

## **Plymouth Local Access Forum**

**Monday 24 January 2011**

### **PRESENT:**

Mr Fairchild, in the Chair.

Mr Stewart, Vice Chair.

Mr Attrill, Councillor T Browne, Mr Emery, Councillor K Foster, Ms Hitchens, Mrs Mickley, Mr Pawley, Miss Roberts, Mr Skinner and Councillor G Wheeler

Apologies for absence: Mr Goddard and Mrs Rodgers

The meeting started at 10.30am and finished at 1.00pm.

*Note: At a future meeting, the committee will consider the accuracy of these draft minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes of that meeting to confirm whether these minutes have been amended.*

### 46. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made by Members in accordance with the Code of Conduct –

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Mr Pawley	South West Coast Path (minute 52 refers)	Is the new Plymouth local representative for the South West Coast Path.	Personal

### 47. **MINUTES**

With regard to the minutes of 22 November 2010 members commented that –

- (a) regarding minute 35 (f), Ordnance Survey should be spelt Ordnance Survey;
- (b) regarding minute 35, the word Society should be removed after Plymouth Ramblers.

Agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2010 are confirmed as a correct record subject to the above amendments in (a) and (b).

### 48. **CHAIR'S URGENT BUSINESS**

#### **Keith Loze resignation**

Ray Fairchild, Chair of the LAF informed members that Keith Loze had recently tendered his resignation as a member of the Plymouth LAF.

Agreed that a letter be sent to Mr Loze to thank him for the dedicated service he gave to the LAF.

### **Ham Drive to Carnock Road Public Inquiry**

Ray Fairchild, Chair of the LAF informed members that on 12 January 2011 he attended a public inquiry looking at the Definitive Map Modification Order for Ham Drive to Carnock Road. Members were informed that this public enquiry demonstrated the expensive, laborious and time consuming process that existed when entering a path onto the Definitive Map.

#### 49. **TRACKING RESOLUTIONS**

Members noted the tracking resolution document and commented that the document was a very useful addition to the agenda.

#### 50. **ACCESS WHITLEIGH**

Rosie Dale, Major Schemes Officer and Robin Pearce, Public Rights of Way Officer (Sustainable Transport Team) provided information on a potential project and informed members that –

- (a) Plymouth Transport and Highways were currently working on a project, which aimed to provide an integrated safer and sustainable package of works in geographically defined areas. The first target site had been identified as Whitleigh and thus this project was entitled Access Whitleigh;
- (b) the Access Whitleigh project aimed to work with the local community and local partnership agencies in order to make a positive and effective impact in the Whitleigh community;
- (c) it was hoped that, should the scheme progress, the LAF could align their work programme to include the Access Whitleigh project to help deliver the project by –
  - identifying partners and stakeholders that Plymouth Transport and Highways could work with;
  - assisting in providing routes to include public rights of way (PROW) that could be used by the local community, including active walk groups;
  - providing information on the state and maintenance of the existing PROW in the Whitleigh area;
- (d) it was felt that the recent survey of local public rights of way undertaken by Forum members could be an important tool for the Whitleigh Access project and other potential projects in

the Plymouth area;

- (e) it was hoped that some of the routes contained within the Ramblers' 88 map could be recorded on to the Definitive Map as part of this project.

Members of the Forum put forward questions to which the following responses were provided –

- (f) Budshead ward councillors had been approached about the Access Whitleigh project;
- (g) the Access Whitleigh project was at an early stage in the process and the virtual team was looking at implementing a similar project in six other areas of the city;
- (h) the majority of the project costs would be met by the Capital Programme scheme supported by existing revenue funding. Additionally, local agencies may also be able to apply for funding which could help reduce the costs to the council.

Members commented that –

- (i) the Ramblers' had a regular route around Whitleigh, which they walk during the Summer months;
- (j) two organisations that could be involved in the Access Whitleigh project were the PROW Working Group and neighbourhood groups;
- (k) the LAF would be keen to be involved in the delivery of the Access Whitleigh project.

Ray Fairchild, Chair of the LAF thanked Rosie Dale, Major Schemes Officer and Robin Pearce, Public Rights of Way Officer for their attendance.

Agreed that the LAF Secretary would send a link showing the neighbourhood profiles to all Forum members.

#### 51. **SOUTH WEST LAF CONFERENCE**

The Forum noted the South West LAF Conference report.

#### 52. **SOUTH WEST COAST PATH**

The Forum considered a response provided by Anthony Payne, Director for Development and Regeneration on the South West Coast Path and commented that –

- (a) the response did not satisfactorily answer why the South

West Coast Path had remained closed or why the geotechnical survey had still not been completed;

- (b) while the path did present a danger to users, having to walk on the road was potentially more dangerous than the risk of falling rocks or further landslides.

Agreed that –

- (1) the Public Rights of Way Officer email the results of the geotechnical survey, when they become available, to all members;
- (2) the South West Coast Path would be added as an agenda item for the next Forum meeting.

*(Mr Pawley declared a personal interest in the above item)*

53. **GRASSROOTS ENGAGEMENT: THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT WHITE PAPER**

Members noted the consultation request and commented that having consultation requests this close to the consultation closing date did not allow for the Forum to provide a sufficient response.

Agreed that –

- (1) any future consultation requests are emailed to members along with the consultation closing date prior to Forum meetings;
- (2) if any members wanted to respond to the Grassroots Engagement consultation they needed to do so as an individual before Monday 31 January 2011.

54. **RESULTS OF THE LOCAL ACCESS FORUM DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Forum considered the results of the Plymouth Local Access Forum development questionnaire and were informed that –

- (a) 50 per cent of members completed the questionnaire;
- (b) the results of the questionnaire would form the basis of the LAF development report which was to be presented at the next Forum meeting.

It was commented by Members that –

- (c) a 50 per cent return rate did not reflect the opinions of the

whole Forum and the results were distorted as a result;

- (d) due to other commitments around the time of the consultation, some Members were unable to complete the questionnaire.

Agreed that the consultation questionnaire is emailed to those members who had not submitted their response in December 2010.

## 55. **WORKING GROUPS**

### a) **FUTURE OF THE WORKING GROUPS**

Ray Fairchild, Chair of the LAF, introduced a discussion into the future of the working groups. Members made the following comments –

- (a) the working groups rarely provided a report and had lost their purpose, there needed to be a reform into the operation of working groups;
- (b) the working groups were an important aspect of the LAF and in order to operate effectively they needed to be improved;
- (c) the planning working group required training and should concentrate on responding to planning applications. The planning working group should invite a Planning Officer to one of their meetings to advise them about how PROW was dealt with in planning applications;
- (d) the PROW working group was key and it should be utilised more frequently, as a full response to issues could not always be discussed and agreed upon in LAF meetings. It was felt that the mapping exercise was an important piece of work carried out by the group.
- (e) the working groups may work better if they were conducted on an ad-hoc basis and concentrated on reviewing strategic issues rather than local issues;
- (f) when organising working groups the LAF should follow the guidance provided by DEFRA and make the working groups separate entities from the Forum;
- (g) the Access Whitleigh project would be a good project for the PROW working group to review.

Members were informed that –

- (h) working groups in their current format had been successful in the past, with a LAF working group previously being

recognised nationally for the work it undertook;

- (i) at the next meeting a report would be presented on LAF Development which would contain a section on working groups.

Agreed that –

- (1) the LAF Secretary would distribute the electronic Planning Application list to all Forum Members on a weekly basis;
- (2) the LAF Secretary would look into organising a site visit to Saltram Countryside Park and Plymstock Quarry.

b) **POTENTIAL RIGHTS OF WAY WORKING GROUP**

There was no report from the Potential Rights of Way working group.

c) **PLANNING WORKING GROUP**

There was no report from the Planning working group.

56. **WORK PROGRAMME**

Members noted the work programme for 2010/11 and commented that whilst the changes implemented by the LAF Secretary were helpful and would assist Forum Members, it was important that the LAF remain an independent body.

57. **CORRESPONDENCE**

The Forum considered the correspondence received and sent by the Forum and were informed that –

- (a) on the list of outstanding Definitive Map Modification Orders, Hooe Road referred to the path that ran from Radford Dip to Westcombe Avenue;
- (b) the Modification Order process took a long time to complete with the two recent completed orders being in the process for more than five years.

58. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Agreed that the next meeting of the forum is held at 10:30am on 28 March 2011 at the Council House.

59. **ISSUES ARISING FROM FORUM MEMBERS**

A member of the Forum raised an issue about appointing members to the Forum. It was stated that members were appointed as individuals and not based on organisations they represent.