



## JLAF13: Background Papers

---

### Agenda item 6: Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) Implementing Funding

Chris Burke, Natural England

---

The following notes are provided by Natural England to supplement a presentation at the IPROW Conference in Oxford on 24<sup>th</sup> September, 2007. It is a work in progress as we collate information to support ROWIP implementation and share it. The notes will be added to as further data is gathered.

#### SECURING RESOURCES FOR ROWIP IMPLEMENTATION

**“Whatever you do now in rights of way, its about looking wider than the line on the ground. You must develop linkage between other strategies and policies to effectively develop the funding” Peter Tilley, Suffolk County Council.**

#### Introduction

This advice is our start in collating information about funding and other resources that deliver ROWIP implementation. We aim to keep this updated via the GPG (PROW Good Practice Guide) and continue to seek case studies to illustrate successful implementation schemes. We will also insert a reference to this into the LAF (Local Access Forum) information pack. This paper is targeted at LAFs as well as LHAs (Local Highway Authorities), as some are well placed to help you by making the connection between funding sources and the community.

The advice is split into three parts:

1. Some general advice for securing resources, achieving success and explaining about the changing emphasis in government policy to putting people first and enabling them to become the drivers in securing schemes that meet local needs.
2. Current available funding programmes, illustrated with examples that will be appropriate to look at for ROWIP implementation schemes.
3. Other resources that help deliver ROWIP implementation

#### 1. The process of securing resources

Seeking and securing funds and other resources for ROWIP implementation is only part of a staged approach to securing sustainable improvements to ROW (Rights of Way) networks. The ROWIP development process itself will have been the first stage in identifying projects based on user needs. Any successful funding bid will rely on a number of elements being in place that convince the funder that you have identified the project based on real needs, that communities, user groups, businesses and other stakeholders affected by the project are supportive and that you can deliver the project to budget, meeting any requirements the funder might put upon you, e.g. meeting environmental standards, sustainable long term management and maintenance, community ownership and participation.

### **Key stages to consider:**

- Consider all funding models and examples of successful schemes
- Learn how to work effectively with communities and politicians to make a case for ROW
- Consider how ROW can be prioritised within other strategic documents other than the ROWIP and also within Local Area Agreements (LAAs)

### **General hints and tips**

*(taken from proceedings of the CRN conference "The Changing Funding Environment for Outdoor Recreation" May 2007)*

- Funding is in fixed or reducing supply
- Demand has never been higher
- The "bar is being raised"
- Professionalism in bid writing is high
- Tailor projects to fit funders' objectives/criteria – necessary to satisfy their needs too
- Funders will check there is majority support for the project
- Bids with supporting evidence tend to be better received
- More robust evidence will be required
- Build up contacts and a good working relationship with funder.
- Partnership working – this is expected and shows cooperation and using the strengths of a number of partners
- Liaise with Regional Development Agencies, do not underestimate personal contacts in RDAs and assess projects that may fit with RDA (Regional Development Agency) objectives.
- RDAs have different priorities so it is worth finding out what is the regional agenda. The North East and North West RDAs have larger funding pots for outdoor recreation to contribute to projects
- Strongly recommend economic evaluation using Government standards- the HM Treasury Green Book which explains how to justify actions (investments) rationally and the DCMS (Department for Culture, Media and Sport) White Book which focuses on demonstrating "additionality" and is consistent with the Green Book.
- BIG Lottery, Defra, DH (Department of Health), DCLG (Department of Communities and Local Government) are very keen on economic appraisal and it's important to set aside an appropriate amount for the economic evaluation of a scheme with output apt to the intended audience.

In addition we would add:-

- Be on track with latest government agenda on local decision making and empowerment, e.g. Gordon Brown's vision for a 'reinvention of the way we govern', promoting 'the active citizen, the empowered community, open enabling government'. (Local Government White Paper on "Strong and Prosperous Communities").
- The long term sustainability of a project that ensures ongoing management and maintenance should be considered and built into any funding application.

## **2. Potential ROWIP Funding Sources**

The following list of potential sources is by no means exhaustive but gives an indication of where funding might be sought.

### **EU PROGRAMMES**

European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and LIFE+ are all applicable to the whole of the UK and represent a marked change in policy to Objective 1 and 2 funding during the past programme 2000-2006.

We will welcome examples of how you engage with RDAs in future and examples of successful funding for ROW under these programmes.

**EAFRD (European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development)** –There are current opportunities for influencing Regional Development Agencies on how to operate this funding as it is at an early stage and may be appropriate for ROW projects

- Aim is diversification of rural economies
- In practice will focus on environmental management activities
- Approx £3.9bn
- England Rural Development Programme structured around 3 themes:
  - Enhancing the environment and countryside, linking to environmental stewardship commitments
  - Making farming and forestry more competitive and sustainable
  - Enhancing opportunity in rural areas
- Greater engagement of RDAs
- Regional Implementation Plans (RIPs) currently being drafted for each region and strong opportunities for appropriate outdoor recreation. Eligibility for ROW will depend on what is in each regional plan.

### **ERDF (Regional Development Fund)**

- Less money, spread more thinly
- Tendency not to fund under ERDF if funding possible under EAFRD
- At least two-thirds of any award must be spent on a limited range of employment actions:
  - promoting innovation and knowledge transfer
  - stimulating enterprise and supporting successful businesses
  - ensuring sustainable development, production and consumption
  - building sustainable communities

### **EXAMPLE**

Suffolk County Council was awarded £80,200 from ERDF with additional funding from other sources for the creation of the "Discover Suffolk" website which helped deliver a number of targets in their Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This provides opportunities for rural enterprises to promote themselves, promotes circular and long distance walks as well as improvements to the rights of way network and transport links. For more information: [www.discoversuffolk.org.uk](http://www.discoversuffolk.org.uk)

### **LIFE+ (L'Instrument Financier pour l'Environnement)**

- Popular well established EU programme
- 3 key strands:
  - Nature and biodiversity
  - Implementation and governance
  - Information and communication
- ¾ of LIFE+ under control of national authorities although projects will require EU approval
- Approx E70m for 1<sup>st</sup> 4 yrs
- UK co-ordinating body to be appointed
- 1st calls – late 2007

### **EXAMPLE**

A previous successful project was the Parrett Trail in S. Somerset, a 42 mile footpath route from the source of the R. Parrett to its mouth. The weblink can be found at <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life..>

**Hints and tips-** Talk to colleagues who have had some success. EU looks at track record of organisations and uses a scoring system for assessment. If an application is not successful there will be no funding for any feasibility studies done up to point of application but if a scheme is successful, the EU will cover the costs of prior meetings and studies.

---

## **Agenda item 7: Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) Quick Wins**

---

The Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) is currently subject to decision within the three councils. The following are three quick wins where the document includes the JLAF under "key partners and stakeholders/funders" in the Statement of Action:

- **Develop joint diversion policy including specification standards for diverted paths**
- **Complete a full review of signage in the area and produce signage guidelines**
- **Provide information, guidance and support to landowners**

---

# Agenda item 10: ITEMS FOR RATIFICATION & INFORMATION

---

## Agenda item 10a: Consultations: JLAF meeting to ratify responses to...

---

### “Right to Apply”

The following letter and enclosure was sent to the Defra as a response to the consultation on implementation of the right to apply for orders to extinguish and divert public rights of way, and associated rights of appeal. The reply was formulated by a subgroup of JLAF members John Gunnery, Peter Gould and Ann Fay, chaired by the JLAF Vice Chairman Robin Winfield. In order for the response to be considered as a consensus of the JLAF, members present at the meeting must agree the response as representing a consensus of their advice.

17 August 2007

Dear Mr Audcent,

### **Consultation on implementation of the right to apply for orders to extinguish and divert public rights of way, and associated rights of appeal**

Enclosed with this letter is our response to the questions posed in your consultation, the deadline for submission of which is the 31<sup>st</sup> August 2007. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Unfortunately, there was insufficient time to consider this consultation properly before a scheduled full meeting of the Joint Local Access Forum (JLAF). However, at the last full meeting, the JLAF appointed a sub-group, with representatives from Landowning, User and Other interests to formulate a detailed response. The sub-group was chaired by the JLAF Vice Chairman Robin Winfield; John Gunnery, Peter Gould and Ann Fay were the other JLAF members of the group.

This response has been agreed with the consensus of that sub-group. However, it cannot be considered as formal advice with the consensus of the JLAF as a whole. We request, however, that you pay **full attention** to the advice that this response provides. This response will be reported to the JLAF at its next full meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> November and I am confident that the full JLAF will agree with the findings of the sub-group. Additionally, individual members of the JLAF may be making separate responses to this consultation.

Yours sincerely,

Ray Newbiggin  
Chairman of the JLAF.

Encl.

**Consultation on: Implementation of the right to apply for orders to extinguish and divert public rights of way, and associated rights of appeal.**

**Response from a working group of the Joint Local Access Forum for Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire**

**Background:** The statutory right to apply for orders to permanently extinguish or divert certain public rights of way, and the associated rights of appeal to the Secretary of State are introduced by Section 57 and Schedule 6 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which introduces new sections into the Highways Act 1980. The Consultation Paper sets out a proposed approach to commencing the new rights and asks whether, in view of some fundamental issues identified, the legislation should be commenced in its current form, repealed, amended. The Partial Regulatory Impact at Annex F of the Consultation Paper raises a number of concerns, most notably with regard to the estimated costs and benefits of the new legislation, which need particular consideration.

The Consultation Paper asks for views on 35 specific considerations. The questions, *and the response sent on behalf of the JLAF*, are set out in the following table

<b>Question</b>		<b>JLAF Working Group Response</b>
<b>1</b>	Do you agree that the regulations should (a) require authorities to make available application forms for use by applicants, and (b) that the content of the application form should be for the authorities to determine?	<i>(a) Yes (b) No. National Standard Form Required.</i>
<b>2</b>	Do you agree that the regulations should require authorities to seek basic information in the application form, as listed in the consultation paper? See 4.4 below for detail of the information	<i>Yes. Plus written/signed confirmation from the landlord if a tenant is involved.</i>
<b>3</b>	Do you agree that the right to apply should allow for the making of applications to extinguish or divert restricted byways?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>4</b>	Do you agree that the scale of the map accompanying an application should be at the scale of 1:2,500 or, where a map of such a scale is not available, at the largest scale readily available?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>5</b>	Do you agree that the maps accompanying an application should only be amended with the agreement of the authority?	<i>Yes. However, any interested parties to be advised.</i>
<b>6</b>	Do you agree that the applicant should only be required to notify: other landowners, lessees or occupiers whose land they consider will be affected by the order?	<i>No. Adjoining Landowners, and any others who could be affected. (It is recommended that there is written confirmation of this)</i>
<b>7</b>	Do you agree that authorities should be required to consult other councils within whose area the right of way lies, and such other persons as the authority considers appropriate, <i>before</i> deciding an application?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>8</b>	Do you agree that authorities should be required to notify any persons who made representations on an application, of the outcome?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>9</b>	Do you agree that 56 days is a fair period of time within which appeals should be brought?	<i>Yes. For consistency Authorities should have the same time. See Question 11.</i>
<b>10</b>	Do you agree that appeals should be brought by using a form obtained from the Secretary of State, but that the form of appeal need not be prescribed by regulations?	<i>Yes. This relates to Question 16. It should be a standard form.</i>

<b>11</b>	Do you agree that the authority should be required to provide the Secretary of State with the required information within four weeks of receiving notice from the Secretary of State (or such other date as agreed with the Secretary of State)?	<i>No should be 56 days. (See Q. 9).</i>
<b>12</b>	Do you agree that the applicant (appellant) should not be required to give notice of the making of an appeal to any other parties?	<i>Yes. Should be done by Authority, or Sec. of State.</i>
<b>13</b>	In the case of appeals under section 121D(1)(a) do you agree that the Secretary of State should be required to give notice of an appeal to any person who made representations or objections on the application?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>14</b>	In the case of appeals under section 121D(1)(b) or section 121D(1)(c), do you agree that the Secretary of State should be required to give notice of an appeal to any person who made representations or objections on the order (and which have not subsequently been withdrawn)?	<i>Yes</i>
<b>15</b>	Do you (a) agree that the regulations should prescribe an Application Charge set at £1000 per application, and (b) what impact do you consider this would have on the numbers of applications made?	<i>(a) Yes. However where there is a CLEAR public benefit and a hybrid scheme is used, all or part of the charge to be waived. (b) Slight Increase only.</i>
<b>16</b>	Do you agree that the regulations should provide for standard order-making charge, plus four Further Charges, at the levels proposed? <i>For detail of the charges see below Table 1.</i>	<i>Yes. However the advertising in the Press is questionable and we feel site notices and internet would be more cost effective.</i>
<b>17</b>	Do you agree that authorities should be required to refund the difference, where the actual cost of placing the newspaper notice is less than Further Charge C?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>18</b>	Do you agree that Further Charge C should be set at a higher level in those areas where costs are unavoidably higher?	<i>Yes. Actual Cost should be charged.</i>
<b>19</b>	For Order-making authorities only: Do you consider that Further Charge C should be set higher than £500 in your area? If so, provide evidence to show that costs unavoidably exceed £500, and state what level you consider it should be set at in your area?	<i>N/A</i>
<b>20</b>	Do you consider that the prescribed charges for public path diversion and extinguishment orders should apply to special orders (for school security)?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>21</b>	Do special orders raise any additional issues which the Secretary of State should take into account in making regulations which meet the needs of schools?	<i>No.</i>
<b>22</b>	Do you consider that (a) there is a risk of authorities erring on the side of refusing applications (which will minimise their own costs) thereby forcing applicants to appeal, and if so, (b) what measures would most effectively mitigate the risk?	<i>(a) Yes. (b) Allow 6 months for application to be dealt with.</i>
<b>23</b>	Do you agree that applicants who appeal against an authority's refusal to make an order, should be required to meet the expenses incurred by the Secretary of State in drafting and publicising an order, through payment of a charge of approximately £150 plus the actual cost of erecting site notices and publishing newspaper notices?	<i>Yes. However if appeal successful charges to be returned.</i>
<b>24</b>	Do you agree with the proposed circumstances in which authorities should be required to remit or refund charges?	<i>No. See Q 23.</i>
<b>25</b>	Should a partial or full refund of the Application Charge be made when the authority refuses an application for an order?	<i>No.</i>

<b>26</b>	Do you agree that applicants should be entitled to claim refunds as proposed, and that authorities should be required to make a refund on receiving such a claim?	<i>Yes. If authority is responsible for the error.</i>
<b>27</b>	Do you agree with the proposed levels of remittance/refund to be prescribed in the regulations?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>28</b>	Do you consider authorities should be given the power and/or should be required to remit or refund the Application Charge and/or the Further Charges, in any other circumstances?	<i>Yes. Clear guidance would be needed as to circumstances.</i>
<b>29</b>	Does the partial RIA adequately assess the likely level of uptake, costs, potential impacts, risks, and benefits?	<i>We don't feel we have enough information or knowledge to comment on this.</i>
<b>30</b>	Do you consider that the proposals would (a) meet the needs of landowners/lessees/occupiers and (b) take full account of the needs of other stakeholder groups?	<i>(a) Yes. (b) No. See note on tenant/applicant.</i>
<b>31</b>	Do you consider that the legislation relating to the right to apply and appeal should be (i) commenced in its current form, or (ii) repealed, or (iii) amended? If you consider it should be amended please say in what ways and give your reasons.	<i>(i) No. (ii) No. (iii) Although restricted to certain applicants we can appreciate the reasoning behind this. However it does mean that these applicants have the benefit of an appeal system which is not available to domestic applicants. Consideration as to the introduction of an appeal system on existing legislation should be urgently considered. There appears to be little consistency in advertising, nor any incentive for the Authority to minimise cost to the applicant by using its "buying power". Provided online and ADEQUATE site notices are used we would recommend that the removal of newspaper advertising is seriously considered.</i>
<b>32</b>	Do you agree that the regulations should allow applications, notifications and appeals to be made online?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>33</b>	Do you agree that a lead in-time of at least 6 months would be sufficient to prepare for the new rights?	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>34</b>	Are there any other considerations, which you think it is important for the Secretary of State to take into account in deciding how or when to introduce the new rights?	<i>We also consider there should be a maximum time for the implementation of the legislation of 12/18 months.</i>
<b>35</b>	Do you consider that (a) authorities should be required to notify their local access forum of each application received, and/or (b) that the Secretary of State should be required to notify the relevant forum of each appeal made?	<i>(a) No. The Authorities are required to keep a Register, therefore reporting on this when the Local Access Forum meets should be sufficient, and would enable the LAF to monitor the number of applications, appeals and results. (b) The appeals should be notified to the LAF as part of the normal reporting procedure, together with the results of the appeals. Whether this is done by the Local Authority or Secretary of State is immaterial.</i>

*In relation to Para. 7.12, 7.13 we are adamant that the Rights of Way staff are the correct people to deal with all the applications. The LAF's have a strategic role, and should provide a local monitoring service, but not advise on individual cases.*

*The members of the LAF's are volunteers, and this time schedule to comment on individual applications would require monthly meetings as we cover three authorities. Should it be decided that LAF's should deal with individual cases a substantial fee would be necessary.*

*Applicant and Notification.*

*With the Farm Business Tenancies and the Single Farm Payment Scheme the role of the tenant and Landlord are not as clearly defined as they used to be. In order to avoid and confusion or conflict at a later date it is recommended that should an applicant advise they are a tenant a signed proforma should be required from the landlord agreeing to the content of the application.*

## "Coastal Access"

The following email and attachment was sent to the Defra as a response to the consultation on Proposals to improve access to the English Coast. The reply was formulated by a subgroup of JLAF members Bill Dawson, Bob Hall and Robert Killen, chaired by the JLAF Deputy Chairman Ron Phelps. In order for the response to be considered as a consensus of the JLAF, members present at the meeting must agree the response as representing a consensus of their advice.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Chris Hogg

**Sent:** 06 September 2007 17:59

**To:** 'Coast Consultation (SLR)'

**Subject:** Coast Consultation Response: Joint Local Access Forum for Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire

Dear Mr Crawford,

### **Consultation on Proposals to improve access to the English Coast**

Attached to this email is our response to the questions posed in your consultation, the deadline for submission of which is the 11th September 2007. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Unfortunately, there was insufficient time to consider this consultation properly before a scheduled full meeting of the Joint Local Access Forum (JLAF). However, at the last full meeting, the JLAF appointed a sub-group, with representatives from Landowning, User and Other interests to formulate a detailed response. The sub-group was chaired by the JLAF Deputy Chairman Ron Phelps; Bill Dawson, Bob Hall and Robert Killen were the other JLAF members of the group.

This response has been agreed with the consensus of that sub-group, however, it cannot be considered as formal advice with the consensus of the JLAF as a whole. We request, however, that you pay **full attention** to the advice that this response does provide. This response will be reported to the JLAF at its next full meeting on the 2nd November and I am confident that the full JLAF will agree with the findings of the sub-group.

Additionally, individual members of the JLAF may have made separate responses to this consultation.

Yours sincerely,

Ray Newbigin

Chairman of the Joint Local Access Forum for Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire.

6<sup>th</sup> September 2007.

### **Chapter 2: Vision and Outcomes**

**1** Do you support this vision? If not, what vision do you have for improving access along the English coast?

Yes    No    Not sure

*We support the vision especially the integrated approach to enjoyment and protection of wildlife*

**2** Do you have any comments on Outcome 1?

Yes    No

*We are particularly supportive of encouraging benefits to tourism and a system that can be rolled back relatively simply when erosion is a problem. We realise that exceptions must be made.*

**3** Do you have any comments on Outcome 2?

**Yes** No

*We support the need for ways of getting to coastal access land and facilitating public transport both for ecological reasons and to make the coast available for as many as wish to use it. Circular routes are important for the most likely users.*

**4** Do you have any comments on Outcome 3?

**Yes** No

*We support appropriate management of the coastline which is adequately funded. It is critical both for the ecology and visitors' enjoyment that intensive agriculture is moved back from cliff tops etc. Work should begin immediately on devising compensation which is fair to both the taxpayer and the landowner whether by one-off payments or agri-environmental schemes taking into account land management costs and capital losses.*

**5** Do you have any comments on the relative importance of the three Outcomes?

**Yes** No

*The three outcomes should be regarded as an integrated scheme so no one of them is more important.*

### **Chapter 3: Fact-finding and conclusions drawn**

**6** Are there any other sources of information you are aware of which you consider should contribute to the evidence base?

Yes **No**

**7** Do you agree with Natural England's overall picture of the current access situation on the coast? Are there any other studies that might support these conclusions or add to them?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Our local Councils - Bath and North East Somerset, City of Bristol and South Gloucestershire, assisted by ourselves - the Joint Local Access Forum have carried out a study which draws attention to the variable facilities in one parish, Oldbury, on the Severn Estuary.*

**8** Do you agree with Natural England's strategic conclusions? If not, what aspects of Natural England's strategic conclusions do you disagree with, and why?

**Yes** No Not sure

*We agree with the strategic conclusions but would like to see a consistent approach around the coastline supported by legislation and a statutory methodology which gives clarity and confidence to users and landowners. Enthusiastic Local Authorities should be supported in carrying out the work. Where, for any reason, the Local Authority is not proactive both Natural England and the Public should have recourse to legal action to ensure due diligence. Our reservations are spelt out elsewhere in this response.*

**9** Are there any other perspectives or factors that you think should be considered?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Many visitors to the coast enjoy watching shipping and leisure sailing activities, and viewing commercial and industrial environments. Where security and safety allows this should be taken into account in planning access.*

### **Chapter 4: Work undertaken on benefits and costs**

**10** Do you have any comments on the benefits and costs identified in the partial Regulatory Impact Assessment?

**Yes** No

*While we do not wish to comment on the detail we do think that every effort should be made to produce robust costings and benefits but recognise that the apparent precision of these methods is often illusory. So qualitative improvements to peoples' enjoyment of life should be given due weight.*

**11** Are there any other benefits and costs that are relevant to the options which should be considered?

Yes No

No comment

### **Chapter 5: Option 1 – Highways Act 1980**

**12** Do you agree with Natural England's assessment of option 1 – use of the Highways Act 1980?

**Yes** No Not sure

*We think the Highways Act mechanism while theoretically possible has proved slow in the past and Local Authorities would not be motivated to drive proposals through. We believe that if they have not done it before it is unlikely that they will do it in future.*

**13** Do you agree with our assessment of the likely scale of effect?

**Yes** No Not sure

*We think the scale of effect is correct but believe that the timescales for this method are over optimistic, the legal process being drawn-out and costly.*

### **Chapter 6: Option 2 - Section 3 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000**

**14** Do you agree with Natural England's assessment of option 2 – the use of section 3 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000?

**Yes** No Not sure

*We think the critical factor is the difficulty of mapping to physical features.*

**15** Do you agree with our assessment of the likely scale of effect?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Open countryside was expensive to map. CRoW would require a new methodology in which case new legislation would be more appropriate.*

### **Chapter 7: Option 3 – Voluntary measures to create permissive access**

**16** Do you agree with Natural England's assessment of option 3 – the use of voluntary measures to create permissive access?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Small gains might be made but is reasonable to suppose that most of the landowners that are positive towards access have already granted it. So significant further voluntary gains are unlikely.*

**17** Do you agree with our assessment of the likely scale of effect?

**Yes** No Not sure

*It is scalable in the sense that money can be allocated out as it becomes available. But the ultimate cost in winning over reluctant landowners is unknowable and the final scale of effect will be less than option 1.*

### **Chapter 8: Option 4 – proposal for new primary legislation**

**18** Do you agree that the Government should introduce new primary legislation to allow for a tailored access regime around the coast? If not, which of the options would you prefer?

**Yes** No Not sure

*It has not been demonstrated that options 1-3 will work so option 4 is preferred. This is also the only way to achieve national consistency. The case has yet to be made for a working presumption against compensation. The process must be seen to be fair by both users and landowners.*

**19** Do you think that spreading room (such as headlands, viewpoints or uncultivated land) along the coast is important?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Spreading room is important to the full enjoyment of the coast and in some cases will spread the visitor load reducing environmental impact. However the methodology must be robust and take account of current land use and suitability. A mechanism for temporary emergency restriction/closure must be addressed in the legislation.*

**20** Do you believe it is important to formalise access to beaches?

**Yes** No Not sure

*The issue of access to beaches requires clarification taking account of the impact on business and safety issues.*

**21** Do you have any comments on the proposal for a statutory methodology?

**Yes** No

*A robust statutory methodology is critical to the proposal. All forms of coastal environments should be identified including woodland and sea defences. The width of the corridor should be determined taking account of safety, comfort and enjoyment. Special attention should be paid to estuaries. This response is from the JLAF which has an estuarial "coast" inland of the Severn estuary motorway crossings and the definition of first pedestrian crossing point (which is a two mile walk alongside a motorway) is a controversial issue for its members. There is some agreement that any changes to access along the Severn (and similar cases) should take account of local expectations and current usage. However, our members' views range from those who would like to see a literal interpretation of "first pedestrian crossing point" and those who are keen to maintain the continuity of access along the interesting landscapes and environments found in estuaries.*

**22** Do you agree there should be a right of appeal against Natural England's application of the statutory methodology?

**Yes** No Not sure

*The right of appeal should extend to the public as well as landowners.*

**23** Do you have any views on this approach to protecting important wildlife and habitats?

**Yes** No

*We agree that Natural England should oversee the process.*

**24** Do you agree that planning and implementation should be undertaken through access authorities wherever possible and funded by Natural England?

Page 38

**Yes** No Not sure

*The legislation should be sufficiently robust to ensure that Local Authorities and Natural England carry out their responsibilities fully and within time limits. Consideration should be given to allowing the public recourse to legal remedies in the event of non-performance.*

**25** Do you agree that Natural England should have powers to do such work itself where the access authority was unwilling to act?

**Yes** No Not sure

**26** Do you think it is important that local solutions should be designed in consultation with local interests?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Yes, subject to 24 above. Local Authorities should identify in particular whether higher rights for equestrians (horse riding and driving), the disabled, cyclists, etc. are appropriate taking into account the practicalities of the terrain and other issues.*

**27** Are there any partners that you consider Natural England should particularly involve in its consultations?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Local Access Forums. The Severn Area Rescue Association (SARA) is not listed amongst your consultees. This body (not the RNLI) is responsible for rescue upstream of Avonmouth.*

**28** Should any legislation enable conditions to be placed on access if necessary (e.g. seasonal diversions to protect sensitive species or permanent diversions as a result of coastal change and realignment)?

**Yes** No Not sure

*Diversions should be planned in advance and made available in planned or emergency situations. Reasons for diversions should be made clear to the public. People should generally be responsible for their own safety.*

**29** If so, should it be the responsibility of Natural England or the access authority to plan for and implement such conditions?

*In the case of environmental considerations it should be Natural England. This being the case it would make sense for them to deal with coastal change and similar problems.*

**30** Do you agree 10 years is a reasonable timescale for implementation? If not, what period should the implementation programme be over?

**Yes** No Not sure

**31** Do you have any comments on Natural England's assessment of costs?

Page 39

**Yes** No

*We do not comment on the detailed costing other than to say that the methodology must be as robust as possible. We think that the work should be budgeted over, say ten years, so that the public can clearly see if/when there has been interference with the funding.*

**32** Do you agree that compensation should not be paid in respect of the new right of access?

Yes No **Not sure**

*Whether a compensatory regime is thought appropriate or not the rationale should be made explicit*

**33** If you disagree, in what circumstances do you think compensation should be paid, and why?

*Dependent on the legislation compensation might be appropriate where there is a clear loss of rights leading to monetary loss.*

**34** Do you agree that the reduced level of occupiers' liability introduced for access land under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 should also apply to coastal access?

**Yes** No Not sure

**35** Do you have any comments on Natural England's proposals for complementary work to enhance coastal landscapes and wildlife?

**Yes** No

*This is an essential part of the package. The corridor must be clearly defined for the benefit of all parties. Natural England should work with its partners to protect and enhance (where practicable) wildlife and the physical environment.*

**36** Do you have any other general comments on Natural England's proposals for new primary legislation?

**Yes** No

*New primary legislation should be sympathetic to existing schemes and voluntary agreements where these are shown to deliver appropriate outcomes.*

**37** Do you agree with Natural England's assessment of the outcomes its recommended approach would deliver?

**Yes** No Not sure

*The outcomes are desirable and achievable with good primary legislation including a statutory methodology and a legal mechanism for getting Natural England and Local Authorities to carry out their responsibilities. All this will be subject to adequate funding and the source and extent of funding should be set out from the start.*

**38** Do you agree with our assessment of the likely scale of effect?

Yes    No    **Not sure**

### **Chapter 9: Other issues**

**39** Do you believe there is a need for higher rights (rights other than a right of access on foot for open-air recreation) around the coast?

**Yes**    No    Not sure

*Local Authorities should consider higher rights and the disabled in their planning. Such rights should be appropriate to the landscape, surface conditions and enjoyment of the corridor by the public. Equestrian rights (horse riding and driving) on the foreshore are particularly important in some areas.*

**40** Do you have any information on demand for, and opportunities to provide for higher rights?

**Yes**    No

*There is a demand from representatives of equestrian groups (including carriage drivers) and cyclists to extend their enjoyment of the coast. However, land managers will inevitably have reservations concerning higher rights and these concerns need to be addressed carefully.*

**41** Do you consider there is a need for more advice or information on possible visitor safety risks being available to the public if access to the coast was improved? If so, are there any particular issues that the advice and information should cover?

**Yes**    No    Not sure

*Information and advice is paramount and should be provided in a format similar to the Countryside Code.*

**42** Do you agree with Natural England's advice that improving access to salt marshes and mudflats should not be a national priority in its own right?

**Yes**    No    Not sure

*But in due course they should be treated on their merits. Route ways through and around these areas may be suitable in some instances or at some times of the year. Cost, disturbance and safety will be an issue in many but not all cases.*

**43** Are there any other issues we need to take into account in assessing how we might improve access to the English coast?

*Natural England and Local Authorities should have an obligation to consider, on the merits of the case, provision for the disabled. One mechanism to ensure that the disabled benefit from greater coastal access might be to set up a specific fund for enhancements.*

## **“Discovering Lost Ways”**

Natural England contacted Local Access Forums by email on the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2007 with an original response deadline of the 30<sup>th</sup> October 2007. JLAF members were emailed this information and invited to respond by correspondence. The responses were compiled by the JLAF Chairman and are shown below. The JLAF has been granted an extension so that a response can be sent soon after this meeting. JLAF members must consider the comments below for ratification. The response will then be emailed to Natural England.

The Questions on the consultation, contained within the ‘Discovering Lost Ways Ebulletin Number 5’:

1. It is 2020 and you have just come back from a day out with friends using the rights of way in your favourite bit of countryside. You are delighted with what you experienced. Why – what did you experience? How did the maps you used contribute to that experience?
2. Given the current situation and procedures for recording routes on the definitive map what needs to change to enable you to enjoy your great day out in 2020?
3.
  - a. Local access forums have been set up to give advice on public access. What role do you see the LAF having in DLW?
  - b. If this required the LAF becoming more involved in route specific discussions how could this be handled?
  - c. What relationship do you see between DLW and the ROWIP?

### **Discovering Lost Ways, JLAF reply to Natural England Ebulletin**

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to contribute to the Natural England’s (NE) report to Ministers on the Discovering Lost Ways (DLW) project. Because of the severe time constraints, we emailed all our JLAF members and I have used extracts from their replies to answer the five questions.

#### **1. It is 2020.....**

“I had a delightful walk in ordinary countryside (not just the uplands). It gave access to river banks and the tops of hill. The greatest pleasure was that since the network was improved there has been a much greater variety of circular walks clearly shown on hard copy and electronic maps.”

“Reads like advertisers’ drivel. In my favourite countryside, I might not even need a map. The “contribution to my experience” (an emetic phrase) would be to enable me to plan a new route and follow it without getting more than pleasantly lost.”

“Because it is “my favourite bit of the countryside” and I was “using the Rights of Way”, I did not need to use a map.”

#### **2. What needs to change.....**

“If we are using an evidence based approach it is difficult to see how the procedure can be changed without giving the right of appeal. In this case the standard of proof is going to be high, relatively expensive to produce and may take a long time in public enquiry. Has anyone thought of a better way? It would make more sense to identify routes that the public wants without having to establish the existence of a lost way. This could be made attractive to the landowners as an alternative to DLW. But no change should be made to DLW without a viable alternative being in place.”

“More skilled staff to work on the archives: not necessarily paid. Consider what is achieved in local and industrial history by amateurs.

Some sense of urgency amongst the professional administrators. Perhaps this paper is even now overdue?”

“More links need to be made between PROW, for example more circular routes.”

### **3a. LAF role in DLW.....**

"This LAF would probably welcome the opportunity to get involved. There is the issue of consensus but all parties would probably rather be part of the process with the opportunity of keeping it balanced."

"What is there to discuss? Either there is documentary evidence that stands up or there isn't. As a jury, JLAF might be considered prejudiced."

"The JLAF role would be chiefly to instil a sense of urgency. JLAF members were not appointed for their archive research skills."

"The Pathfinder Project 4 in Herefordshire is the best way to tackle this subject. The main emphasis should be on the proper maintenance of the existing PROW and the linking of PROW, using DLW where they are needed."

### **3b. LAF in route specific discussions.....**

"We would expect to set up a working party to investigate any ideas. But we do not necessarily have the ability to consult widely. Although we have a small number of members who are willing and able to give their time there may be a problem of overwhelming them."

"I don't think it's desirable, but it would need a standing subcommittee of members who were interested. A better model perhaps is the Highway Authority PROW Liaison Groups that deal with details that JLAF rightly avoids."

"In the first instance, give LAFs the task of finding practical methods of linking PROW using DLW. This JLAF could form a small group of interested JLAF members and we have a Chairman available to guide this work."

### **3c. DLW / ROWIP relationship.....**

"None! Connecting these two approaches would only lead to confusion and delay. Do not give anyone the excuse to procrastinate."

"DLW may provide routes that would otherwise be very expensive in respect of compensation: they may still be quite expensive in respect of procedure. Locally, I have Dundry in mind. These routes will necessarily be "historical" not "desire lines"."

"We should have mentioned to need to research DLW to link PROW in our comments on the ROWIP, but we did not do so."

"I think that Natural England should perform the research on historic Rights of Way with a standard approach across the country and then the LAFs be involved with any resulting routes being included in the ROWIP."

### **In addition, some further comments were made:**

"The consultees for the original Definitive Map following the Countryside Act 1949 were mainly representatives of walking groups, parish councils and landowners. It is not surprising that many **bridleways** and possibly **Byways** were not recorded or downgraded to footpath status. Also since the parishes worked in isolation, a route which was a bridleway in one parish could become a footpath when it crossed the boundary into the next parish."

"The LAFs because they cover many parishes should study the bigger picture and involve more users such as the **Equestrian** groups (includes riding and driving of horses), **Cycling** groups as well as the **Ramblers** groups. These users on a day out may cross a few parishes or even LAF areas."

"I think that this project is a bit of a can of worms and consideration should be given to its sustainability and financial worthiness."

"The rediscovery and proper development of the historical network should be one where "time is not the essence". The Minister should not try to bounce this work by artificial constraints and short-term considerations of short-term value for money."

"You asked us to think "outside the box" and I suggest that you are asking the wrong people. By definition most LAF members are knowledgeable about the PROW and take exercise in the countryside. Natural England should be making an effort to increase the **demand** for use of the PROW rather than just expanding the **supply** of PROW. This means that more PROW need to be created near urban areas and they need to be well maintained."

"One subject that should be considered is DLW in urban areas. Whilst this might be irrelevant at first sight (given an assumption that many lost ways have been built over) this is not always the case, as has been shown in the Bath Definitive Map project, particularly where sometimes legally 'lost' ways are unrecorded even though currently used by the public. Perhaps note that legally 'lost' is not always 'lost' to use. This is the case in areas developed before 1949 and where pre-existing routes have been incorporated or reserved in post 1949 development. Those historic routes now built over would be a matter of greater contention."

Ray Newbiggin

Chairman, Joint Local Access Forum covering Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire .

---

## **Agenda item 10b: Access Land: Update by Councils**

---

Bath & North East Somerset Council and South Gloucestershire Council have both been involved in the Countryside Agency's (now Natural England's) Access Management Grant Scheme (AMGS), for implementing works on Access Land designated under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. All of the land mapped as Access Land in Bristol is section 15 land, which means it has access because of some other legal mechanism, such as the Clifton and Durdham Downs (Bristol) Act 1861. As such, land in Bristol does not attract grants from the Access Management Grant Scheme.

Works were completed under the grant scheme for 2005/2006. The works completed on Access Land then followed the advice given by the JLAF and included the five sites within each council area prioritised by the JLAF. The councils then applied for funds under the same scheme in 2006/2007 but, following a moratorium on Countryside Agency funding the application was not successful. However, as there was landowner agreement the councils completed some of the works that were included in the 2006/2007 grant application we used other funds to complete work during that year. The Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust also managed to find funding later in that year to improve access to Lower Woods.

### **Completed Works**

The following summarises works completed in 2005/2006 and 2006/2007:

#### **Bath & North East Somerset**

##### **Access Land Site: Burledge Hill**

Improvements to access have been completed, including the installation of kissing gates and surfacing and revetment works to a section of footpath across the site that has been almost impassable in winter. Improvements on all entrances to the site have been completed, replacing styles with gates and kissing gates. Access signage and information boards with site plans have also been installed.

Following the moratorium on funding in Natural England's 06/07 grant, Bath & North East Somerset Council funded improved access to the site, installing kissing gates along the entire route to the site from the nearby village of Bishop Sutton.

##### **Access Land Site: Castle Wood**

The council funded improved access with a series of kissing gates on and leading to the site. These connect the Access Land at Castle Wood to Burledge Hill and beyond to Bishop Sutton as a stile-free route.

##### **Access Land Site: Breach Hill**

Proposed improvements are complete, and included the installation of kissing gates in place of stiles, the installation of new steps with a ditch crossing and the provision of signs and information boards with site plans.

##### **Access Land Site: Knowle Hill**

Some clearance work has been undertaken at this site, signage and information boards with site plans have been installed. A new kissing gate was installed on this site during 2006/2007.

##### **Access Land Sites: Radstock (Bristol Road, Northfield, and Waterside)**

Signs with access disks and information boards with site plans have been installed on these sites. New kissing gates and a water crossing have been installed. Works were not undertaken at Southfield in Radstock as works to create suitable access to the site were not agreed.

##### **Access Land Site: Bannerdown**

Improvements to access include the installation of access disks, a large information notice board and information boards with site plans on the public rights of way entrances to the site are complete. The funding originally provided for one large information notice board has been used to install two such boards.

One of these has been installed at a newly created prominent access point with a flat surfaced access and an 'easy-latch' equipped gate to improve access on a bridleway. Since the initial grant aided work the site has been further improved by the landowners at Bannerdown in association with the Cotswold Voluntary Wardens where scrub management improves the grassland and access.

#### **Access Land Site: Field North of Engine Wood**

New access land signage with site plans have been installed. No further work is planned here.

#### **Access Land Site: Prior Park**

Four new kissing gates have been installed to enable access through new field boundaries.

#### **Access Land Site: Little Solsbury Hill**

The installation of three new kissing gates to provide easier access are complete, a new steps have been installed by the Cotswold Voluntary Wardens, and a large interpretation board has been installed on a main entrance, mounted on a secure oak plinth.

The landowners have recently further improved the site in association with the Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG) installing fencing around the entire site. This secures the site for grazing so that the grassland can be managed effectively, and should also benefit access where further regrowth and spread of scrub is prevented.

### **South Gloucestershire**

#### **Access Land Site: Spanorium Hill**

The installation of seven kissing gates and new steps on a steep bank have significantly improved access on this site, and the public rights of way leading to it that also form part of the Forest of Avon trail. Access signs have also been installed.

#### **Access Land Site: Lower Woods**

Significant improvements to access are complete, with the installation of new kissing gates and bridle/hunting gates on bridleways across the site. A short stretch of surfacing works to open a new route is also complete.

Following the extensive works funded by the AMGS in 05/06 a grant application was made to improve the surface of the main route for access into the site. Following the moratorium in Natural England funding the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust completed the works to improve this access after seeking alternative funding.

#### **Access Land Site: Broad Hill**

Signage on routes leading onto the site, including boards with site plans are complete.

#### **Access Land Site: Hanging Hill**

Access Land signage has been installed.

#### **Access Land Site: Cold Ashton**

Works complete include the installation of kissing gates, a field gate with pedestrian opening and surface improvements. Also complete are signage and information boards with site plans.

### **Future Works on Access Land**

Where improvements would complement the wider access network and achieve the aims of the ROWIP, the councils will consider opportunities to improve Access Land sites. Such improvements are subject to funding. Improvements are likely to take a similar form to works completed previously, continuing to improve access, or starting new work on Access Land sites. This might include reducing barriers such as stiles by introducing timber or metal kissing gates and in places making gaps in walls to introduce new access. In carrying out other work proposed in the Rights of Way Improvement Plan some improvements to Access Land could be included, for example in improving the provision of information.

### **Access Management Grant Scheme in 2007/2008 and beyond**

The councils have been recently notified by Natural England that there is a fund of approximately £60000 available nationally for Access Land works to be completed during this financial year.

Bath & North East Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils have indicated to Natural England that they are seeking for approximately £9000 of funds to make improvements on four sites. This includes a proposal to improve access to Access Land at Lansdown, with a new route across Bath & North East Somerset Council owned land to provide a new link along the edge of the Cotswold Escarpment. Other works would include clearance at Little Solsbury and Burlledge Edge to provide improved routes across those sites, and improved drainage at the accesses to the land at Little Solsbury. In South Gloucestershire the grant would be used to create a path to an isolated 'island' Access Land site near to the Cotswold Way National Trail, with associated signs, gates and path furniture.

There is currently no indication on funding for improvements to access land beyond March 2008.

---

## **Agenda item 10c: Access Land: Letter from JLAF regarding Access Land at Lansdown**

---

The following letter was sent from the Chairman of the JLAF to Cllr Charles Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways at Bath & North East Somerset Council.

Monday, 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2007

Dear Cllr Gerrish,

### **Access Land at Lansdown, Bath.**

I am writing to you as Chairman of the Joint Local Access Forum (JLAF) for Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire.

As you know, we are a statutory advisor to the three Councils and Section 94 of the CROW Act 2000 defines our statutory function as being to:-

“advise as to the improvement of public access to land in the area for the purposes of open air recreation and the enjoyment of the area, and to such other matters as may be prescribed”.

The previous Chairman of the JLAF wrote to the previous Executive Member on the 11 October 2006 and I wrote on the 10 February 2007. No reply has been received to either letter and I enclose copies of both our letters.

It is now nearly a year since we broached this matter and we are keen to have an early reply because this land is still not available for public recreation and enjoyment.

If it would help you, I would be happy to come to see you to talk over this matter.

Yours sincerely

Ray Newbiggin, Chairman of the JLAF.

The following letter was sent to the Chairman of the JLAF on behalf of Cllr Charles Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways at Bath & North East Somerset Council.

**Environmental Services**

Floor 2, Riverside, Temple Street, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 1LA  
Minicom: (01225) 394166 Council Connect: (01225) 39 40 41  
[www.bathnes.gov.uk/BathNES/transportandroads](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/BathNES/transportandroads)

**Date:** 21 Aug. 07  
**Our ref:** WS/F203  
**Your ref:**  
**Direct line:** (01225) 477622  
**Fax:** (01225) 394205  
**E-Mail:** will\_steel@bathnes.gov.uk

Ray Newbiggin  
Chairman of the Joint Local Access Forum

Dear Ray

**Re: Access Land at Lansdown, Bath**

Thank you for your letter of 29 June to Cllr Gerrish. He has asked me to reply to you.

I apologise for the length of time taken to respond and this is a holding reply. However, we are looking positively at the means of providing access to this land including how it might be linked to the wider public rights of way network and I hope to be able to provide you with more definite information in the not too distant future.

Yours sincerely

Will Steel  
Team Leader  
Public Rights of Way

---

## **Agenda item 10d: JLAF Project Progress - Chew Valley Lake**

---

Copy of letter sent to Bath & North East Somerset Council regarding the JLAF's advice on improvements to Access near Chew Valley Lake:

Wednesday, 10<sup>th</sup> October 2007

Dear Cllr Gerrish,

### **Chew Valley Lake Trail.**

I am writing to you as Chairman of the Joint Local Access Forum (JLAF) for Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire.

As you know, we are a statutory advisor to the three Councils and Section 94 of the CROW Act 2000 defines our statutory function as being to:-

“advise as to the improvement of public access to land in the area for the purposes of open air recreation and the enjoyment of the area, and to such other matters as may be prescribed”.

One such area which needs “improvement of public access” is the Chew Valley Lake Trail where there have been discussions between the Chew Valley Trail Group, B&NES, Bristol Water and other local interests since 2000. The JLAF consider that this is an important matter and asked the JLAF Vice Chairman to investigate progress on a route around the Chew Valley Lake, with particular reference to its use by the disabled.

He met with the relevant Officers, reviewed the files and made site visits then reported back to the JLAF.

The JLAF appreciates the work that has been done so far and passed a resolution asking that B&NES Council investigate the possibility of a multi-surface around the whole of the lake so that disabled people will be able to fully enjoy the facilities.

We believe that external funding should be available for this project and ask that urgent action should be taken to complete this project, which is now seven years old.

Yours sincerely

Ray Newbigin  
Chairman of the JLAF

cc: Matthew Smith, Assistant Director: Environmental Services

---

## Agenda item 10e: JLAF Annual Report 2006-2007

---

### Summary

This is a report on the fourth year of the Joint Local Access Forum for Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City and South Gloucestershire (the JLAF). This report fulfils the requirements of paragraph 13 of The Local Access Forums (England) Regulations 2007. This report is for the period 1<sup>st</sup> July 2006 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2007.

### From the last Annual Report 2005-2006

These matters were highlighted for consideration by the JLAF in the year 2006-2007:

- "Access Land. Following the new right coming into force in December 2004, the JLAF maintains a statutory interest, for example in considering applications for restrictions on access land. The JLAF will continue to review access land in its area.
- Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIPs). The JLAF is a statutory consultee for Rights of Way Improvement Plans, to be prepared by each authority by November 2007. It is anticipated that this will be the major area of interest for the JLAF at least over the coming two years. This will include contributing to the Local Assessment Areas through JLAF/ROWIP working groups and commenting on drafts of the ROWIP itself.
- JLAF liaison with authorities. The JLAF wishes to develop its relationship with each authority with a view to promoting the authorities' functions. Similarly, the JLAF wishes to develop its relationships with other bodies, including adjacent LAFs and the Public Rights of Way Liaison Groups arranged by each council."

These matters have been acted upon by the JLAF in the year 2006-2007.

### Membership

The JLAF has 20 voluntary members, that is, one councillor from each authority involved and 17 other members. The councillor members are appointed annually by each authority. The other 17 members are appointed by the three authorities together, with a reasonable balance between members with landowning interests and user interests. Members are also appointed to represent other interests. Members are now appointed for a period of 3 years, with appointments expiring in 2 out of 3 years. There was one resignation, Ken Scott, from the JLAF in its fourth year.

At the meeting of the JLAF on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2006, Alun Morgan resigned as Chairman of the JLAF, and Ray Newbigin resigned as Vice Chairman of the JLAF. Ray Newbigin was then elected as Chairman of the JLAF and Robin Winfield was elected Vice Chairman of the JLAF. An additional informal post of Deputy Chairman was created, to assist the Chairman and Vice Chairman. All of these posts are for a period until July 2008.

The membership of the JLAF for the year as at 6<sup>th</sup> July 2007 is shown in the table below. The current membership of the JLAF is shown below. This information also appears and is kept up-to-date on the internet at [www.jlaf.org.uk/meetings](http://www.jlaf.org.uk/meetings).

JLAF Membership 2005-2006	Area of interest	Appointment Period
Councillor Chris Cray - Bath & North East Somerset Council	Nominated as Councillor Members	Nominated annually in May by each Council
Councillor Kevin Quartley - Bristol City Council		
Councillor Peter Tyzack - South Gloucestershire Council		
David Colbourne	Other	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003
Bill Dawson	User	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003
Ann Fay	User	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003

Peter Gould	User	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
John Gunnery	Landowner	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003
Robert Killen	Landowner	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
Mark McGuinness	Other	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
Alun Morgan	Other	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
Ray Newbiggin	Other	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
Chairman of the JLAF, NOV06-JUL08		
Ron Phelps	User	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
Deputy Chairman of the JLAF, NOV06-JUL08		
Andrew Short	User	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003
Adam Stratton	Landowner	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003
Janet Wallis	Other	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years from 16/05/2003
Margaret Wilson	Landowner	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008
Robin Winfield	Landowner	Appointed to the JLAF for <b>3</b> years until 30/06/2008

### **JLAF Observers**

There are a number of observers of the JLAF. These are bodies or individuals that are invited to the JLAF meetings, who can provide information to the JLAF or receive advice from the JLAF. These include a member of the executive of each council, secretaries of adjacent local access forums and government and agency contacts. The list of observers is reviewed periodically and invitations to join the list are sent to potential observers.

### **Meetings held by the JLAF or attended by members on behalf of the JLAF.**

The JLAF held two main meetings during its fourth year, on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2006 and the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2006. The formal meeting set for the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2007 was cancelled by the Councils in order to spend officer time working on the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). However, the JLAF took the opportunity to hold an informal event to review and plan the work of the JLAF and to consider the JLAF's response to the ROWIP. The notes from this informal event were considered at the next formal meeting of the JLAF.

In addition to the two main meetings, a series of JLAF/ROWIP working group meetings were arranged over the summer and autumn of 2006 to look at Access and the potential for access in four Local Assessment Areas for the Rights of Way Improvement Plan. These areas were Timsbury Parish, Sodbury Parish, Brislington in Bristol and Oldbury on Severn Parish. Prior to these meetings, members of the JLAF went out to each area to see the access for themselves, then submitted reports to be considered at the working group meetings. The notes were then reported to the JLAF as a whole on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2006 and then submitted to the Councils to be considered.

The councils held a series of six ROWIP events in January 2007, local area assessment events in each of the four areas and an Access Users event, and an Access Providers event. The JLAF Chairman, Vice Chairman and Deputy Chairman were in attendance at all or some of these events, as well as other members of the JLAF.

The JLAF have increased two-way links to the Public Rights of Way Liaison Groups held in each council area by nominating, with the agreement of the councils, the JLAF Chairman to the South Gloucestershire group, the JLAF Vice Chairman to the Bath & North East Somerset Group and the Deputy Chairman to the Bristol Group. This will also assist in forging closer working relationships with the Officers working in each council.

The JLAF Chairman, Vice Chairman and Deputy Chairman attended a South West England regional meeting for LAFs on the 12<sup>th</sup> March, organised by the Regional LAF Coordinator, Hilary Winter. Hilary Winter also attended the JLAF meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2006. Funding for this role finished at the end of March 2007.

Papers for all of the meetings of the JLAF are available from the secretary and on the JLAF website, but below is a selection of subjects considered by the JLAF in its fourth year:

1. Continuing to advise on improvements to Access Land introduced by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, including the JLAF approach to access on a priority site where access improvements had not been agreed
2. The development of a joint Rights of Way Improvement Plan by the three authorities and the JLAF's input into that plan, including the JLAF's advice on improvements within the four Local Assessment Areas and at the councils' ROWIP consultation events and the public consultation questionnaires that the councils undertook
3. The Avon Frome Feasibility Study and the Avon Frome Strategy
4. The Forest of Avon bid for a research bid on Dedication of Land for Public Access
5. Enforcement on Public Rights of Way
6. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act
7. National Countryside Access Forum meetings
8. The Bath & North East Somerset Council Strategy for Horse Riding
9. The work of the Public Rights of Way Liaison Groups in each of the three authorities
10. Statutory Guidance on Local Access Forums
11. Coastal Access and Right to Apply subgroups were formed to respond to Defra consultations

### **JLAF Website**

A JLAF website has been maintained at [www.jlaf.org.uk](http://www.jlaf.org.uk). The website includes all meeting papers of the JLAF, details of JLAF members, documents produced by the JLAF and other information that relates to the work of the JLAF.

### **JLAF Work Programme 2007/2008**

The following areas of work are among those that the JLAF expect to consider in the coming year, developed in part from discussions at the JLAF's informal meeting in March 2007:

- The priority for JLAF will be the discussion of, and JLAF's input to the initial implementation of the ROWIP
- ROWIP Quick Wins
- Links to the Liaison Groups
- Pursue improved access at:
  - Lansdown Access Land
  - Chew Valley Lake
  - Monarch's Way
  - Mead Riding off-road link at Chipping Sodbury
- Build positive relationships in each council with all relevant departments and executive members
- Increase understanding of Management Controls, including finance, PROW network, staff and comparable authorities
- Develop the JLAF website
- Coastal Access

### **JLAF Forward Programme 2007/2008**

The following are dates for full meetings of the JLAF, following a pattern of once every 4 months, on the first Friday of the month:

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Agenda items submitted by</b>	<b>Agenda meeting, week of</b>	<b>Papers available</b>
<b>02 NOV2007</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	05 OCT 2007	08 OCT 2007	26 OCT 2007
<b>07 MAR 2008</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	08 FEB 2008	11 FEB 2008	22 FEB 2008
<b>04 JUL 2008</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	06 JUN 2008	09 JUN 2008	20 JUN 2008

---

## **Agenda item 10f: Public Rights of Way Liaison Groups: Agendas**

---

There follows a copy of the Agenda for the most recent meeting of each of the three Public Rights of Way Liaison Groups, together with the date of the next meeting. These meetings are not statutory as the JLAF is, and meetings are not held in public. If you would like further information, contact the JLAF secretary in the first instance.

### **South Gloucestershire Public Rights of Way Liaison Group (PROWLG) Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> October 2007**

#### **Agenda**

1. Apologies
  2. Notes of last meeting 12<sup>th</sup> July 2007 and matters arising
  3. Interim RA arrangements
  4. Priority Issue Progress
  5. CAMS feedback improvements
  6. Mead Riding Off Road Link
  7. ROWIP: we are nearly there!
  8. Progress reports from User Groups
  9. Any Other Business
- The next meeting – Thursday 17 January 2008

### **Bath & North East Somerset Council Public Rights of Way Liaison Group (PROWLG) Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2007**

#### **Agenda**

1. Welcome
  2. Apologies
  3. Notes from last meeting held on 21 February 2007 and matters arising
  4. Chew Valley Trail
  5. Best Value Performance Indicator 178 – The Ease of Use of PROW – an explanation of the current national methodology for this key indicator
  6. Rights of Way Improvement Plan update
  7. Management of hedgerows and roadside waste / Solving the problem of overgrown vegetation on existing routes
  8. How can the authority together with the support of voluntary bodies build a network of bridleways and safe routes for the Equestrian.
  9. Major works on PROW 2007
  10. Current PROW Legal Orders update
  11. City of Bath Definitive Map update
  13. Any other business
- The next meeting – 7<sup>th</sup> November 2007

### **Bristol City Council Public Rights of Way Liaison Group (PROWLG) Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> September 2007**

#### **Agenda**

1. Chairperson
  2. Minutes of PROWLG meeting on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> June 2007  
Matters arising.
  3. Matters raised by Members  
Bristol City Council protocol for closing paths (i.e. routes not shown on the definitive map)  
Circulation of PROW Liaison Group minutes  
Section 130A Highway Act Notices
  4. JLAF/ ROWIP update
  5. Any Other Business
- The next meeting – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2007

---

## **Agenda item 12: The next meeting JLAF14**

**(in Bath & North East Somerset on the 7<sup>th</sup> March 2008)**

### **Proposed Agenda Items**

### **Subsequent Meeting Dates**

---

The following are dates for full meetings of the JLAF, following a pattern of once every 4 months, on the first Friday of the month:

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Agenda items submitted by</b>	<b>Agenda meeting, week of</b>	<b>Papers available</b>
<b>07 MAR 2008</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	08 FEB 2008	11 FEB 2008	22 FEB 2008
<b>04 JUL 2008</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	06 JUN 2008	09 JUN 2008	20 JUN 2008
<b>07 NOV 2008</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	10 OCT 2008	13 OCT 2008	24 OCT 2008
<b>06 MAR 2009</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	06 FEB 2009	09 FEB 2009	20 FEB 2009
<b>03 JUL 2009</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	05 JUN 2009	08 JUN 2009	19 JUN 2009
<b>06 NOV 2009</b>	Fry Club, Somerdale, Keynsham	09 OCT 2009	12 OCT 2009	23 OCT 2009



ERROR: undefined  
OFFENDING COMMAND:

STACK: