



MINUTES
of a meeting held in Diocese offices, Chelmsford
Tuesday, 5th December 2017 at 2pm-4.50pm

Present: Members:

Bob Drane (BD)	Katherine Evans (KE)	Martyn Towns (MT)
Louise Fuller (LF)	Jan Arthur (JA)	John Victory (JV)
Sue Dobson (SD)	Rick Gray (RG)	Ed Dixon (ED)
Vernon Glashier (VG)	Ray Booty (RB)	Doug New (DN)
Gary McCarthy (GMcC)		David Massey (DM)

The following Officers were present in support:

Shirley Anglin (SA)	Essex Highways
Robert Lee (RL)	Essex Highways

Apologies: Adam Scott (AS)

Minute Taker: Val Cleare, Business Support BC1 Mid (VC)

1	Chairman's Welcome: apologies and appointments	Action
	<p>Apologies had been received from Adam Scott.</p> <p>The Chairman welcomed Vernon Glashier, Ray Booty, David Massey and Gary McCarthy as new members of the LAF for 3 years.</p> <p>KE would like to have some land owning members. KE also noted that there are no members from the south of the county, i.e. Rochford, Castle Point and Basildon area. There is no-one from the Colchester/Tendring area.</p> <p>Both JA and BD's membership had come to an end. JA was happy to renew her membership for 3 years. BD would like to continue but will come if and when he is able. BD membership agreed for another 12 months.</p> <p>There had been a lack of information received by BD. Diversions and Traffic Orders go to KE, RG and LF only now which has reduced correspondence.</p> <p>KE proposed and agreed all new members. KE proposed JA and BD to renew membership and SD seconded the proposal. This was unanimous.</p>	
2	Minutes of the previous meeting	
	<p>The minutes were signed by the Chairman as a true representation of the meeting</p> <p>Annual Conference of LAF's presentation to be sent out as a PDF to all.</p> <p>Action: Temporary TRO's – put on next agenda.</p>	<p>KE</p> <p>SA</p>

	<p>Matters Arising Minute taker – VC from BC1 Mid. Requests will be submitted via Peter Massie for a minute taker for future meetings.</p>	
3	<p>Development and Rights of Way: How the PROW team process applications.</p>	
	<p>Robert Lee gave an informal presentation. RL works in conjunction with ECC Strategic Development who provide responses back to the Planning Authority. Some have PROW experience themselves. RL reported there has been a good working relationship with them which has allowed them to give a cohesive response. Strategic Development coordinating the final responses. They moderate what we are asking for and where it can be considered in the framework. RL and George Farr work on this with responses to Planning.</p> <p>When planning applications come into ECC they should be received by Strategic Development. They contact both RL and GF and we provide a response in concert with PROW colleagues to do the final response to Planning. We try to get District Authority Planning Departments to adhere to certain standards and should consider PROW from the outset. There is a need to clearly indicate the location of PROW which may or may not be affected. It is necessary to have access to online mapping for this. RL reported that they do not always get support from District Authorities to assess applications when they come in. They argue it is a Highways matter or Planning matter. We are always after the event the final arbiter.</p> <p>We are looking to make sure sustainable transport is achieved and District and Strategic Development are like minded to achieve this aim. We are looking to enhance the current network. To protect or increase access, might not be in the form of PROW on the definitive map. We want to aim to have multi user routes (mur) that are accessible by all including equestrians.</p> <p>Re MUR: Challenges and currently discussing with Strategic Development Adam Garland (who looks after the Tendring area) is to try an alternative which is completely untested. We want to try different methods to see what is important, affordable, and maintained and inspected properly and can give access that is required to enhance connectivity. An example was given regarding garden developments which are out for consultation. Consultation process is the opportunity to prevent issues affecting PROW and influence other routes which are provided and incorporated in a development to achieve enhancements where possible.</p> <p>RL highlighted a big problem with housing developments. It is not only the developers and housebuilders but sometimes district authorities which completely ignore what they are told because the focus is on planning work. RL liaises with Strategic Development when there are problems. However Planning Authorities are under pressure and we need a review of our development guide which they will take notice of.</p>	

Q. There is no ultimate sanction. If someone pursues a known complaint they can ignore this and there is no sanction/punishment.

A. The planning process is separate from Highways law. They can get planning approval but still face highways enforcement.

Q. Planning applications and District ignore them. If we see something encroaches on PROW there is nothing we can do.

A. When we notice that will happen then we object to this proposal. A diversion may be necessary. If not applicable for a Town and Country Planning diversion then would need to be a highway act one.

Q. I would be interested to hear of the multi user route. This should have been sorted years ago. Talking about looking into legal aspects of this. Do you know if there has been anything like this in other areas of the country?

Adam recently joined as an associate member of IPROW and used this forum to discuss multi user routes. He understood that it was viewed as largely a budget matter. It would appear that other LA's are not forging ahead with doing this. It was noted that Cambridge LA are doing a lot and it would be good to have a case study. Looking for an intermediate/large development to fit and see what happens, e.g. in the north-east of the county at Great Oakley, Tendring (Village Maker). Carriageway can be used by pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists and have a permanent TRO to prohibit vehicular use. ECC would not look to have more urban bridleways.

Q. KE said because planners miss putting PROW on applications, is there a chance that Strategic Development will miss it?

A. No, they have online mapping. If in doubt they discuss with RL/GF and determine exactly and look at historic maps to work out if likely any obstruction.

Q. At what stage of the development do you get involved?

A. It would be at the beginning. We would have outline planning application for a particular parcel of land if the development is large enough. For other development it is at the planning application stage. We get involved early on in the process. Section 106 agreements are ironed out by Strategic Development. For the planners there is a limit to what they can ask for under Section 106. PROW would be one item when only six may appear reasonably on the S106. Many LAFs to comment on Local Plans. Propose this forum should think about reporting to the LAF when they comment on planning apps. One of the proposals in Chelmsford to visualize cycle access from the west of Chelmsford. It was noted that the Chelmsford Local Plan will be consulted upon in Spring 2018.

KE suggested asking for funding but this does not go back into the PROW budget.

	<p>JA volunteered about doing a coordinated approach for local development plans. Then this could be used strategically to inform thoughts and decisions.</p> <p>Action: All to email JA so that she can co-ordinate the information.</p>	All
4	Network Rail: Update on the Transport and Works Act Order Public Inquiry	
	<p>KE updated that the Inquiry has been put back to Summer 2018 because it has been discovered that more landowners had not been informed. SA advised that 12 landowners not contacted, 12 others with a legal interest in different parcels of land not contacted. Cambridge Inquiry is happening at the moment.</p> <p>ED reported about representation from Wivenhoe. There had been an argument about Terms of Reference/admissible evidence. SA said that part of the inspector's job is to listen to everything and consider it. In his report he will tell you which points have been considered relevant or not. The whole process is to let people have their say.</p> <p>Q. Is there a proposal to take crossings out and not upgrade?</p> <p>A. The use of the Order means that PROW's are being diverted, often to less commodious and sometimes more dangerous routes.</p> <p>It was noted that Simon Taylor is removing illegal rail crossing closures put in by Network Rail. SA commented that ECC are asking for evidence of safety issues to support the need for crossings to be closed.</p> <p>Action: for next agenda.</p>	
5	Byway Management Review	
	<p>A progress update on this project was given by SA, Essex Highways. Over the last 2 years ECC has been putting in closures on byways to motor vehicles. TRF have objected to our use of these powers which has led to not reinstating the orders this season. There are political issues around byways. Have not had a robust way in which to respond to complaints and queries around safety. SA has looked at all the issues with regard to byway 13 Shalford. Have found that it is a perfectly well-maintained byway and it should not continue to be closed. The Order has been revoked and it is now open to all traffic again but need to monitor this.</p> <p>SA and ST had been to Kent to look at permit schemes and how effective they are. Learnt a lot from this and things to avoid.</p> <p>We have done a condition assessment of all the byways in the three tranches and considered surface condition and noted a description for each end of the byway. Looked at surface misuse and also looked at other signs of anti-social behaviour such as drug taking and fly tipping.</p>	

	<p>Some byways are in good condition, others are not. They are being looked at on a case by case basis. All have a different nature and different situation there cannot be a blanket approach.</p> <p>An example was explained, Willingale 61 – this has had a prohibition place don it until April 2018. It is a natural surface and showing signs of deterioration that is making it more difficult for horses, cyclists and walkers. If we act now we can reduce the damage this winter and then less investment is required to make surface improvements.</p> <p>It was noted that a Byway Working Group will be formed and will bring recommendations to that group and that will be made up of motorist users, ECC officers etc . KE suggested someone from LAF to be on this working group and that person can feed back to this group. LF agreed to be the representative on this group plus three new members of the group. Our main aim is to have a robust framework and take this to the Cabinet Member.</p> <p>There are six routes closed to horse drawn carriages and motor vehicles, except motorcycles this winter until April 2018. It was noted that these closures are a one off. This issue will go the Working Group for discussion as to what to do with it longer-term.</p> <p>Mike Meadows has developed a byway condition database and has volunteers to populate this. In early January will be looking at this information with the Byway working group. RB asked if the User Group is still continuing. LF confirmed that the next meeting is scheduled for 11 January 2018 in the morning. GM asked if there was any scope for volunteers. This matter will need to be discussed with SA.</p>	
6	<p>LAF Liaison with neighbouring forums.</p>	
	<p>SD will mention this at Thurrock next week.</p> <p>It was suggested to have a meeting about this topic.</p> <p>Action: SA to pursue with the County Councils in the first instance and get agreement from the neighbouring County Councils as a starting point including Norfolk which will help with coastal and national trial.</p>	SA
7	<p>Interacting with Health and Wellbeing Boards</p>	
	<p>RG, ELAF vice chair, reported. This Board was formed in 2012 to replace Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). This body informs the Government. RG commented that the Uttlesford 5 year plan is up to 2022. This is a “wish list”. This year’s topic is “how to deal with dementia” and one of the benefits is walking which is the best form of exercise and people improve their health. The other topic is “loneliness in the community” and trying to form friendship groups. How we interact with people is a challenge. Natural England had produced a guide and it will be necessary to consider Essex LAF and ECC. How do we interact is an open question and we will need to give some thought about that. RG will come back with a reference point to make sense of the subject to guide people as individuals and look into own interests.</p> <p>Action: RG to come back with ideas.</p>	RG

	<p>RG explained about the previous scheme. Walking for Health, which still exists, was formed by Macmillan Fund for ramblers. They formed a training department. There is now in excess of 400 members.</p> <p>KE asked “is there anything that can be accessed on “Huddle”.</p>	
8	Access and common land between Roydon and Harlow	
	<p>This had been previously looked at in 2015. We do not have a lot of access of common land in Essex but this area between Roydon and Harlow there is an issue of the railway going across the middle, the issue of flood plain and impacts on accessibility. Harlow Council and Harlow Wildlife Trust tried and got a group of people together to get an excellent policy and plan for this area. It included railways crossings and crossing over the River Stort. There is potentially a new town at the north side of Harlow and development in Harlow and access land near the new M11 junction. Common land is not being used because it has flooding issue and the issue with the railways crossings.</p> <p>Action: All to read, do investigation and bring back as an action point to the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: SA to contact Harlow and find out Wildlife Trust’s views and report back at the next meeting. RG to liaise and find out update on where at with the proposed new town Gilston plans.</p> <p>Extra issues JV – Items on publicity of LAF. If people want to comment and feedback for Edition 3 (draft) – send to JV.</p> <p>SA to investigate re PROW and Essex LAF pages – to get this information moved up a level on Essex Highways webpages.</p> <p>Action: SA to write to RCCE requesting that they give up the domain name for the Essex LAF website or suggest a message is put on the front page to point to the ECC website.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>SA</p> <p>RG</p> <p>All</p> <p>SA</p> <p>SA</p>
9	Highways Fault Reporting system	
	<p>Ongoing issues were discussed.</p> <p>Process is being done to have PROW status for enquiries. Inspectors do not have adequate status at the moment. We cannot change historic information. A solution is being worked on and this is expected in the near future. In the meantime previous information will not be updated. It has previously been reported to ECC Customer Complaints and has not been dealt with.</p> <p>KE agreed that this tracking system needs to be produced with multiple tracking of faults as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Action: Need to report this tracking of faults to ECC Customer Complaints.</p>	
10	Any other business	

	<p>RB looks after the Facebook page. Please advise RB if there is anything which should be added.</p> <p>SA suggested running a PROW Twitter campaign over the course of a week and this could link in with the Facebook page. This could include things like capital schemes achieved this year.</p> <p>SA also suggested about advertising the Byway Working Group on Facebook.</p>	
11	Date of next meeting	
	<p>To be held at the Chelmsford Diocese Offices.</p> <p>SA will book 2018 meetings:</p> <p>Tuesday, 6th Feb 2018 at 2pm</p> <p>Tuesday, 15th May 2018 at 2pm</p> <p>Tuesday, 7th August 2018 at 2pm</p> <p>Tuesday, 6th November 2018 at 2pm</p>	SA