NOTE – At the commencement of the meeting there will be a public forum for up to 15 minutes which will offer members of the public the opportunity to make statements or ask questions.

Mid-Lincolnshire Local Access Forum Meeting

A meeting of the Mid-Lincolnshire Local Access Forum will be held on Tuesday, 18 July 2017 at 2.00 pm in Meeting Room, Huttoft Village Hall, Sutton Road, Huttoft, nr Alford, Lincs LN13 9RG for the transaction of the business set out on the attached Agenda.

Yours sincerely

Tony McArdle
Chief Executive

Membership of the Mid-Lincolnshire Local Access Forum

Chris Padley, (Users of Local Rights of Way) (Chairman)
Sheila Brookes, (Users of Local Rights of Way) (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Charles Edward Hugo Marfleet, (Lincolnshire County Council)
Councillor William James Aron, (Lincolnshire County Council)
Councillor Iain Colquhoun, (North East Lincolnshire Council)
Sandra Harrison, (Landowners)
Ray Shipley, (Landowners)
Dr Chris Allison, (Users of Local Rights of Way)
Richard East, (Users of Local Rights of Way)
Peter McKenzie-Brown, (Users of Local Rights of Way)
Colin Smith, (Users of Local Rights of Way)
Richard Smith, (Other Interests)
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Generic Advice to Planning Authorities</td>
<td>(Pages 13 - 22)</td>
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<td>8</td>
<td>Natural England LAF Conference at Birmingham 21 June 2017</td>
<td>(Pages 23 - 24)</td>
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<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>English Coastal Footpath - Update</td>
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<td>12</td>
<td>North East Lincolnshire Countryside and Rights of Way Improvement Plan</td>
<td>(Pages 43 - 44)</td>
</tr>
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13 **Lincolnshire County Council's Progress of Definitive Map Modification Orders**  
*(To receive a report by Catherine Beeby, Senior Definitive Map Officer (Countryside)) in connection with the latest situation of the County Council's Definitive Map Modification Orders)*  
*(Pages 45 - 52)*

14 **North East Lincolnshire Council's Definitive Map Modification Orders**  
*(To receive a report by Matthew Chaplin, Public Rights of Way Mapping Officer), in connection with the latest situation of North East Lincolnshire Council’s Definitive Map Modification Orders)*  
*(Pages 53 - 54)*

15 **Lincolnshire County Council Progress of Public Path Orders**  
*(To receive a report by Catherine Beeby, Senior Definitive Map Officer (Countryside)), in connection with the latest situation of the County Council's Public Path Orders)*  
*(Pages 55 - 58)*

16 **North East Lincolnshire Council Progress of Public Path Orders**  
*(To receive a report by Matthew Chaplin (Public Rights of Way Mapping Officer)) in connection with the latest situation of North East Lincolnshire Council's Public Paths Orders)*  
*(Pages 59 - 60)*

17 **Date and Time of the next meeting**  
*(The next meeting normally takes place in October. The views of Members are sought)*

---

**Democratic Services Officer Contact Details**

Name: **Steve Blagg**  
Direct Dial **01522 553788**  
E Mail Address **steve.blagg@lincolnshire.gov.uk**

**Please Note:** for more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Business of the meeting  
- Any special arrangements  
- Copies of reports

Contact details set out above.

All papers for council meetings are available on:  
**[www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/committeerecords](http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/committeerecords)**
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PRESENT: CHRI$ PADLEY (CHAIRMAN)

Representing Lincolnshire County Council: Councillor D McNally

Representing North East Lincolnshire Council: Councillor Iain Colquhoun

Representing Independent Members: Sheila Brookes, Ray Shipley, Richard East, Peter McKenzie-Brown, Deborah North and Colin Smith

Officers: Steve Blagg (Democratic Services Officer), Matthew Chaplin (Public Rights of Way Mapping Officer) and Chris Miller (Environmental Services Team Leader (Countryside Services))

56 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Richard Graham and Sandra Harrison.

57 WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS AND FAREWELL TO CURRENT MEMBERS

The Chairman, on behalf of the Forum, welcomed Richard East and Peter McKenzie-Brown, both representing Users of Local Rights of Way, to their first meeting of the Forum.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Forum, stated that this was Councillor Denis Hoyes MBE, last meeting of the Forum before his retirement from the Council after 40 years of service. The Chairman stated that this was also Councillor Daniel McNally’s last meeting although he was standing again for re-election at the forthcoming County Council Election on 4 May 2017. He thanked both for their contribution to the work of the Forum.

58 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

None declared at this stage of the meeting.
MID-LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL ACCESS FORUM
4 APRIL 2017

59  MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE MID LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL ACCESS FORUM HELD ON 24 JANUARY 2017

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Forum held on 24 January 2017, be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

60  ACTIONS ARISING SINCE THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE FORUM (IF ANY)

None.

61  GENERIC ADVICE TO PLANNERS

The Forum received a report from John Law, a member of both South Lincolnshire and Leicestershire Local Access Forums, on generic advice to Planning Authorities when these authorities were considering planning applications and the effect on rights of way. The advice had subsequently been considered by the East Midlands Chairs of Local Access Forums at their recent meeting. The Forum was asked whether it could use similar advice to Planning Authorities.

The Forum agreed that this was an important area especially as the Forum had a responsibility under Section 94 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to provide advice to authorities on access to the countryside. Officers stated that the County Council which was a two tier authority there was a need to consult seven Planning Authorities. North East Lincolnshire was a unitary authority and was able to liaise with its own planning department which was much easier.

The Forum noted that some District Planning Authorities had good communications with the County Council but some were not as good. The Forum suggested that it would be beneficial to hear the views of a planning officer from a District Planning Authority which had a good relationship with the County Council and to seek their views on John Law's report. Following this the opportunity could be taken to produce a generic letter to be sent to planning authorities.

RESOLVED

That the report be deferred for consideration to the next meeting and that a District Planning Authority Planning Officer be invited to attend and consideration be given to producing generic advice from the Forum to planning authorities on the effect of planning applications on rights of way.

62  PERMISSIVE ACCESS

The Forum received a paper submitted from John Law, a member of the South Lincolnshire Local Access, in connection with proposed correspondence by Leicestershire Local Access Forum to various Government departments about public access to the countryside and particularly the implications after Brexit. Particular
reference was made to the removal of funding for provided access in Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) schemes in which farmers received payment for providing new permissive access. This had been removed because of UK Government budget constraints.

Officers stated that the matter had been raised nationally and the Forum would be kept informed of developments as the HLS scheme would need to be altered after withdrawal from the European Union.

RESOLVED

That the paper be noted and that the Forum be updated.

63  CHARITABLE INCORPORATED ORGANISATION (CIO'S)

The Forum received a paper forwarded from John Law, a member of the South Lincolnshire Local Access Forum, which had recently been considered at the East Midlands Local Access Forum Chair’s meeting, in connection with Local Access Forums becoming a Charitable Incorporated Organisation. The Chairman stated some LAFs were pursing this option but it was his view that if this Forum went down this route it could turn into a pressure group. Officers stated that it would also be necessary to create a bank account which would involve a lot of work managing an account.

RESOLVED

That the paper be noted.

64  BENNERLEY VIADUCT PROJECT

The Forum received a paper from John Law, a member of the South Lincolnshire Local Access Forum, in connection with the restoration of the Bennerley Viaduct by Sustrans, which had been considered at a recent meeting of the East Midland Local Access Forums Chairs' meeting. The viaduct was over a quarter mile long straddling the Erewash Valley between Ilkeston, Derbyshire and Awsworth, Nottinghamshire and if opened up would help connect both arms of the Erewash Valley Trail.

The Chairman had attended the Chairs' meeting when this matter had been discussed and stated that the viaduct was located in a populated area and was similar to the viaduct at Torksey but much larger. He stated that the painting of the viaduct was a big job and Sustrans had no plans to carry out this work.

RESOLVED

That the paper be noted.
The Forum received a report from John Law, a member of the South Lincolnshire Local Access Forum, in connection with an update of "Countryside for All" routes in Lincolnshire and Rutland. Officers stated that they had been examining various sites around the county to create routes on those routes with limited access and had been working with various partners to attract funding for this project.

The Forum stated that there was national concern in rights of way about funding and one significant source of funding was the NHS. The Forum agreed that there was a strong connection between physical and mental health and exercise but agreed that it was difficult to show evidence as the effects of exercise were long term. The Forum needed to emphasise the importance and strong evidence of rights of way for the wellbeing of all.

The Forum emphasised the importance of access to the countryside for disabled people and the need to remove obstacles. Officers gave an example of the removal of stiles in north Lincolnshire and added that when a new route was installed the County Council's Access Policy was taken into consideration. North East Lincolnshire Council now had a policy of not installing stiles.

Officers drew attention to the latest developments in connection with the English Coastal footpath in Lincolnshire particularly the route from Skegness to Mablethorpe where access by wheelchair users had been taken into account.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

The Forum received a report on the latest situation in connection with North East Lincolnshire Council's Countryside and Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

Since the publication of the report officers stated that they were meeting the land agent to discuss improvements to exit points on to the A18 (closure of footpath 21 at Stalllingborough) and that it was proposed to move a Sub Station at the end of the footpath (Footpath 72). Officers stated that poachers were a problem in some areas as they were able to use their vehicles on bridleways and that this was being examined. A member stated that any prevention measures would need to consider Carriage drivers and that the issuing of a key might be an option. In the event of the absence of Humberside Police not having anyone responsible for wildlife crime it was suggested that North East Lincolnshire Council should seek advice from PC Nick Willey, who had responsibility for wildlife crime in Lincolnshire.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.
The Forum received a report from Lincolnshire County Council on the latest situation in connection with their Definitive Map Modification Orders.

Since the report was published officers stated that in connection with Case 379 (North Ormsby), no objections had been received to the recording of this footpath and therefore the footpath was now opened for use and that in Case 136 (Castle Bytham), this had now been submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration.

The Chairman stated that attempts were being made to provide a digitalised transcription of the enclosure awards to enable easy computer access and asked if anyone from the Forum was interested in participating in this project. A member suggested that the History Group at the University of Lincoln might be interested.

Officers reported that Catherine Beeby had been promoted internally to the post of Senior Definitive Map Officer and would attend the next meeting of the Forum.

**RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

The Forum received a report from North East Lincolnshire Council in connection with the latest position of their Definitive Map Modification Orders. Officers stated that the Country Park which included the provision of a footpath (DMMO 8) was expected to open in summer 2017.

**RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

The Forum received a report from Lincolnshire County Council in connection with the latest situation of their Public Path Orders.

Officers drew attention to the potential dedication of a bridleway over a current footpath in the Coastal Country Park area but Mablethorpe Town Council had raised concerns because of the extra responsibility involved in its maintenance and the potential conflict between horse riders and walkers. The Forum stated that there were already many rights of way which allowed different users and all users needed to have respect for each other.
RESOLVED
That the report be noted.

70 NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL PROGRESS OF PUBLIC PATH ORDERS

The Forum received a report from North East Lincolnshire Council on the latest situation in connection with their Public Path Orders.

RESOLVED
That the report be noted.

71 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Forum would be arranged for 2pm on Tuesday 18 July 2017 at Huttoft Village Hall, followed by a tour of the Coastal Country Park at 4pm.

The meeting closed at 3.40 pm
Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills - Executive Director for Environment & Economy

Report to: Mid Lincolnshire Local Access Forum
Date: 18 July 2017
Subject: Generic Advice to Planning Authorities

Summary: Concern has been expressed by the Local Access Forums about the effect of planning applications on Public Rights of Way (PROWs). Consideration of this matter was deferred at the previous meeting of the Forum. (A copy of advice given by Leicestershire Local Access Forum to Leicestershire local authorities is also enclosed with this report).

Recommendation(s): That the views of the Forum be sought.

1. Background

On Friday 23rd June 2017 the Lincolnshire County Council Senior Definitive Map Officer and her colleague dealing with public path orders attended the meeting of the Development Management Officers’ Group. Representatives from LCC and all the District Councils (Except South Kesteven) were present. The following topics were covered:

1) Provision of mapping system updates.
   - The County Council will send yearly electronic updates to GIS Public Rights of Way mapping layers held by District Councils for their use in processing planning applications and drafting Public Path Orders. These will include all legal changes made in the preceding year to the digitised public rights of way network. This will enable planners to ensure that PROW are properly recognised on the current lines.

2) Amendment made to Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by Section 12 of the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013.
   - The amendment enables an order seeking to stop up or divert a public right of way to be made in anticipation of planning permission. The section also amends section 259 of the 1990 Act so that the competent authority or Secretary of State may not confirm a stopping up or diversion order until planning permission has actually been granted. It also amends section 259 so that the competent authority or Secretary of State may not confirm an order unless satisfied that it is necessary to enable the development to be carried out. This will enable developers to have surety concerning the intended locations for a PROW which may be affected by development.
3) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Orders and safe design principles.

- Where a path is being diverted for development purposes, it is imperative that designers, developers, planners and rights of way officers work in partnership to ensure that public rights of way are satisfactorily incorporated within the development.
- The needs of disabled people should be catered for at the outset by careful consideration of surfacing, widths and gradients.
- Rights of way on new development sites should provide direct, secure and visually attractive routes. They should be properly considered at the design stage and, wherever possible, preserved on an enhanced existing alignment.
- Opportunities to improve and extend the network should always be considered. Narrow paths running between houses and enclosed by close boarded fences are not desirable - these paths are not easily overlooked and therefore can be perceived as a haven for potential antisocial and criminal activities.
- Sharp changes in direction of paths should also be avoided so that no blind spots are created. Such routes may adversely affect householders’ privacy and security and appear threatening to users.
- New routes should not follow estate roads/existing roads as this would effectively amount to an extinguishment of the path.

4) Other matters.

- Draft Public Path Orders under the Highways Act 1980 or Town and Country Planning Act 1990 should always initially be sent to the County Council at Countryside_access@lincolnshire.gov.uk for provision of any technical information necessary to assist in drafting the order.
- Section 23 of the Deregulation Act 2015 gives owners, lessees or occupiers the right to apply for a public path diversion or extinguishment order under the Highways Act 1980. The change will take effect once the regulations and guidance have been completed - there is no date for this as yet.
- The change will not increase the landowner’s chances of achieving change (the application and order must still pass all the same tests), but the clause ensures that the application is at least considered by the authority.
- The authority must consider the application within four months and give the applicant notice in writing of the decision and the reasons for it. If the council doesn’t consider the application within that time, the applicant can appeal to the Secretary of State for a direction requiring the council to determine the application. If the council refuses to make an order, the applicant can appeal to the Secretary of State to make the order. All the same criteria for making an order under the Highways Act apply.
2. Consultation
   a) Scrutiny Comments
   
   b) Executive Councillor Comments
   
   c) Local Member Comments
   
   d) Policy Proofing Actions Required
       n/a

3. Background papers

   The following background papers as defined in the Local Government Act 1972 were relied upon in the writing of this report.

   None

   This report was written by Chris Miller, Team Leader – Countryside Services, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or countryside_access@lincolnshire.gov.uk.
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Meeting: Mid Lincolnshire Local Access Forum – 18 July 2017
Report by John Law, representative on South Lincolnshire Local Access Forum.

(This is a generic advice / response agreed by Leicestershire Local Access Forum to be given to planning authorities and or developers. Elements may be omitted depending on their relevance to any particular situation and points may be added regarding specific applications after email or other consultations with the members of the Planning & Travel Committee).

The Leicestershire Local Access Forum (LLAF) wishes to make what we trust you will find constructive suggestions for when considering planning applications and local plans. Planners are quite constrained by national guidelines but still have sufficient discretion to make a difference in a number of areas of concern.

The LLAF is an independent statutory body, set up as a result of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CRoW) 2000, and exists to represent the interests of everyone concerned with access to the countryside and the public rights of way network including footpaths, bridleways and byways, cycleways and areas of open access.

Section 94 of the CROW act makes it a statutory function of the Forum to give advice to a range of bodies, including local authorities, on access issues in respect of land use planning matters.

Ministers have advised that in particular forums were asked to focus on the impact and options for minimising possible adverse effects, of planning policies and development proposals in respect of future public access to land and identifying and expressing support for opportunities to improve public access, or associated infrastructure, which might be delivered through planning policies or new development.

There are three issues which we wish to highlight where the planning process can help greatly. There is an amount of overlap.

These are:

Access and sustainable travel

Open spaces for both people and wildlife

Planning for the environment.

Access and sustainable travel

When considering new developments, the design of our neighbourhoods is key to promoting healthy travel habits, where local facilities such as shops, doctors, schools and other services are located to encourage routine walking and cycling.
The benefits of the footpath, bridleway and cycleway networks are multi-dimensional and have impacts on sustainable travel, green infrastructure, recreation, tourism, local economies, health and general well-being. They are an essential mechanism for linking communities and facilities if we are to reduce motorised transport and the carbon emissions that ensue. They play a major part in the development of the recreational potential of any area. It is essential to create a physical, social, economic, and legal context in which more people will be encouraged to walk more often and to walk further.

The benefits of the rights of way network should be balanced against the need to protect and enhance the ecology and landscape and enable regeneration and economic growth. These should not be viewed simply as competing demands but as a challenge to use best practice and/or innovative approaches to achieve good quality outcomes to meet each of the aspirations. The LLAF recommends that any policy includes a dedicated section that makes specific reference to the existing network and potential improvements to it and to this end we would suggest the paragraphs in appendix 1 be included in any policy or plan.

When looking at planning applications there are a number of areas that should be considered. If we want to encourage sustainable travel and improved physical and mental health of the residents, then all developments should be designed to encourage and facilitate the taking of exercise by walking. This does not mean providing no bus service but it does mean wherever possible offering attractive alternatives.

Snickets and cut-throughs should enable people to get to facilities such as shops, schools and bus routes. We need however to look at the bigger picture beyond the actual potential development site. Does an existing right of way pass nearby or is there some green space close by? If so can a link from the site be achieved? If not within the control of the landowner could section 106 monies 'buy' a way to join the network up?

We need to ensure that in the planning of our communities, access to basic amenities and services is not dependent on car ownership but is always available to those on foot, bicycle, wheelchair and public transport.

Open spaces for both people and wildlife

If we are to encourage walking we need attractive places to attract them. Green open spaces are great for wildlife and provide an outlet for residents to enjoy. If trees feature they are also ‘lungs’ helping counteract air pollution. Planners should always bear this in mind when permission is requested to remove trees.

The built environment has a major impact on how we travel, so planners and policymakers have an opportunity to make changes in that environment to promote healthier and more active communities. The presence of, and access to, green areas and the natural environment can help increase activity and reduce obesity. Daily physical activity is essential for maintaining health; inactivity directly contributes to 15% of deaths in the UK.
Whether for walking, running or the riding of either bicycles or horses, the benefits of all kinds of access to green space have mental and general health benefits plus many economic benefits especially to rural communities by transferring money from the urban areas to the countryside. To harness these benefits a concerted and co-ordinated effort is needed from policy makers, planners, public health practitioners, health professionals, the voluntary sector, community groups, local media and the public themselves. This collaborative effort needs to identify available green spaces, make them safe and accessible for everyone, make use of them for community and group activities and prescribe their use to promote health and wellbeing. They could help treat a number of conditions, particularly mild to moderate depression. Planning can assist by either encouraging provision within developments or rejecting applications which would threaten such areas.

Larger developments are required to leave green oases but these are often overly manicured. Sewn and fertilised ‘parks’ are good at absorbing rainwater but rough grassland is over four times more effective and trees improve things further. Such wilder ‘semi-natural’ areas are also much better for wildlife. We must plan for more absorbent habitats especially in the flood plains. Wetlands and woodlands are ideal at holding back floodwaters as are moors but these are in short supply in Leicestershire. They also provide a varied landscape for residents to access and enjoy.

(The National Planning Policy [NPPF] provides protection for Local Green Space although local Green Space does not have a single definition but provided it is of local significance to the community it should be protected.

All new development should produce a green infrastructure plan to show how the development can improve green spaces and corridors for people and nature, in the context of the surrounding landscape.

Even small scale developments could contribute significantly to creating and enhancing local wildlife habitat thereby encouraging people to get out into the wilder areas to see it. This may be by requiring or suggesting using native plants in landscaping schemes. Also for every tree that is removed they could be required to plant two or even three. Developers should be encouraged to create new habitat such as woodland, wetland, wildflower meadows or other wildlife habitats and adding a green roof to new buildings is also to be encouraged.

It can be a win-win situation. If we create wetland and woodland areas and green corridors linking them, we can help wildlife to migrate between populations keeping them healthier and introducing them to our gardens; can create ideal walking possibilities for the health and general wellbeing of the population and cut down the risk of flooding all at the same time.

We must protect and extend natural habitats that soak up and store rainwater. We can employ these natural processes in urban areas, including water-holding habitats in the urban scene and by installing more green roofs on our houses and garages, more permeable surfaces in our towns and cities and more sustainable drainage systems to capture excess water.
Planning for the environment.

Many parts of Leicestershire suffer air pollution levels close to or in excess of acceptability. When agreeing any new roads or industrial sites it is essential not to add to this problem.

Parts of the County are prone to flooding which can close off rights of way and hinder access to open spaces. All applications should be assessed for impact in this regard. Other parts of the country have suffered far worse, but homes in some areas are at risk and we must not add to the problem. There is increasing pressure to build in the flood plain of the Soar and its tributaries in particular the Rothley Brook corridor.

It is little use building flood protection barriers if it just transfers the problem downstream.

When looking at major developments flood relief basins are required but more use of planning could be made on a small scale. Wherever possible parking areas should be made of permeable material and that includes drives to domestic properties. Far too many homes are paving over front gardens for parking which stops rain being absorbed into the ground and speeds up run off. Urban areas lack the vegetated spaces needed to absorb water safely and release it slowly. Poor planning in the past has allowed too much hard landscaping. Another means of slowing this run off which planning can promote is the application of green roofs to larger constructions.

We need an integrated approach to flood alleviation and water quality issues and adverse side effects like wildlife decline. This is just as important locally as nationally and we must stop ignoring Environment Agency advice and building in the wrong places.

Where Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) are needed they should be designed in a way that benefits wildlife. Good SuDS schemes not only help with water management to prevent flooding but also benefit wildlife for little or no extra cost and provide attractive oases for walkers to visit.

APPENDIX 1

Footpaths, Bridleways, Cycleways and Access Land

1. Whenever new developments are considered it is important that improvements to the foot/bridle/cycle path network are considered. Such changes should aim to improve sustainable transport, green infrastructure, recreation, tourism, health and general well-being. Improvements will normally have beneficial impact on local economies and the aspiration should be for improvements rather than for maintenance of the status quo. Considering their public utility, footpaths have very low maintenance costs. The larger the scale of any developments, the greater should be the opportunity to enhance all aspects of the foot/bridle/cycle paths network.
2. The most important property of the network is the inter-connectedness of the network itself. Every opportunity should be taken to improve the inter-linking of the network so that it becomes more useful to the public.

3. Opportunities should be taken for giving rights of way a higher status whenever possible. For example, bridleways are legally useable by both cyclists and pedestrians whilst footpaths can only be used by walkers.

4. For the maximum public benefits, the main target groups are schoolchildren and short-distance commuters. In essence, these require direct routes from A to B. Such routes should also provide safe and pleasant access to and from public transport facilities, local shops, medical centres etc.

5. For recreation, families look for attractive circular routes. Based on the experience of the LLAF, recreational routes are preferred where they are away from traffic; beside water; with open space on one side and, whenever possible, having a good surface (pram-pushing, child-biking, walking and riding). They are most popular when free from stiles and gates.

6. New housing developments will contain a large number of dog walkers and these users need to be catered for. Circular routes of about one kilometre are most useful for these.

7. Where significant mixed foot, horse and cycling traffic is expected, the way needs to be of appropriate width to allow all traffic to pass easily and safely and, where practical, different classes of users should be provided with their own space. Wherever possible, motorised traffic is to be kept separate from other users.

8. The surfaces of the foot/bridle/cycle path network should be appropriate for its use and the amount of traffic expected. Cycleways for example need an all-weather surface otherwise they soon become too muddy for general use and some bridleways can become so cut up by horses that the surfaces become difficult for use by pedestrians. These problems can be avoided by appropriate drainage and surfacing.

9. In order to assist the less able and those pushing buggies etc., gates/gaps/stiles should be as easy to use as the requirements permit. On bridleways, gates should allow operation by riders without dismounting.

10. In some circumstances, particularly in built-up areas, lighting of the foot/bridle/cycle path may be required.

11. When a development fronts an existing road, separation zones e.g. grass verges or ‘behind the hedge’ routes should be considered to take walkers, cyclists and horse riders away from motorised traffic. Every opportunity should be taken to create new routes and to link up with any existing routes, although care needs to be exercised in planning where users can re-access the highway.
12. New foot/bridle/cycle paths can often usefully be combined with “green wedges” and “wildlife corridors” thus also fulfilling the need to protect and enhance both the ecology and landscape.

13. Longer distance routes for those taking exercise or pursuing treks as a hobby, bring visitors into rural areas boosting local economies and to this end all opportunities should be taken to improve connectivity to local services.

14. It is often thought that the rights of way network is already fixed, but this is not true. Leicestershire has hundreds of “lost ways” and informal “desire paths”. Any proposed development should aim to recover these historic assets or link existing paths together. Informal paths should not be ignored just because they have no legal protection. The LLAF working with the County Council has established a wish list of many of the possibilities and these can be made available to planning authorities or developers.

15. As required by statute, Leicestershire County Council has a Rights of Way Improvement Plan which should be consulted when developments are proposed.
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Natural England LAF Conference at Birmingham 21 June 2017

Report by Chris Padley, Chairman of the Mid-Lincs Local Access Forum (LAF)

I attended this conference on behalf of the Mid Lincs LAF. Lincolnshire County Council’s Environmental Services Team Leader (Countryside), Chris Miller, also attended on behalf of the Institute of Public Rights of Way Officers (IPROW), to assist in the presentation of the workshop on Network Rail and level crossings.

I attended the workshop on railway crossings and that on multi-user routes. The main presentations included an update on access issues from Natural England, a talk on Health and the Natural Environment, a talk from Defra on the deregulation act, and a talk on future role of RoWIPs and their preparation.

We all had some difficulty with the venue because of poor acoustics and a very stuffy atmosphere. Talking to other delegates I found a fairly high level of dissatisfaction, partly because of these problems with the venue, but also because the speakers from Natural England and Defra seem out of touch with life at the sharp end of a LAF. They spend too much time telling us basic, even obvious, things we already know, or suggesting we do things which are quite beyond our resources and sometimes even remit. This is reflected in the organization of all the recent conferences, which are essentially a series of talks by “them” to us, with a few questions thrown in at the end. Much more time needs to be spent by “them” listening to us, and for the delegates to be able to share problems and ideas in a constructive way. I think some of the Defra and NE officers would have something to learn.

I am pleased to be able to say that the most constructive part of the day which I attended was the IPRoW workshop on level crossings and Network Rail. This is an area in which sharing knowledge between different areas of the country, involving both LAFs and the authorities is both useful and important. I would like to congratulate Chris Miller on his role in organizing this.
Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills - Executive Director for Environment & Economy

Report to: Mid Lincolnshire Local Access Forum
Date: 18 July 2017
Subject: English Coastal Path Update

Summary: To provide an update on the development of the English Coastal Footpath.

Recommendation(s): That the report be noted.

1. Background

Sutton Bridge to Skegness – Natural England continue to work with affected occupiers to secure a route. The key issues here remain the provision of access from Frampton to Gibraltar Point and also the need to cross the Steeping River at Gibraltar Point. Currently, the likely solution is to utilise the existing Internal Drainage Board bridge. However, this causes problems for conservation and for the Environment Agency. The natural route to the bridge will cause wildfowl disturbance across an area under national and European protection and will also traverse across an area subject to occasional flooding. It is expected that the report for this section will be prepared for early 2018.

Skegness to Mablethorpe – This short section has already been through the report process which received 14 representations. It is, therefore, now being submitted to the Secretary of State for ratification. It is considered highly likely that it will be approved without further inquiry. The key issue on this stretch was the alignment of the route along the beach as opposed to the path constructed by the Environment Agency as part of the rock armour sea defence which is now under the ownership and land parcel of North Shore Golf Course. The rationale for this route selection was that the golf course demonstrated that there was a safety aspect to walking the rock armour pathway which was diminished by walking in the beach. Natural England, as part of the official scheme guidance has to balance both the needs of the user and those of business interests and in this case determined that a short stretch of route on the beach was acceptable in the circumstances.

Mablethorpe to Humber Bridge – Natural England have begun work on assessing this stretch and have undertaken a brief paper based walk through as well as some site visits. The issues they are seeking to review are predominantly where to align the route at Donna Nook given the extensive seal population at specific times of the year and how to join access through Grimsby and Immingham.
2. Consultation

a) Scrutiny Comments
   N/A

b) Executive Councillor Comments
   N/A

c) Local Member Comments
   N/A

d) Policy Proofing Actions Required
   N/A

3. Background papers

The following background papers as defined in the Local Government Act 1972 were relied upon in the writing of this report.

More detailed information about Natural England's progress with the English Coastal Footpath can be obtained from their website. Progress reports have been submitted to previous meetings of the Forum and are available for viewing from Democratic Services, County Offices, Newland, Lincoln (email steve.blagg@lincolnshire.gov.uk or Tel No. (01522) 553788)

This report was written by Chris Miller, Team Leader – Countryside Services, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or countryside_access@lincolnshire.gov.uk.
1. Background

In response to Sheila Brookes’s request for more information on this Act the following is a brief description on the affect it has on public rights of way.

The Act is often seen as legislation that sought (amongst other things) to curtail opportunities to access the countryside in mechanically propelled vehicles (MPVs) and it does so in two ways. Firstly the Act restricts the creation of new public rights of way (including what could be termed “normal carriageways”) for MPVs unless it is expressly provided for in a piece of legislation e.g. for the construction of major roads or if a road is built intended to carry such vehicles following powers in any enactment e.g. under the terms of s.38 of the Highways Act 1980 often concerning the building of estate roads in housing developments.

Secondly the Act extinguished all unrecorded MPV rights if such rights were not shown in a Definitive Map & Statement (as a Byway Open to All Traffic) or if the route on which unrecorded MPV rights may subsist is shown only as a footpath or bridleway. See handout mapping.

There are certain “saving clauses” which will if demonstrated to apply save the MPV rights and allow routes to be recorded as BOATs. The first set appear as s.67(2)(a) to (e):

(a) it is over a way whose main lawful use by the public during the period of 5 years ending with commencement was use for mechanically propelled vehicles,

(b) immediately before commencement it was not shown in a definitive map and statement but was shown in a list required to be kept under section 36(6) of the Highways Act 1980 (c. 66) (list of highways maintainable at public expense),
(c) it was created (by an enactment or instrument or otherwise) on terms that expressly provide for it to be a right of way for mechanically propelled vehicles,

(d) it was created by the construction, in exercise of powers conferred by virtue of any enactment, of a road intended to be used by such vehicles, or

(e) it was created by virtue of use by such vehicles during a period ending before 1st December 1930.

The second set appear as .67(3)(a) to (c):

(a) before the relevant date, an application was made under section 53(5) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (c. 69) for an order making modifications to the definitive map and statement so as to show the way as a byway open to all traffic,

(b) before commencement, the surveying authority has made a determination under paragraph 3 of Schedule 14 to the 1981 Act in respect of such an application, or

(c) before commencement, a person with an interest in land has made such an application and, immediately before commencement, use of the way for mechanically propelled vehicles—

(i) was reasonably necessary to enable that person to obtain access to the land, or

(ii) would have been reasonably necessary to enable that person to obtain access to a part of that land if he had had an interest in that part only.

This second set concerns application to amend the Definitive Map & Statement through the Definitive Map Modification Order process following subsequent case law (the R (Warden and Fellows of Winchester College) v Hampshire CC [2008] and Maroudas v Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Oxfordshire CC [2009] judgments) which indicate that any DMMO application must strictly comply with the requirements of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981.

Finally there are provisions for those who relied on MPV rights that have now been extinguished to get to their property in that those rights are converted to private rights of access.

2. Consultation

a) Scrutiny Comments
   N/A

b) Executive Councillor Comments
   N/A

c) Local Member Comments
   N/A
d) Policy Proofing Actions Required
N/A

3. Background papers

The following background papers as defined in the Local Government Act 1972 were relied upon in the writing of this report.

There are no background papers associated with this report.

This report was written by Chris Miller, Team Leader – Countryside Services, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or countryside_access@lincolnshire.gov.uk.
South Lincolnshire and Mid Lincolnshire Local Access Forums’ Meetings on 12 and 18 July 2017

COUNTRYSIDE FOR ALL – A Report by John Law, a representative on the South Lincolnshire Local Access Forum

1. COUNTRYSIDE FOR ALL ROUTES

1.1. Lincolnshire

We are now aiming to have details of the 5 new route leaflet details with the designer/printer by the end of July. It has been confirmed that the track from the Casthorpe Road to the Grantham Canal towpath belongs to Lincolnshire County Council. Unfortunately money is not readily available to upgrade the track and access gate. It has been decided to provide the route leaflet to reflect the current state of the route. When the road from the towpath has been placed on the definitive map we will work with Lincolnshire County Council the Canal and River Trust to obtain funding for improvements.

Progress on the Freiston Shore RSPB route leaflet has come to a stop, as we are hoping to include information about the new World War 2 Museum which is adjacent to the site. The Museum, besides being an excellent museum offers disabled toilet facilities, a fully accessible site and a cafe is planned when funds become available. We believe providing information about the Museum in the Freiston Shore leaflet, will encourage more people to use the route on the RSPB site. As soon as the organisation’s charitable status is resolved, we will finalise the leaflet. If we do not receive this information by the end of July we will finalise the leaflet without the Museum’s information.

Now funding has been won for Woodhall Spa Airfield route, we will be looking to carry out the survey for this route later in the year.

Funding has also been secured to produce folders for the Lincolnshire route leaflets. The capacity of the existing folder has now become inadequate due to the number of route leaflets we now have. We aim to have the new folders available for use during August.

*Action: Chris Miller – Please make the sub group aware of when the route from Casthorpe Road to the Grantham Canal towpath is placed on the definitive map.*

*Chris Miller – Please let the sub group know when the funding is received from the Nineveh Charitable Trust.*
1.2. Rutland

The success of the Rutland leaflets and folder is displayed in the Choice Unlimited section of this report in 5.3.

2. INCLUSIVE COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS COURSE

Nineveh Charitable Trust has provided funding for the Inclusive Countryside Access course. The course will take place at the Whisby education centre 23rd November 2017. We will be discussing with the trainer how we can spend more time on the practical side during the day.

3. WOODLAND TRUST

A meeting took place between John Law and Louise Tuffin, a regional manager responsible for 16 counties including South Lincolnshire and Rutland. The minutes of this meeting have been circulated prior to this meeting. The aim of the meeting was to persuade the Woodland Trust to create route leaflets in Countryside For All format for their most accessible countryside routes. We are still in conversation over this matter and have asked for a meeting with the CEO to explain the reasons the most accessible routes should be in Countryside For All format. Another region including north Lincolnshire has requested that 10 members of their staff are included in the Inclusive Countryside Access course which we have won funding for.

The Woodland Trust is aiming by 2025 to have 10 top level visitor sites, 250 “Welcome” sites and the remainder would be described as locally loved. The Welcome sites would include car parks, signed and have waymark routes. The welcome sites in South Lincolnshire will include Alma Park, Londonthorpe and The Pinewoods. Gorse Field in Rutland will become a Welcome site.

We have asked if the George Henry Wood can have an accessible route suitable for people with wheelchairs. The following is an extract from the response we have had “The biggest barrier for access is the parking situation; currently there is a layby people park in that is in fairly poor condition. It has been recognised that parking needs to be looked at for the wood, but the Trust won’t be in a position to do this for a few years yet. In addition, the deer fencing onsite necessitates the need for the current kissing gates to remain in place for a while yet. So in a few years it is likely that we review the whole site in terms of its visitor offer, which will include access considerations, but there isn’t scope to do anything in the near future I’m afraid.” The sub group will be asking if an outline plan of a route can be drafted, if any trees are on the route can be cleared whilst they are still young saplings. This will reduce the work and cost required for the future route.

An example of the Woodland Trust’s draft new access statement has been received. We will be going back to them pointing out where the statement is lacking in information for the disabled.
DEMENTIA FRIENDLY WALKS – RUTLAND

Monthly walks are taking place at the Lodge Trust. We are advertising for further volunteers to receive the funded training. This training has been booked for early July but is dependent on the number of volunteers that are interested in taking part. We previously booked the training for April but only had one person interested. We have advertised the training places in a number of places and with a number of organisations.

4. CHOICE UNLIMITED EVENT

4.1. Rutland

Voluntary Action Rutland has joined the working group. This should help ensure the event is an annual event for many years to come. The next meeting of the working group is 29th June. We are looking to finalise the venue, date and how we include the Local Offer into the event. The sub group also has a meeting 5th July where we will be discussing how we can improve our display to encourage more disabled people and children to take part in activities. As outcomes of these meetings were not available prior to this report being submitted a verbal update will be provided at the LAF meeting.

ACTION: John – Provide an update on the outcomes of the Working Group meeting and the Countryside For All sub group meeting.

5.2 Lincolnshire

We are currently building a small working group to help us take the project forward. Those who have currently agreed to be part of the working group besides the LAF are: Lincolnshire Community and Voluntary Service, Lincolnshire County Council Children's Services, Lincolnshire County Council Adult Care and Community Wellbeing Service through the Public Health Locality Lead, Lincolnshire Voiceability, Tonic Health and Lincolnshire Parent Carer Forum.

After visiting the Springfield event Centre and having discussions with the Centre managers we have decided, if we get the backing and funding, to hold the Choice Unlimited event at that venue in May 2018. LCIL, the organisation which delivers the event has been kept in the loop with progress. Once the members of the working group have been finalised a meeting will be held with LCIL. We have been asked to include a representative of TED (Taste, Eat and Drink project running until 2021) East Lindsey in the working group. If TED want to be involved it will be mainly as an observer. The focus of this working group will be on Spalding. Depending on the outcome of the Spalding event and ensuring it becoming an annual event, we may then look at other locations to hold a Choice Unlimited event in Lincolnshire.
5.3 Leicester Tigers Event

We had three tables at the event, one funded by Leicestershire County Council, one funded by Rutland County Council and one funded by a private donor. Thanks must go to Stan Warren (Leicester City and Leicestershire LAF) for helping to set up the displays and John Howells (Leicestershire LAF chair) who assisted John Law by speaking to the people visiting our display. The purpose at being at the event was to encourage disabled people, their carers and the elderly to visit and enjoy the countryside. Our aim was to engage with the visitors, talk about their interests, talk about countryside activities and signpost them to the relevant leaflets or organisations which could help them pursue their countryside interests. The activities we promoted included countryside for all routes, Walking for Health, Dementia Friendly Strolls, horse riding, carriage driving, cycling and sailing as well as some other activities. We also had a number of park leaflets. We were kept busy for most of the day, although there were times when we were waiting for visitors. At times we could have done with three of us working at the display. The location of our display within the hall was excellent. We used a TV, laptop computer and a static display. Part of our remit was to attract potential accessibility ambassadors and we used the computer display to promote this as well as a screen show by LCIL. Next year we will be able to use all our display tables and equipment to focus on all aspects of promoting countryside access for the disabled. There were a number of areas we felt we could improve on:

- A banner stating what we represent
- Only allow leaflets on our display which represent our message
- Seek funding of a table from Leicester City Council via the Leicester City LAF to promote Leicester parks
- Ensure district councils promote their Walking for Health and Dementia Friendly Strolls
- Use the large screen for the promotion headlines
- Use the computer screen to promote details of individual activities. This is currently being reviewed by the Lincolnshire and Rutland LAFs Countryside for All sub group.

The Leicestershire LAF members are being asked on 4 July whether their organisations would be willing to fund two banners. These banners would not be LAF specific and this would enable them to be used at any event for the disabled across the three counties.

**ACTION:** John Law – Provide a verbal update on the outcome of funding for banners.
Following the event at Leicester an email providing feedback was sent to Active Rutland, each of the Leicestershire districts and Leicestershire County Council Public Health. Everything on display from Lincolnshire and Rutland was well received. Below is the extract from the email:

Good morning

I hope you have enjoyed your break. On copy is John Howells, Chair of the Leicestershire Local Access Forum (LAF) and Stan Warren who represents the Leicester City and Leicestershire LAF. Both John and Stan worked on the display with me at the Choice Unlimited event. Also on copy is John Costor from LCIL and Sandra Pugh from Ellesmere College. LCIL deliver the Choice Unlimited event. I am providing you with feedback from the event, to enable the local access forums and yourselves deliver an even better event for the disabled, their carers and the elderly next year.

Dementia Friendly Walks/Strolls

We only received leaflets from Rutland which displayed the Rutland programme. There was a lot of interest from individuals and representatives of carers organisations. Whilst some of the people lived in the Rutland area, there was disappointment from many who had picked up a leaflet to find there was nothing for Leicestershire. We asked those outside Rutland to send us their email address to enable us to forward the relevant programmes to them. To date we have not received their contact details. This does stress the importance of having the relevant promotional material available on the day of the event.

Walking For Health

We received leaflets from Rutland and Leicester City displaying the Walking For Health programme. Once again these leaflets were taken quickly but there was disappointment that no districts had provided their walks programme.

Trips, Slips and Falls

This set of leaflets was provided by North West Leicestershire. This leaflet did not really belong on our display however the leaflets were soon picked up by individuals and care organisations. There were many good comments from all sectors about the information on the leaflet. Two people did say when they had rang the phone number on the leaflet, they never received a response. These leaflets and other questions from the public did show the need for the districts, City and County Council to have a display and answer questions from those who attend the event in the future.

Countryside For All route leaflets

The leaflets for Rutland and Lincolnshire were quickly taken up by individuals and organisations examples of the route leaflets can be seen at:

https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/countryside/visiting/visiting-the-countryside/countryside-for-all/120947.article

We were also asked for Countryside
For All leaflets for Nottinghamshire, Northamptonshire and Norfolk. This information will be fed back to the relevant LAFs. There was tremendous disappointment that there were no leaflets for Leicestershire. We spent a fair amount of time with 17 people explaining the Countryside For All leaflets and showing them the access information. All were asked, "If you had these type of leaflets for Leicestershire would it encourage you to get out in the countryside? All replied yes to this question. Some other comments from those we spoke to in relation to the lack of Countryside For All leaflets in Leicestershire are displayed below:

Many said they did not visit country parks or the countryside as they felt it may not be accessible

Many did not know of Watermead Country Park

Three said they visited Bradgate Park as it was the only accessible countryside they knew. Two stated they liked Bradgate Park but as it was the only place they could go, they did tend to get fed up of it.

Many asked why there were no route leaflets for Leicestershire

One said it was shameful Leicestershire had no route leaflets

Two said it was disgusting that Leicestershire had no route leaflets

Lincolnshire has 16 Countryside For All leaflets and will have a further 5 by the end of the year. There are also organisations in Lincolnshire budgeting to produce these leaflets in the future. Rutland currently has 3 leaflets with three organisations aiming to add further route leaflets for the County. The funding for the route leaflets initially came from council funds for both counties. Funds for the leaflets have since been provided by charitable bodies, private sponsorship, Anglian Water and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. It will be a great shame if we have no Leicestershire route leaflets of Countryside For All standard available for next year's Choice Unlimited event. Leicestershire has many very accessible countryside routes. The lack of promotion of these sites/routes in the Countryside For All format, makes accessible sites inaccessible. Please contact me for further information if you are interested in providing Countryside For All leaflets for your most accessible sites.

**Cycling**

A number of enquiries were received in relation to cycling for the disabled at Rutland Water. I believe Wheels For All were also received a lot of interest. One member of the public who was disabled told me that hiring a bike at Rutland Water had encouraged him to buy his own bike and he now cycles on a regular basis. Both Lincolnshire CC through Lincolnshire Sports and Rutland CC have purchased bikes for the disabled and these are hired out through cycle hire centres. It would be useful if Leicestershire CC and Leicester Shire and Rutland Sports could investigate whether this is a possibility at Hicks Lodge.
School children

There was a noticeable lack of disabled school children at the event. At the Rutland event, although it was in school holidays, they contributed to the event in a number of ways. I believe that this encouraged other disabled children to join the clubs which were promoting the activities. There is no reason why disabled children cannot take part and visit these events in school time. It is important that they are aware of the opportunities from an early age. I realise that Ellesmere College and Birkett House do a very good job in helping their students but seeing things in a different environment can generate interest. Both Ellesmere and Birkett House sites are close to the City Choice Unlimited venue. Creating a display for Ellesmere and Birkett House and helping out at these displays at Choice Unlimited would be a valued experience for the students. Encouraging other disabled school children to attend with their parents or as a party would also prove useful. I have to admit that I have not managed to attend the Local Offer Live event. I believe this has been a good showcase for disabled children. The Choice Unlimited event provides another opportunity for disabled children and they should be encouraged to take part and attend.

If you wish to discuss how you could benefit from a display at Choice Unlimited next year please contact John Costor (on copy).

The local access forums promote many aspects of countryside access. Whilst the feedback above has covered some of our observations, a full report will be provided under Countryside For All at the next LAF meeting, this will then be available as a public document. As mentioned in the opening paragraph we are looking at how we can improve the local access forums display at the next Choice Unlimited event to encourage disabled people to enjoy activities in the countryside.

One closing thought which touched me, was a girl in her late teens or early twenties who was in a wheelchair and looking for places to go in the Leicestershire countryside without being dependent on other people to go with her. She had recently been to some "wheelchair friendly" routes, to find they were definitely not suitable for her. My thoughts are, if we do not provide route leaflets in Countryside For All format for Leicestershire, even the disabled who are very determined in venturing out into the countryside will give up.

Should you have any queries in relation to the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

John

John Law
Member of the Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Rutland Local Access Forums, Countryside For All sub group
The email was sent to 3rd May, we have only had one response. This was from Blaby District Council. They have requested four weeks notice in future to enable them to provide us with leaflets and walk programmes. We will take this comment on board for the next event.

We have received some **VERY GOOD NEWS** since the email was sent. The next Leicester Choice Unlimited event will combine with the Local Offer Live event. The Local Offer has been ran as a separate event by Leicester City and Leicestershire County Council for families who have children with disabilities or special educational needs. We were concerned with the lack of children at the Leicester Choice Unlimited event. However it does mean we have to work harder to get sponsorship to pay for I – Spy books or similar to give out at these events. This combined event will ensure we see disabled children and their parents and special school representatives at the 2018 event.

5. **FUNDING BIDS**

5.1. **Nineveh Charitable Trust**

As mentioned previously we have been successful in obtaining a grant from the Nineveh Trust. This will allow us to fund an Inclusive Countryside Access course, a larger capacity folder for the Lincolnshire Countryside for All leaflets and a Countryside for All route leaflet for Woodhall Spa airfield.

5.2. **Replenishment of current leaflets**

Whilst we currently have ample stock of the Rutland leaflets, a number of Lincolnshire leaflets will be at their reorder level next year. As it takes time to gain funding from grants, we will start to look for suitable funders to approach this year. Initially we will ask site owners to see if they are prepared to fund the leaflets.

5.3. **I-Spy In the Countryside**

Neither Severn Trent Water or Leicester City Football Club are able to provide the £410 required for the 300 booklets to give out to children with disabilities at the Choice Unlimited events, to encourage them and their parents to explore the countryside. We are looking at other avenues to obtain this funding. If we are successful we may include in the order of the 300 a variety of I-Spy booklets representing the countryside. If anyone has any ideas of funding bodies which might prove useful please let the sub group know.

**ACTION: All – Provide information on any funding group which is likely to fund obtaining I-Spy booklets to hand out to disabled children.**

5.4. **Chapel Six Marshes**

Although the route surface improvements have been priced, we have worked with LCC to identify how we can improve the interest on the site. LCC may submit an
application to the East Coast Community Fund for financing this project. If the LCC is not able to apply for this funding we will be applying for funding from this source.

5.5. **Ashing Lane Nature Reserve**

We are still waiting for the key players of the Nettleham Woodland Trust to be available to enable us to arrange a meeting to discuss the car park improvements and extension of the all ability path. Further news re the state of the surface of Ashing Lane and the planned maintenance is awaited.

*Action: Chris Miller- Please provide an update for the next LAF meeting*

5.6. **Chambers Farm Wood**

We are working with the Forestry Commission to see how we can extend the all ability trail and improve the current route.

5.7. **Coastal Country Park**

A site meeting has been arranged with LCC on 12th July to discuss how we can improve access for the disabled in the coastal country park.

*ACTION: John/Richard – Provide verbal update*

6. **ACCESSIBILITY AMBASSADORS**

We will be trying to attract ambassadors for Leicestershire and Rutland at a Leicestershire Centre for Integrated Living event which is being held 23rd June.

*ACTION: John – Provide verbal update*

8. **SENSORY TRAILS AND GREEN SPACES**

Due to workload this project has not progressed any further.

9. **DISABILITY SUB GROUP CHANGE OF NAME and LOGO**

We are now using “Countryside For All” as our name. We are still trying to find time to create a logo. We are keen to see the new LAF logos, if we get agreement early enough we will be able to get them printed on our five new route leaflets.

*ACTION: All – Agree on the new LAF logo.*

10. **GRUFFALO SPOTTERS TRAIL**

We are still waiting for information from the Forestry Commission in relation to the Gruffalo spotters trail. We will continue to chase this up as we feel that it is a very useful way of encouraging children to get into the countryside.

*ACTION: John – Provide a verbal update*
11. VISIT ENGLAND PURPLE POUND

Discussions by email have been taking place with Visit England, the reason for this was initially for enquiring for funding for a National Countryside For All web site. Visit England suggested we looked at their web site displaying “Understanding the accessible tourism market”. This certainly gives another reason for us to keep a focus on countryside for all. Details from the Visit England web site are shown overleaf (figures from 2015):

Understanding the accessible tourism market

Good accessibility benefits all visitors. Disabled people have the greatest need for accessible facilities and services but only around 8% use a wheelchair, with many more having other mobility, hearing or visual impairments. People with health conditions and impairments – and their travelling companions – spend £12 billion a year on tourism in England.

- In 2015, nearly one in five tourism day trips in England were taken by people with impairment and their travelling companions, spending £8.5 billion.
• In 2015, 18% of all overnight trips by British residents in England were taken by those with an impairment and their travelling companions, worth £3.2 billion.
• Over half a million people with a health condition or impairment visit England from abroad each year, spending around £3 million.

In addition to this, our research reveals that visitors who make up the accessible tourism market are:

More likely to take longer trips

• Find seaside destinations particularly appealing
• Anecdotally very loyal

12. VISIT ENGLAND AND THE COUNTRYSIDE FOR ALL WEB SITE

We continue to have an exchange of emails with Visit England in relation to a Countryside For All routes nationwide to be hosted on their web site.

ACTION: John – Provide verbal update

13. CHANGING PLACES TOILETS

When examining the toilet facilities with Springfield Event Centre it was learnt that grants for the refurbished toilets had been received from both the District and County Council. This did include disabled toilets but not “changing places toilets”. Changing places toilets defined by Mencap are for “people with profound and multiple learning disabilities, as well as people with other physical disabilities such as spinal injuries, muscular dystrophy and multiple sclerosis often need extra equipment and space to allow them to use the toilets safely and comfortably” The Leicestershire Ashfield school Youtube clip highlights this need.

We only have changing places toilets in Lincolnshire in the following locations in Lincolnshire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Toilet Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>The Showroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>North Kesteven Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Yarborough Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horncastle</td>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Princess Royal Sports Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louth</td>
<td>Meridian Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td>Jubilee Church Life Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skegness</td>
<td>Briar Way Public Conveniences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Rutland we only have one Changing Places Toilet which is in Oakham. Rutland Water is a major attraction for outdoor activities. It is disappointing that it has no Changing Places Toilet.

Clearly we need more of these facilities, especially at the coastal resorts. This will help us to encourage disabled people to enjoy our countryside and coastal attractions. It will also help benefit the local economy. To ensure there is a growth in
these facilities organisations requesting grants should be made aware of this need and provided help in obtaining funding for this cause.

All the UK Changing Places Toilets are identified on the Changing Places web site which belongs to Mencap. Mencap have authorised us to have the changing places web address on the walk leaflets. They have also asked if we would like to be added to their list of supporters on their 'Changing Places' website http://www.changing-places.org/about_us/supporters_of_the_campaign.aspx. If we are to act as a supporter they will place both county council’s web address on the list. This is clearly a matter for both county councils to consider.

**ACTION: Chairman - Can a letter be written to the appropriate member/officer and ask when organisations apply for funding to improve facilities, they are made aware of the need for changing places toilets?**

**Chairman – Can a letter be written to the appropriate members/officers for the Lincolnshire County Council and Rutland County Council to be included in the list of supporters on the “Changing Places” web site?**

**Chairman – Can a letter be written to Anglian Water to see if they have any plans to construct a Changing Places Toilet at Rutland Water?**

14. **APPROACHING ORGANISATIONS FOR ANNUAL FUNDING**

As discussed at the last meeting, we will initially be aiming for funding partners for Rutland. We aim to discuss costs of the Rutland Choice Unlimited event with LCIL before approaching potential funding partners.
### North East Lincolnshire ROWIP Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROWIP 2</td>
<td>Currently being written</td>
<td>As there will not be any large consultation as the first ROWIP, how would you like to be input into ROWIP 2? Email, paper or open forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Update**
Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills - Executive Director for Environment & Economy

Report to: Mid Lincolnshire Local Access Forum
Date: 18 July 2017
Subject: Definitive Map Modification Orders - Ongoing

Summary:
A report on the progress of Definitive Map Modification Order Currently being undertaken

Recommendation(s):
That the report is noted & formal written advice provided as required.

1. Background

As Surveying Authority the County Council has a statutory duty to keep under continuous review the Definitive Rights of Way Map and Statement for Lincolnshire and to make orders to take account of events requiring the map to be modified. This is carried out by the processing of Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs) which are either applied for by the public or initiated by the Authority on the discovery of evidence.

Highways & Traffic Guidance Note HAT33/3/11 sets out that such cases will be dealt with in order of receipt/initiation unless one or more of the eight "exception criteria" apply.

The criteria are as follows:

1. Where there is sustained aggression, hostility and ill feeling within a community that is causing severe disruption to the life of that community, and that in processing the case early there is a strong likelihood that this will reduce.

2. Where there is a significant threat to the route, likely to cause a permanent obstruction (e.g. a building, but not, for example, a locked gate or residential fencing).
3. Where there is, or has been, a finding of maladministration by the Local Government Ombudsman on a particular case and that in processing the case the County Council will discharge its duty to the Ombudsman’s decision.

4. Where legal proceedings against the County Council are instigated or are likely to be instigated and it is possible that the Authority has a liability.

5. Where there is a risk to children on County Council owned property and land or where the claimed route would provide for a safer alternative route to a school, play area or other amenity for children.

6. Where there is a significant financial saving to the County Council (and therefore taxpayers) through the processing of an Order.

7. Where a new application is received that relies on evidence of a case already received or, if the new application forms part of or is adjoining to an existing claim, the new claim will be dealt with at the same time as the older application.

8. Where the route will significantly assist in achieving a Countryside and Rights of Way Improvement Plan Objective or Statement of Action.

The above numbered exception criteria do not cover every eventuality and it is recognised that in exceptional circumstances there may be other reasons why it would benefit the public for a case to be considered out of normal order. Officers will not prioritise any case under such circumstances and any appeal will only be considered by the Definitive Map & Statement of Public Rights of Way Sub-Committee.

Initially the priority of a case is set by Officers however there is a right of appeal for any affected persons whereby a decision is made by the Definitive Map & Statement of Public Rights of Way Sub-Committee.

Appendix A provides an outline of the position of cases currently deemed to be "active" within the prioritisation policy.

2. Consultation
   a) Scrutiny Comments
   b) Executive Councillor Comments
   c) Local Member Comments
d) Policy Proofing Actions Required

n/a

3. Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix A</th>
<th>Outline summaries of &quot;active&quot; modification order cases as at 29th June 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Appeals against prioritisation – Q4 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>Definitive Map Case Prioritisation (LINK) – Paper copies available on request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Background papers

The following background papers as defined in the Local Government Act 1972 were relied upon in the writing of this report.

Highways & Traffic Guidance Note 33 – Prioritisation of Definitive Map Modification Orders - [HAT 33/3/11](#)

This report was written by Catherine Beeby, Senior Definitive Map Officer, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or countryside_access@lincolnshire.gov.uk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>CASE No.</th>
<th>CASE TITLE</th>
<th>FORMAL APP?</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>UPDATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Ormsby</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Alleged PF between north end of PF 357 and highway in centre of North Ormsby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14/11/2014</td>
<td>DMMO seeking to record a PF made 25.01.2017 - No objections received – Order confirmed 29.03.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogsthorpe</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sea Lane to Maiden Lane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11/12/1986</td>
<td>Compiling Statement of Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Bytham</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Reclassification of RB 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>03/08/19</td>
<td>Order not confirmed by Planning Inspectorate (PINS) 02.05.2017, as requested by the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coningsby</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>School Lane to Dogdyke Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>06/11/1997</td>
<td>Submitted to PINS 27.04.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetford</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Addition of &quot;missing link&quot; North Road to PF 33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30/09/2013</td>
<td>Summary for decision under way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bennington/Westborough and Dry Doddington</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>Alleged PF Westborough Lane-bridge on Church St. along east bank of River Witham. Also access to route from Winters Lane &amp; Sparrow Lane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19/09/2014</td>
<td>PINS Schedule 14 decision received: Appeal dismissed 12.06.2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludborough</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Alleged PF along track running to and from PF 107</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>06/10/2014</td>
<td>Reviewing evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navenby</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Alleged PB Grantham Road-Doncaster Gardens</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16/04/2015</td>
<td>DMMO made seeking to record a PF along the Application route on 23.06.2017: objection period 06.07.2017-18.08.2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Willingham</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Hainton Road-High Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/04/1986</td>
<td>DMMO proposed for confirmation subject to modifications proposed by PINS in Decision dated 26.04.2017 – advertisement period 25.05.2017-22.06.2017, objections received – currently being considered by Inspector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Willingham</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Moors Lane to Poplar Farm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/04/1986</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhall Spa</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Mill Lane to river Witham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/05/1998</td>
<td>PINS Decision issued 11.04.2017 – Order confirmed subject to modification to add extract from 1905 OS Map to Order. Advertisment period 10.05.2017-21.06.2017, no objections received so will be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydour</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>PF to be diverted</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>01/01/1985</td>
<td>Reviewing evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunsby &amp; Dembleby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aunsby RB 6 plus section to Manor House Farm, Aunsby PB 9, Heydour RB 18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11/07/1985</td>
<td>Reviewing evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimoldby</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>From Mill Lane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23/10/1985</td>
<td>Writing Statement of Grounds, confirming part of Order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgh-le-Mash</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Faulkers Lane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/02/1987</td>
<td>Draft Statement of Grounds complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Cherry Holt Lane to Priory Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>03/04/1987</td>
<td>Reviewing evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A - Outline Summaries of "active" modification order cases

BOAT – Byway Open to All Traffic
RB – Restricted Byway
PB – Public Bridleway
PF – Public Footpath

- Total Number of cases (Formal application or Self-initiated) – 144 outstanding inclusive of 3 Orders awaiting determination by the Secretary of State at 29th June 2017)
Appendix B – Outstanding Modification Order Cases

No DMMO prioritisation appeals were submitted or heard over the period since the last forum meeting.
## Appendix B – Outstanding Modification Order Cases

### ACTIVE CASEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Further details</th>
<th>Application/Acceptance</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Priority Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rasen</td>
<td>72 PF</td>
<td>Caistor Rd to Gatehouse Lane</td>
<td>05/08/1987</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogsthorpe</td>
<td>49 PF</td>
<td>Sea Lane to Maiden Lane</td>
<td>11/12/1986</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td>2 RB</td>
<td>to BOAT</td>
<td>13/11/1991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coningsby</td>
<td>182 PF</td>
<td>School Lane to Dogdyke Road</td>
<td>06/11/1997</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetford</td>
<td>365 PF</td>
<td>Addition of missing link to PF 33</td>
<td>30/09/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludborough</td>
<td>378 PF</td>
<td>Claimed footpath along track running to and from PF107</td>
<td>06/11/2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navenby</td>
<td>384 PB</td>
<td>Claimed bridleway from Grantham Road to Doncaster Gardens</td>
<td>16/04/2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydour</td>
<td>48 PF</td>
<td>PF to be diverted - from Southern end of PF 3 to church Lees</td>
<td>01/01/1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunsby &amp; Dembleby</td>
<td>5 PROW</td>
<td>see file</td>
<td>11/07/1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mablethorpe and Sutton</td>
<td>106 PF</td>
<td>High St to Broadway</td>
<td>16/09/1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimoldby</td>
<td>43 PF</td>
<td>from Mill Lane</td>
<td>23/10/1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Willingham</td>
<td>97 PF</td>
<td>Hainton Rd to High St</td>
<td>30/04/1986</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgh-le-Marsh</td>
<td>18 PF</td>
<td>Faulkers Lane</td>
<td>10/02/1987</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>101 PF</td>
<td>Cherry Holt Lane to Priory Rd</td>
<td>03/04/1987</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhall Spa</td>
<td>193 PF</td>
<td>Mill Lane to R.Witham Bank</td>
<td>12/05/1998</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# North East Lincolnshire DMMO's (Definitive Map Modification Orders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref Number</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Effect of Application</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
<th>Progress Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMMO 7</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Vicarage Gardens/Compton Drive to Bargate</td>
<td>Claimed Footpath</td>
<td>18/03/08</td>
<td>Original claim submitted after landowner planned to lock Kissing Gate at centre of path to restrict access and improve security of Vicarage Gardens. Elderly Vicarage Gardens residents objected due to length of alternative route. Have written to certain providers of evidence forms to arrange meeting to take witness statements. No responses received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMMO 8</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Macaulay Lane to Newhaven Terrace</td>
<td>Claimed Footpath</td>
<td>17/04/08</td>
<td>Development of the Country Park has almost completed, which includes the provision of a footpath along claimed line. Legal dedication of the path will be arranged in due course to legalise path as Public Footpath which will resolve claim. Country Park expected to open in 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Background

The County Council has a power to divert, extinguish or create public rights of way either of its own volition or following an application to do so from the public. The Council may also enter into agreements with landowners regarding the dedication of public rights.

2. Summary of ongoing cases

The County Council is currently working on a number of cases most notably as follows:

- A package of 8 diversions to realign routes in the Coastal Country Park area including the potential dedication of a bridleway over a current footpath. The proposed Orders have been submitted for authorisation.

- A proposal to extinguish, create and divert in respect of Little Hale Public Footpaths 2 and 3, which is currently awaiting provision of a bridge.

- A diversion Order is being prepared in respect of Mablethorpe and Sutton Public Footpath 323.

- A diversion of part of Public Footpath No. 124 and extinguishment of a non-definitive footpath at North Wold Farm in Tealby: an Order was made 05.05.2017, with the consultation period running to 15.06.2017. No objections were received therefore the proposal is awaiting certification of the route.
A proposal to divert Old Bolingbroke Public Footpath 198, for which the consultation period also ended on 15.06.2017. No objections were received therefore the proposal is awaiting certification of the route.

A proposal to divert Irnham Public Footpath 7, for which consultations ended on 16.06.217. No objections were received therefore the proposal is awaiting certification of the route.

Extinguishment and creation orders in Market Deeping and Deeping St James parishes seeking to provide an improved route for a well-used public footpath in a developed area were made, with a consultation period running to 02.06.2017, however an objection has been received. The proposal will be passed to the Planning Inspectorate to determine.

An extinguishment proposal in respect of an obstructed public footpath in Ruskington which lies close to a convenient alternative route: the Order has been confirmed, with the confirmation advertisement period running to 13.07.2017.

These public path orders have been undertaken as they fall within one of three of the following strategic areas:

- Applications from members of the public where public benefit in the proposal can be demonstrated in line with the Council’s Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

- Cases that form part of wider green infrastructure schemes (Coastal Country Park, Witham Valley Country Park etc.)

- Cases forming part of wider Council strategies (Road / Rail Partnerships, Environmental strategies)

The County Council is developing a provisional Public Path Order Policy, which will eventually determine the order in which proposals are processed. This will need to be ratified before it can be implemented, and is subject to any changes necessary once regulations in respect of the Deregulation Act 2015 are issued.

3. Consultation

   a) Has Local Member Been Consulted?
      n/a
   
   b) Has Executive Councillor Been Consulted?
      n/a
   
   c) Scrutiny Comments
      n/a
   
   d) Policy Proofing Actions Required
n/a

4. Background Papers
No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by Catherine Beeby, Senior Definitive Map Officer, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or countryside_access@lincolnshire.gov.uk.
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## North East Lincolnshire Public Path Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Location &amp; Path No.</th>
<th>Type of Order</th>
<th>Self Initiated or Application</th>
<th>Progress Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPO 4</td>
<td>Waltham FP72</td>
<td>HA s119</td>
<td>Self initiated</td>
<td>Northern Powergrid have given a time scale of 1 year time scale. An application for relocation has been submitted to planning officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO 15</td>
<td>Stallingborough FP21</td>
<td>HA s118</td>
<td>Self initiated</td>
<td>Currently trying to establish contact with one of the landowners where the proposed diversion would run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO 16</td>
<td>Humberston FP52</td>
<td>HA s119</td>
<td>Self initiated</td>
<td>Diversion order to be made to relocate and reinstate this path which has been unavailable for some time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO 17</td>
<td>South Killingholme FP94</td>
<td>HA s119</td>
<td>Initiated by North Lincs Council</td>
<td>Signage to be installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO 19</td>
<td>Stallingborough FP 37</td>
<td>HA118A</td>
<td>Initiated by Network Rail</td>
<td>Application for extinguishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO 20</td>
<td>New Waltham</td>
<td>TCPA 1990</td>
<td>Initiated by developer</td>
<td>Order currently being written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO 21</td>
<td>Ashby cum Fenby</td>
<td>HA 118</td>
<td>Initiated by landowner</td>
<td>Currently being consulted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>