it would be just the coastal LAFs who would be contacted.
2. Analyse the results of the responses
3. If the majority response was negative, meaning the subject was not of national importance, the result would be communicated to all LAFs and the subject would be closed.
4. If the majority response indicated the subject was of national importance the result would be communicated back to the LAFs and:
 - a. The LAFs would be asked to put forward a candidate to lead the project team.
 - b. The candidates would provide a document on why they should lead the project
 - c. The LAFs would vote to select the project leader
 - d. The LAFs would be asked to put forward a candidate to be included in the team
 - e. The project leader would select the team
5. The project team would be responsible for producing the project proposal for the work to be undertaken. This would be sent to the LAFs Regional Chairs.
6. The Regional Chairs would seek the views of the LAF Chairs on the proposal and put forward any recommendations for alterations
7. On completion of the project the final report displaying the recommendations would be presented to the Regional chairs meeting to discuss and identify the way forward.

The England Access Forum will only be assembled once a national issue has been recognised and all LAFs have confirmed by voting that this issue should be investigated and reported on by the England Access Forum (EAF). The England Access Forum will comprise of a small team of between five to eight people who have an interest and a good knowledge of the specific project .

The majority of communication between the EAF members will be by email. It is recognised in some instance the group may need to meet and also meet with representatives of other organisations related to the specific national project. Therefore it is reasonable to expect travel and other relevant expenses to be subsidised. It is unreasonable to expect highway authorities to fund these costs when they are in relation to national issues. It is reasonable for Natural England to set aside an annual budget for these costs. The EAF members should provide a summary of the expense claims to LAFs on a three monthly basis together with a progress report on the project.

MAKING OUR NEEDS KNOWN AND INFLUENCING DECISION MAKERS

CONSULTATION

04/09/15

1. Do you believe the LAFs require one body to provide advice on National issues?

If “yes” please answer the questions below:

2. Do you agree that a body similar to that suggested in the report is the way forward?
3. Do you believe there is a better process to create a single body to provide advice on National issues?

If “yes” please provide details of the process on an additional document.

4. If you feel there are other examples of national importance to countryside access, in addition to those listed in appendix A, please state below:

Additional current issues

Additional future known issues

5. Do you believe the suggested process for identifying a national issue (appendix C) is the best method?

If “No” please provide details of the process on an additional document.

6. Do you believe the suggested process for creating a team as suggested in appendix C, for investigating and reporting on the issue is the best process?

If “No” please provide details of the process on an additional document.

7. Do you agree with the method of funding the EAF identified in appendix D?

If “No” please provide details of the process on an additional document.

8. What other questions should be on this consultation form? Please state how you would answer the additional questions.

Please complete the following:

LAF:

Region:

Name:

Position:

Date completed:

Please email the completed document to: john.law_32@yahoo.co.uk

Should you have any queries please email them to the above email address

Thanks for completing the consultation document.

A PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE PERMISSIVE ACCESS IN STEWARDSHIP SCHEMES

REPORT

04/09/15

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The South Lincolnshire and Rutland LAF previously placed the report “The Future of Higher Level Stewardship Permissive Access” on HUDDLE. Since the report has been on HUDDLE the South Lincolnshire and Rutland LAF have been made aware of other LAFs concerned with the loss of all permissive access funding by the end of 2020. The current permissive access sites receiving funding are displayed in appendix A. This report has been drawn up in consultation with the Mid and West Berkshire LAF.

1.2. Provision of permissive access is one of the few ways of improving the connectivity of the definitive rights of way network. Behind the hedge or fence paths could be created which improve safety and sometimes make a difference between using, or not using, the definitive path network. The aim is to create a joint report covering all our interests. It is felt important to get this right, as it may be the last opportunity local access forums have to make a change in Government and CAP policy in relation to funding permissive access.

1.3. The report and consultation document can then be dispersed through the regions of those LAFs which have shown an interest in this subject (East Mid’s, West Mids and South East regions). The responses from the consultations coming back to the South Linc’s and Rutland LAF for summarising. Following analysis of the consultation document the South Lincolnshire and Rutland LAF will make the decision on how to take the project forward. One option which will be investigated is whether the report and consultation document should be sent to all LAFs, so all can have a say on the subject.

2. THE PROPOSAL

2.1. Create a body representing local access forums on this matter of National interest, as proposed in the report “Making our needs known and influencing decision makers”, which recommends creating England Access Forum (EAF) for issues of national importance.

2.2. The EAF or a similar body representing all LAFs interests to:

- 2.2.1. Influence Government and CAP, to include funding permissive access on 10 year agreements for perpetuity to be bound into the 2021 CAP agreement and all the following CAP agreements, provided we are still part of the EEC. To ensure the LAFs have the best chance of success in this matter, it will be necessary to start working on this action in 2016.
- 2.2.2. Influence Government to create a reasonable size pot of money, for funding permissive access. Urban LAFs may not have any HLS sites so they should have the option where they can then donate their funding to their neighbouring LAF. However the urban LAF should have a say in where the money is spent. This is to ensure people in their area benefit from the permissive route, as it would be one of the routes their users would be most likely to use e.g. close to the urban area as a link to the PRow network.
- 2.2.3. Influence Government to allocate the pot of money available in accordance with the highway authority's area of land. With the highway authorities with the lowest land area being provided with a reasonable sum to ensure they can provide a reasonable amount of permissive routes.
- 2.2.4. Influence Government to announce the allocation percentage for each LAF by 2019, the minimum funds for small (by area) highway authorities and maximum funds for large (by area) highway authorities.
- 2.2.5. Influence Government to pass the responsibility for awarding permissive access funding to the LAFs. This is due to the LAFs having the knowledge of the access requirements of the locality. Hence the LAF will be responsible for the proportion of types of permissive routes in their LAF area. DEFRA would still be responsible for actual payment to landowners/farmers.
- 2.2.6. Influence Government to create a permissive access rate for restricted byways.
- 2.2.7. Influence Government to maintain a web site for all permissive routes in a format similar to the current permissive access web site <http://cwr.naturalengland.org.uk/walk-ride.aspx>
- 2.2.8. Influence Government to create the option of the opportunity to upgrade PRow to a higher level status through permissive access payments, whilst protecting its PRow status, see appendix B.
- 2.2.9. Influence Government to provide immediate funding for "easy access" routes, as it is recognised that there are very few opportunities for countryside access for the disabled. Details for this proposal can be found in appendix C.

3. **FUNDING**

We are fully aware of the current financial climate and the reduction in Government and local authority budgets but by the Government's own admission, an improvement in public health would reduce the costs to the NHS by having a healthier population. There is now overwhelming evidence that accessing the countryside helps improve individual's general health and wellbeing. Natural England in their presentation "The benefits of Nature for Health and Wellbeing" (<http://letnaturefeedyoursenses.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf-downloads/NE-HealthWellbeing-SarahPreston.pdf>) displays the need for more access to the countryside. So with these issues in mind this report is designed to provide recommendations which can be delivered in our current financial climate and plan for what should happen in the future whether we are still in EEC or not.

Whilst the current financial climate exists it is understood that DEFRA will find it difficult to fund further routes until the CAP agreement 2021. In order for LAFs to fund further permissive routes prior to the new CAP agreement, Natural England should provide training and assistance for LAFs to access suitable funding streams, such as LEADER funding through Local Action Groups, to enable them to offer payments for permissive access.

FUNDED PERMISSIVE ACCESS ROUTES**Appendix A****DATA FROM NATURAL ENGLAND WEB SITE AS AT 06/06/15**

Location	Number of routes
Bath & NE Somerset	7
Bedfordshire	32
Berkshire	6
Buckinghamshire	20
Cambridgeshire	52
Cheshire	26
City of Bristol	0
Cleveland & Teesside	6
Cornwall	36
Cumbria	75
Derbyshire	24
Devon	52
Dorset	25
Durham	17
East Riding & Humber	20
East Sussex	32
Essex	29
Gloucestershire	13
Greater Manchester	0
Hampshire	62
Herefordshire	38
Hertfordshire	21
Isle of Wight	22
Isle of Scilly	0
Kent	36
Lancashire	23
Leicestershire & Rutland	69
Lincolnshire	124

Location	Number of routes
London	1
Merseyside	2
Norfolk	107
North Somerset	2
North Yorkshire	58
Northamptonshire	47
Northumberland	72
Nottinghamshire	33
Oxfordshire	30
Shropshire	65
Somerset	40
South Gloucestershire	5
South Yorkshire	5
Staffordshire	35
Suffolk	85
Surrey	13
Tyne & Wear	5
Warwickshire	11
West Midlands	1
West Sussex	38
West Yorkshire	12
Wiltshire	37
Worcestershire	25
TOTAL	1596

UPGRADING PRoW BY USING PERMISSIVE ACCESS**Appendix B**

This appendix describes a possible process to upgrade PRoW to a higher level status through permissive access funding, whilst protecting its PRoW status

Examples displayed below (note HN references relate to the references in the Higher Level Stewardship: Environmental Stewardship handbook , third edition):

a) PRoW – Public Footpath upgrade to permissive bridlepath

Current payment for Footpath £0.45 per mtr

Current payment for Bridlepath (HN4 & HN6) £0.90 per mtr

Payment made for upgrade £0.45 per mtr

Responsibility for maintenance = 50% of route length highway authority

50% of route length recipient of permissive access payment.

b) PRoW – Public Footpath upgrade to Access for people with reduced mobility (HN5)

Current payment for Footpath £0.45 per mtr

Current payment for HN5 £1.00 per mtr

Payment made for upgrade £0.55 per mtr

Responsibility for maintenance = 45% of route length highway authority

55% of route length recipient of permissive access payment.

c) PRoW – Public Footpath upgrade to Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act access for people with reduced mobility (HN7)

Current payment for Footpath £0.45 per mtr

Current payment for HN7 £1.05 per mtr

Payment made for upgrade £0.60 per mtr

Responsibility for maintenance = 43% of route length highway authority

57% of route length recipient of permissive access payment.

d) PRoW – Public Bridlepath upgrade to Access for people with reduced mobility (HN5)

Horses and cyclists still allowed to use the route

Minimum width still 3mts

Current payment for Bridlepath (HN4 & HN6) £0.90 per mtr

Current payment for HN5 £1.00 per mtr

Payment made for upgrade using the previous formula would equate to £0.10 per mtr. As more access to the countryside is required for people with disabilities maybe this amount should be re examined to encourage farmers/landowners to offer this upgrade.

Responsibility for maintenance = 90% of route length highway authority. The cost of maintenance is significantly higher than a bridlepath, maybe a Government subsidy should be provided to the Highway Authority for these type of upgrades.

10% of route length recipient of permissive access payment.

e) PRoW – Public Bridlepath upgrade to Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act access for people with reduced mobility (HN7)

Horses and cyclists still allowed to use the route

Minimum width still 3mts

Current payment for Bridlepath (HN4 & HN6) £0.90 per mtr

Current payment for HN7 £1.05 per metre

Payment made for upgrade using the previous formula would equate to £0.15 per mtr. As more access to the countryside is required for people with disabilities maybe this amount should be re examined to encourage farmers/landowners to offer this upgrade.

Responsibility for maintenance = 86% of route length highway authority

14% of route length recipient of permissive access payment.

- f) PRow – Restricted byway to allow for carriage driving. Upgrades from PRow Public Footpath or Public Bridlepath should follow the same logic as identified in a and b above. Restricted byways have a minimum width of 3 metres and a maximum width of 5 metres. Where there is a lack of carriage driving opportunities, the LAF may choose to accept a 3metre wide carriage way. To encourage farmers/landowners to agree to an upgrade to a 3metre bridleway a different payment may need to be made.

1. There are 56 Easy Access sites remaining (April 2015), as shown in the table displaying HLS sites suitable for wheelchairs. Both the LAFs and Natural England recognise the lack of opportunities for the disabled to access the countryside. It is therefore essential that funding is found, possibly from Public Health England to continue to provide good quality permissive “easy access” routes in the countryside. It is important that funding is provided to every Highway Authority for permissive “easy access” routes, again the pot should be split amongst the Highway Authorities in accordance to area (square miles).
2. Whilst the aim is to obtain funding for permissive access in stewardship schemes, there is a current example of funding being provided where the route is adjacent to a childrens hospice, this is land which is in a HLS scheme. It is considered that if there is farmland adjacent to a similar establishment and the owner/farmer is prepared to provide a suitable route, funding would be considered, even if the land was not in a stewardship scheme.
3. All highway authorities, even the smallest in terms or area should be provided with a reasonable sum of money to enable them to create an easy access permissive route of at least 1000 metres. The easy access site permissive agreement should run for 10 years . The route literature provided for these routes should be in accordance with Countryside for All standards. The LAFs should be responsible for awarding permissive route status. The Highway authority should assist in promoting the routes. DEFRA/Natural England should make the payments to the farmers/landowners for these routes.

**NATURAL ENGLAND LIST OF HLS SITES SUITABLE FOR
WHEELCHAIRS**

Location	Number of Sites in 2012	Number of Sites in 2013	YEAR GRANT SUBSIDY ENDS							
			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Bath & NE Somerset	0	0								
Bedfordshire	0	0								
Berkshire	0	0								
Buckinghamshire	0	0								
Cambridgeshire	0	0								
Cheshire	3	3	1							2
City of Bristol	0	0								
Cleveland	0	0								
Cornwall	1	1						1		
Cumbria	6	5	1	1		2			1	
Derbyshire	0	0								
Devon	4	3		1		1				1
Dorset	0	0								
Durham	4	3					2		1	
East Riding	0	0								
East Sussex	1	1								1
Essex *	1	1								1
Gloucestershire	0	0								
Greater Manchester	0	0								
Hampshire	0	0								
Herefordshire	2	0								
Hertfordshire	6	6						6		
Isle of Wight	0	0								
Isle of Scilly	0	0								
Kent	3	2				1	1			
Lancashire	5	5	1	1		1	1			1
Leicestershire & Rutland	0	0								
Lincolnshire	6	6	1			1	1	1	2	
London	0	0								
Merseyside	0	0								
Norfolk	4	4		1		1		2		
North Somerset	1	1		1						
North Yorkshire	8	6					1	1	1	3
Northamptonshire	1	1					1			
Northumberland	5	5		2			1		1	1
Nottinghamshire	2	2		1						1
Oxfordshire	1	0								
Shropshire	2	2							1	1
Somerset	2	2	1							1
South Gloucestershire	0	0								
South Yorkshire	2	2		2						
Staffordshire	2	2	1							1

continued

HLS SITES SUITABLE FOR WHEELCHAIRS

Location	Number of Sites in 2012	Number of Sites in 2013	YEAR GRANT SUBSIDY ENDS							
			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Suffolk	1	1								1
Surrey	3	2				2				
Tyne & Wear	2	2		1				1		
Warwickshire	1	1		1						
West Midlands	1	1								1
West Sussex	0	0								
West Yorkshire	2	2							1	1
Wiltshire	1	1	1							
Worcestershire	2	2					1			1
TOTAL	85	75	7	12	0	9	9	12	8	18

* Essex previously had a site categorised incorrectly in 2012

PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE PERMISSIVE ACCESS IN STEWARDSHIP SCHEMES

CONSULTATION

04/09/15

1. Do you agree that funding should be provided for permissive access in stewardship schemes?

If yes please answer the following questions in relation to the draft report:

2.1. Do you agree with: Create a body representing local access forums on this matter of National interest, as proposed in the report "Making our needs known and influencing decision makers", which recommends creating England Access Forum (EAF) for issues of national importance.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.1. Do you agree with: Influence Government and CAP to include funding permissive access on 10 year agreements for perpetuity to be bound into the 2021 CAP agreement and all the following CAP agreements, provided we are still part of the EEC. To ensure the LAFs have the best chance of success in this matter it will be necessary to start working on this action in 2016.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.2. Do you agree with: Influence Government to create a reasonable size pot of money, for funding permissive access. Urban LAFs may not have any HLS sites so they should have the option where they can then donate their funding to their neighbouring LAF. However the urban LAF should have a say in where the money is spent. This is to ensure people in their area benefit from the permissive route, as it would be one of the routes their users would be most likely to use e.g. close to the urban area as a link to the PRow network.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.3. Do you agree with: Influence Government to allocate the pot of money available in accordance with the highway authority's area of land. With the highway authorities with the lowest land area being provided with a reasonable sum to ensure they can provide a reasonable amount of permissive routes.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.4. Do you agree with: Influence Government to announce the allocation percentage for each LAF by 2019, the minimum funds for small (by area) highway authorities and maximum funds for large (by area) highway authorities.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.5. Do you agree with: Influence Government to pass the responsibility for awarding permissive access funding to the LAFs. This is due to the LAFs having the knowledge of the access requirements of the locality. Hence the LAF will be responsible for the proportion of types of permissive routes in their LAF area. DEFRA would still be responsible for actual payment to landowners/farmers.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.6. Do you agree with: Influence Government to create a permissive access rate for restricted byways.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.7. Do you agree with: Influence Government to maintain a web site for all permissive routes in a format similar to the current permissive access web site:

<http://cwr.naturalengland.org.uk/walk-ride.aspx>

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.8. Do you agree with: Influence Government to create the option of the opportunity to upgrade PRoW to a higher level status through permissive access payments, whilst protecting its PRoW status, see appendix B.

If “No” please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.9. Do you agree with: Influence Government to provide immediate funding for “easy access” routes, as it is recognised that there are very few opportunities for countryside access for the disabled. Details for this proposal can be found in appendix C.

If “No” please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

3. What other questions should be on this consultation form? Please state how you would answer the additional questions.

Please complete the following:

LAF:

Region:

Name:

Position:

Date completed:

Please email the completed document to: john.law_32@yahoo.co.uk

Should you have any queries please email them to the above email address

Thanks for completing the consultation document.

Ben Holihead

From: LLAF@googlegroups.com on behalf of Roy Denney <roydenney@hotmail.com>
Sent: 01 October 2015 23:50
To: llaf@googlegroups.com
Subject: [LLAF] Late item
Attachments: extension.jpg

Categories: LLAF

The restoration plan for the waste site is with LCC planners at the moment and is not to my mind acceptable. You may wish to discuss this at an appropriate slot in the agenda and send a consensus view to the planners from the meeting.

The plan in itself looks fine to me other than the access points into it, in particular bridleway.

P31 is shown on the restoration plan offered as a footpath when in fact it is a bridleway. They don't show P30 as an existing retained footpath. Their index shows permissive paths under Public Rights Of Way which is a contradiction in terms

The proposed new bridleway is welcome but it should have a spur taking it into Feanedock which I think is owned by the National Forest. This would permit them to create an off road link to the P31 bridleway. In addition or as an alternative the bridleway could split to have one arm go across the north of the lagoon with the eastern end of P30 being upgraded to a bridleway, again giving a link to P31

Roy

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "LLAF" group.

To post to this group, send email to LLAF@googlegroups.com.

Visit this group at <http://groups.google.com/group/LLAF>.

To view this discussion on the web, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/LLAF/BLU436-SMTP62DBA0B2089D40FDC99434B64C0%40phx.gbl>.



VEOLIA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

SLR
 8 PARKER COURT
 STATFORDSHIRE TECHNOLOGY
 PARK
 STAFFORDSHIRE
 T: 01827 241765
 F: 01827 241766
 www.slr.co.uk

ALBION LANDFILL SITE
 REVISED RESTORATION
 REVISED RESTORATION SCHEME

AL-01 A

Scale: 1:5000 @ A3

DATE: OCTOBER 2014