

MINUTES OF LINCOLNSHIRE'S LOCAL ACCESS FORUMS CHAIRMAN'S LIAISON MEETING – 26TH OCTOBER 2011

Present:

Mr Paul Coathup (PAC)	Assistant Director, Communities, LCC
Mr Chris Padley (CP)	Chairman, Mid Lincolnshire LAF
Cllr Ray Wootten (RW)	Councillor – LCC, South Lincolnshire & Rutland LAF
Mr Brian Montgomery (BM)	Councillor – LCC, South Lincolnshire & Rutland LAF
Mr Andrew Pickwell (AP)	Definitive Map Officer, LCC (minutes)

Apologies:

Cllr Eran Bauer	Councillor – LCC, Mid Lincolnshire LAF
Cllr Denis Hoyes MBE	Councillor – LCC, Mid Lincolnshire LAF
Cllr David Brailsford	Councillor – LCC, South Lincolnshire LAF
Chris Miller (CM)	Countryside Access Manager, LCC

		<u>ACTION</u>
1.	<p><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>PAC welcomed the Chairmen to the meeting and introduced AP.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Chris Miller.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Minutes of Last Meeting</u></p> <p>Approved.</p> <p>CP said that the previous meeting of 26 October 2010 mainly centred on the potential effects on the delivery of public rights of way (PROW) services in light of the proposed budget reductions. He thanked LCC for their open consultation and positive response to the restructuring of PROW services.</p> <p>PAC said that despite the reduction of the PROW budget, LCC has been able to continue with a reasonable PROW service.</p> <p>RW mentioned that despite budget constraints he has received no complaints from the Grantham Ramblers regarding PROWs.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Matters Arising from previous meeting of 26.10.2010 and Progress Updates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Process Route Mapping in Orders Work</u> <p>AP stated that no changes have yet been made to the way Public Path Order (PPO) and Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) work is progressed. However, CM is working on a process route map for this area or work, and when complete this will be shared with LAFs for comment.</p>	<p>CM to complete a Process Route Map and share</p>

	<p>CP said that the recent restructure of PROW services should provide the Authority with the ideal opportunity to review DMMO and PROW processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Staffing Structure</u> CP queried the number of vacancies left to be filled in PROW and asked if all Definitive Map Officers are in post (DMO). AP stated that all DMO positions are filled, but one officer is on maternity leave and another is on long term sick leave, thus leaving 2 Officers dealing with DMMOs at present. AP said that he was only aware of one vacancy at Assistant Rights of Way Officer (AROW) level which is intended to be filled in due course. • <u>Legal Services Lincolnshire</u> PAC stated that the legal services of LCC, East Lindsey, West Lindsey, North Kesteven and South Holland District Councils and Boston Borough Council have now been incorporated into one organisation, Legal Services Lincolnshire (LSL). LSL have restructured due to budget reductions but they have provided assurances that they have the capacity to deal with the work sent to them by highways. • <u>Flood Risk and Drainage Management</u> PAC stated that LCC has taken over flood management duties from other organisations, which include identifying who is responsible for causing and fixing flooding or drainage issues. This work will be undertaken by LCC's highway teams. These additional duties have not had much of an impact yet mainly due to the drought conditions suffered by the County for some months. • <u>Arboricultural Services</u> PAC said that Arboricultural Services have been moved into highways and is under the management of CM. This is because much of their work involves roadside trees. • <u>Volunteers – Parish Councils</u> RW asked about the use of parish councils in relation to the maintenance of PROWs. PAC said that LCC would press and encourage parish councils to volunteer for the provision of services including maintenance of PROWs where there will not be an impact of additional costs on LCC. 	with both LAFs
4.	<p><u>Definitive Map Work – Backlogs & Available Resources</u></p> <p>CP raised an issue regarding the sporadic progression on some DMMO cases over many years. One example given was that of Wickenby DMMO 121 which has resulted in questions in correspondence remaining unanswered and other facts possibly overlooked. AP stated that the DMMO priority system now operating ensures that DMMO cases being worked on by officers are progressed through to completion before new cases are picked up. CAP hopes that the process route mapping of DMMOs when complete will help resolve these issues. CP wondered</p>	

	whether a fresh outlook by an independent party on the progression of DMMO casework would be helpful.	
5.	<p><u>Network gaps (missing links & “Not to Road”) and other mapping anomalies</u></p> <p>CP wished to raise the issue of missing links in the PROW network and cited a footpath in Wispington (which appears to be Public Footpath No. 87) as an example. CP wished to ensure that the missing links in the network are not overlooked and enquired whether it would be possible to look for an opportunity to resolve some of them, possibly through ROWIP 2.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2</u></p> <p>CP stated that the aims within the current ROWIP appeared to have been created to target external sources of funding rather than delivering “concrete” achievements. He suggested that the next ROWIP should contain aims which will result in tangible outcomes and achievements.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Recreational Motoring</u></p> <p>CAP stated that the signposting and mapping of strategic non-metalled unclassified roads is underway.</p> <p>CP highlighted that the main issue regarding recreational motoring is the abuse of green lanes and cited Sewton Lane (The Drift), which is also a SSSI, in Skillington as an example.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Any Matters Arising</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Policy for Gating Orders</u> RW enquired about LCC policy on gating orders. He mentioned that following a gating order made for a public footpath in Grantham, problems with antisocial behaviour in the route decreased significantly. Gating Orders have been considered for some highways in Gainsborough. AP stated that the Authority does not have a policy for gating orders, but CM has met with officers in Northeast Lincolnshire regarding the processes and procedures they use in relation to gating orders and is looking at producing a policy for LCC. AP also mentioned enquiries have been received by the Public Rights of Way Section about gating orders for routes in Boston and Caistor which are subject to applications for Modification Orders. CP asked that the LAFs are consulted on any draft policy for gating orders. 	