

North Yorkshire Local Access Forum**25 July 2018****District Council and LAF project Updates****Report of the Secretary****1.0 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 An opportunity for LAF members to update the Forum on District Council liaison and other LAF representative project activity since the last meeting.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The LAF operates an agreed list of nominated representatives willing to act as the first point of liaison with the constituent District Councils in relation to planning and other relevant matters.
- 2.2 Individual LAF members are also nominated from time to time to take a lead on specific projects that the LAF has an interest in or in representing the LAF on other partnership bodies
- 2.3 This agenda item provides an opportunity for the Forum to be updated on activity since the previous meeting.

3.0 District Council Liaison

- 3.1 Appendix 1 summarises activity reported to the Secretary.
- 3.2 Nominated representatives are invited to report verbally at the meeting on any other activity undertaken.

4.0 LAF projects

- 4.1 Appendix 2 summarises activity reported to the Secretary.
- 4.2 Nominated representatives are invited to report verbally at the meeting on any other activity undertaken.

5.0 Local Liaison Groups

- 5.1 Appendix 3 summarises key issues and items of interest to LAF arising from Local Liaison Group Meetings provided by George Bateman. The supporting documents have been circulated separately to LAF members.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 That members note the updates.

BARRY KHAN
Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)
County Hall
NORTHALLERTON

Report author: Kate Arscott, Secretary to North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Background Documents: None

District Council Liaison

District & Lead	Activity	Summary
Craven Mike Bartholomew	Woodland Creation Grant scheme near Lothersdale	<p>The LAF was consulted on a grant application for a woodland creation scheme submitted to the Forestry Commission/ Natural England under the Countryside Stewardship Scheme in an area known as Surgill Rough near Lothersdale in Craven. The area is CROW access land and the Forestry Commission asked that the LAF be consulted.</p> <p>The following comment was submitted: If public access is unaffected by the tree-planting scheme, then the LAF has no objection. It would mean only that, as the trees grow, the public would have access to a patch of woodland, rather than a patch of heather moorland. This raises issues of principle only if the planting scheme is of a sort that brings into play the LAF's statutory obligation to consider the preservation and enhancement of the environment. If a tree-planting scheme is a purely commercial venture, designed to raise just a single species of softwood, the LAF might have objections, but if the scheme is for mixed broad-leaved woodland - which is what is understood about the Craven scheme – the LAF would support it.</p>
Hambleton Rachel Connolly	Northallerton School & Sixth Form College	<p>The following response was agreed at the LAF meeting on 11 April: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this planning application, with regard to the access matters connected with it. The Local Access Forum is concerned that although the number of pupils attending the school will be over 1600, it seems a mere 16 places have been allocated for cycle parking. This will not encourage pupils to cycle to school in line with NYCC's Local Transport Plan 4, and the Forum would suggest a number nearer 10% to demonstrate a commitment for sustainable transport, particularly in view of the likely increase in demand when the North Northallerton 'village' is built. Various space-saving versions of secure and covered cycle parking arrangements are available and the Forum recommends that these are explored together with a provision that reflects future target demand.</p> <p>The developer responded via the Planning Department as follows: The planning application has not included any proposals with regards to cycle parking due to the school having plans to install more cycle parking in December this year. This is detailed within the School's Travel Plan under the 'Planned Actions' section. It may be that the school offer NYCC a contribution to have new cycle parking installed as part of the main alteration works, in this case I can send you details to pass onto North Yorkshire Local Access Forum for comment.</p>
Harrogate Richard Smith	Harrogate Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule	Richard co-ordinated a response on behalf of the LAF to Harrogate Borough Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule.

District & Lead	Activity	Summary
Richmondshire David Barraclough		
Ryedale Roma Haigh	Malton to Pickering Cycleway design consultation	Roma co-ordinated a response on behalf of the LAF to the Malton to Pickering Cycleway design consultation.
Scarborough Doug Cartwright		
Selby Barrie Mounty		

LAF Projects

Project	Lead	Summary
A66	Paul Sherwood	See attached report from the meeting on 3 July. A map will be available at the meeting.
A1 and Local Access Roads	Rachel Connolly	<p>As suggested at the last meeting on 11 April, a meeting was arranged between LAF members and Council officers including Barrie Mason, to enable a discussion on outstanding areas of concern to LAF members about the A1 and Local Access Roads, following the exchange of correspondence in February and March this year.</p> <p>The meeting is due to take place on Friday 20 July. A verbal update will be provided at the LAF meeting.</p>
A59 Kex Gill	Rachel Connolly	<p>Rachel Connolly, Mike Bartholomew and Richard Smith co-ordinated a response on behalf of the LAF to the recent consultation on the preferred proposed alignment for the A59 at Kex Gill.</p> <p>A progress report, seeking the adoption of the proposed preferred alignment is due to be considered by the County Council's Executive on 24 July. A link to the report is given below.</p> <p>http://democracy.northyorks.gov.uk/committees.aspx?commid=18&meetid=3777&agendaid=5470</p>
Yorkshire Wolds Way Partnership	Roma Haigh	
Teesdale Way	Paul Sherwood	See attached report from the meeting on 17 July.

Highways England
Trans-Pennine A66 Route
Non-Motorised User Group Meeting - 'Stage 1'
Mercure Hotel (formerly 'Kings Head') Darlington 3rd July 2018

Pre-amble

I have issued previous reports on this long term project (anticipated completion 2028) these being:-
18th October 2017 Dolphin Centre, Darlington - full 'Stage 1' meeting.

16th February 2018 Mercure Hotel, Darlington - first NMU (sub-group) meeting.

These reports detailed the 'past history', anticipated time-scale, poor safety record, unreliable journey times, design criteria for the entire fifty-mile project etc.

I produced a spread sheet that was issued to you, dated October 2017 identifying relevant crossing points which may be contentious on the two short sections (totalling about six-kilometre) of the A66 in North Yorkshire. There are many more in County Durham & Cumbria with the same issues.

The purpose of the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Non-Motorised User Group (NMU) is to help Highways England identify and review the relevant non-motorised user issues with respect to the A66 project. This early engagement will seek to help identify options that may result in a better quality, more sensitive development.

Organisations Invited to Attend

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| • Appleby Travellers | [Mal Blenkinsop] |
| • British Horse Society | [Caroline Bradley] |
| • Cycling UK | [Terry Ratcliffe] |
| • Cycling Forum - Richmondshire | [Barbara Gravenor] |
| • Highways England | [Matt Townsend + 5?] |
| • Cumbria & Lakes Local Access Forum | [no representative] |
| • Durham Local Access Forum | [no representative] |
| • North Yorkshire Local Access Forum | [Paul Sherwood] |
| • North Yorkshire County Council | [Andrew Brown] |
| • Ramblers Association | [George Bateman] |
| • Sustrans | [Claire Kerrin] |

Report (this is not chronological or in 'minutes' format)

This was a fairly informal meeting lasting about two hours, with general discussion as to what Highways England had achieved since the last meeting and what the delegates of the various organisations hoped for, based on suggestions already given. At this early stage Highways England wanted discussions to be very broad based (although some delegates were trying to raise local issues on specific crossing points) as it will be several years before an actual defined route proposal is in place. They are currently still looking at the options for either an "on-line" improvement (basically widen the existing) or an "off-line" improvement (new road) or indeed a mixture, but their design team stated that generally nothing will be more than a kilometre from the existing route. No matter what options and routes are selected there are very many footpaths/bridleways etc that ideally need to be able to cross, and not terminate on the A66 corridor. See the spread sheet referred to above for details of routes in North Yorkshire.

The North Yorkshire Footpath Officer raised the point of local interconnectivity, not so much for NMU use but more generally; communities at the eastern end of the route have an obvious commercial need to access Richmond easily and likewise in the west similar situations around Brough or Appleby.

Obviously financial constraints are a critical consideration as are the recommendations from "Transport for the North" & "Northern Powerhouse" in their aims to improve road communications and economic development in the North of England.

The design teams need input from users (non-motorised in our case) as to the current usage figures and anticipated future usage, for both leisure and local residents access; and leisure/tourism route popularity of interconnections, crossing points etc, giving supporting evidence and articulating the

benefits for any additional costs incurred. *[an example was given stating that Highways England had been in discussion in another of the 'user group' meetings with the Road Haulage Association and twenty-six haulage companies trying to ascertain the anticipated road usage in ten years time.]*

It is difficult for most leisure organisations (BHS, CTC, RA etc) to be able to prepare this data accurately. There appears to be plenty of out of date information on how much use routes have had in the past, mainly on the sections of A66 already upgraded and on the A1(M) upgrade. But history has changed the future use, if a path has gone, or is difficult to use people will eventually adapt, we need to look at anticipated future use. Personal opinion is that once this project gets into the public consultation arena, more accurate usage data, based on 'sightings' may come from local residents and land owners than from anyone else. What's the practicality of using 'smart' counters? Or of using surveys of users?

Bearing in mind the time scale involved it was not helpful when BHS & Cycling representatives were referring to usage figures already fifteen years old that had been assessed for the A66 partial upgrade in the Gilling area, these are going to be twenty years out of date at the design stages. Current evidence based statistical results are needed to support requests for bridges, underpasses, re-alignment etc. With clear evidence based data outlining the 'benefits' obtained by doing the work.

Highways England raised the point of the financial implications of the "we want an underpass" or similar suggestions, as there are literally dozens of contentious crossing points for walkers, horses, cyclists over the fifty-mile route of the A66. If two crossings are fairly close it is unrealistic to cater for both NMU routes, some adaption to the rights of way need to be addressed to combine both routes where possible & practicable.

There was little further discussion on this other than the high costs of such civil engineering works; and in the case of bridges the visual impact, in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. An underpass under a road on an embankment may not be an exorbitant cost, but going under a level road, needing access ramping at each side, flood prevention, draining including powered pumping, which may entail bringing electrical supplies, etc becomes very costly and without evidence based 'advantages/benefits' information it seems unlikely that such civil engineering would be done.

There was discussion from the representative of the Travellers/Appleby Fair, regarding slow moving horse drawn items going to and from Appleby Fair using the A66, and the resultant fatal accidents. At the last meeting it was explained by Highways England that this could not be regarded as a special case obtaining additional funding. However, at this meeting it appeared a little more relaxed after we were advised of numbers, speeds etc of horse drawn 'bow top' caravans and carts. Generally, a horse can do 20 miles per day at 4 mph, with regular rest points, and they try not to travel in large groups. A suggestion (by travellers) was for speed restrictions over the period of the fair, and possibly matrix information/speed limit signage. This wasn't ruled out.

A further user group meeting is scheduled for later in the year.

Paul A. Sherwood...

River Tees Rediscovered Landscape Partnership
Groundwork NE & Cumbria
Preston Park Museum, Eaglescliffe 17th July 2018

Pre-amble

North Yorkshire Local Access Forum became involved in this project more than two years ago; the purpose at that time was looking at ways to promote the 150km 'Teesdale Way' Long Distance Path which commences at Dufton in Cumbria, then from Cross Fell down the entire 137km length of the river to the North Sea. The river Tees was formerly the old North Riding & County Durham border. Now, Yorkshire only has a southern bank of the river from NZ:181164 near Gainford to NZ:401111 near Low Worsall. That amounts to only 5% of the actual walk route, and this is made up of two short sections of 'alternate' route, it appears most walkers stay on County Durham side.

After almost eighteen months of nothing happening, and with the advent of the Tees Valley Combined Authority, Groundwork NE & Cumbria became involved in handling the project. You have had reports of earlier meeting.

I reported on that first meeting with 'Groundwork' on 23rd May and emphasised that there was very little, if any, involvement for Local Access Forums, especially North Yorkshire, as the venture had become a quasi-commercial marketing exercise known as 'River Tees Rediscovered' mainly concerned with the lower reaches of the river, roughly downstream of Darlington.

However, it appears Groundwork are not interested in anything upstream of Piercebridge, and now there is no mention of the long distance walk. The following is extracted from the Groundwork website:-

"River Tees Rediscovered project recognises and celebrates the river's natural and social heritage while also protecting, preserving and enhancing its unique landscape and driving schemes to allow wider access and enjoyment.

River Tees Rediscovered will give everyone a chance to explore and celebrate the River Tees, from Piercebridge to Teesmouth.

Through a series of community projects and activities we want to tell the amazing story of the river and its landscapes, and make it easier for everyone to enjoy the river and uncover its rich heritage.

Our vision is to reconnect the people of the Tees with their river through telling the engaging story of the River Tees as a natural feature that has molded the physical and cultural development of the landscape and communities through which it runs".

Likewise, several other Tees Valley based websites no longer make reference to the 'Teesdale Way', example from Stockton Borough Council:-

"The River Tees Rediscovered programme will promote the lower Tees Valley through a variety of coordinated projects from Darlington to the estuary.

The Heritage Lottery Fund supported Landscape Partnership Scheme was unveiled at a special 'River Tees Rediscovered - Welcome Aboard!' reception held at Middlesbrough College.

The event was attended by representatives from local business and industry, and senior leaders from the public sector".

This venture no longer appears to be involved with the 'Teesdale Way' Long Distance Footpath and has extremely limited access involvement for North Yorkshire.

I have been trying to obtain the official stance of North Yorkshire County Council on the project through both our Chairman and Committee Clerk, to no avail; but I did speak to Andrew Brown (NY PROW) at a recent A66 meeting and he verbally advises that they have no staff or time resources to become involved, (confirming what Lucy Chapman of Groundwork told me at the last meeting when I queried lack of NY involvement) he also said any access issues on the 'Teesdale Way' in North Yorkshire would be handled in the normal way, without any specialist involvement.

Report on seminar

About fifty people attended the two and a half hour event consisting of various organisations:- River Tees Rediscovered, Groundwork NE & Cumbria, the five borough councils, the Tees Valley Combined Authority, Environment Agency, Deputy Harbour Master, Tees Archaeology, River Tees Trust, Tees Valley Wildlife Trust, Northumbrian Water Authority, etc etc. I saw no other Local Access Forum people there - but they may have been.

Several Speakers with 'Powerpoint' presentations: -

- Doug Nicholson, chairman of River Tees Rediscovered
- Linda Tuttiett, Head of Culture & Tourism, Tees Valley Combined Authority
- Rachel Dodd, Rivershack
- Vicky Cairns, Northumbrian Water Authority
- Zoe Fraiser, Fisheries Officer
- Robin Daniels, Archaeology Officer
- James Hunter & Lucy Chapman Groundwork NE & Cumbria

Topics briefly discussed: -

- South Tees Development Corporation
- General Tourism
- Invasive plants/animals
- Archaeological sites
- Job Creation
- Infrastructure review (travel/ parking/public transport)
- Portrack Tern Island
- Seaton Carew/Hartlepool RSPB reserve
- Volunteers (from Groundwork, large employers etc)
- Environmental Power Generation - 'renewables'

North Yorkshire was mentioned briefly by the archaeologist as three minor digs are south of the river; Dalton-on-Tees, Low Worsall & Aireyholme (all on private land so no 'access' issues) and the "Teesdale Way" was very briefly mentioned by one speaker.

Recommendation

The original "Teesdale Way" concept, may have needed minimal involvement from North Yorkshire Local Access Forum. It is now very clear that the project now envisaged by the combined authority & Groundwork has no immediate co-dependency on the Long Distance route. They also have no interest in the route upstream of Darlington; making the "Teesdale Way" very peripheral to 'River Tees Rediscovered'. Therefore, I recommend to the forum that we take no further action.

Paul A. Sherwood.

North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

25 July 2018

PROW LOCAL LIASION GROUP UPDATE REPORT

Report from George Bateman

1.0 Purpose of the Report

1.1 To provide the Forum with “items of interest” from recent Local Liaison Group Meetings

2.0 Background

2.1 Members asked that I report to each LAF meeting any key issues and items of interest to LAF arising from Local Liaison Group Meetings. The County Council arranges these meetings twice a year with user representatives. There are two separate regional meetings – I attend the meeting for the north and east of the county.

3.0 Local Liaison Group Meeting April 2018

3.1 I was unable to attend the meeting but based on the agenda the following items may be useful to LAF.

PROW Officers for the Northern and Eastern Areas Reports

- Some increase in staffing with appointment of a graduate PROW field officer
- Addressing of the waymarking backlog
- Operation of new process for ploughing and cropping.
- The swapping of responsibilities for UURs to PROW (with the plan to recruit one more person to oversee the work) with maintenance of urban surfaced PROWs moving to Highways.
- A1 south of Leeming
- Restoring volunteer working parties overseen by a PROW Officer.

- Progress on Wolds Way, Coastal Access Project and Howardian Hills AONB.
- Pathways to Health project including development of “Scarborough Trails”.
- CAMS improvements planned to include on line reporting of faults and mobile facility for PROW Field Officers. See below re Fault reporting Workshop)

PROW Team Performance Graphs and Table of Volunteer Activity

- The maintenance backlog increased in 2017/18 by 340 to 9,569
 - currently 49% of the network had “issues” and 11% are obstructed
- (how does the number of volunteer activity / hours compare with previous years?)

Definitive Map DMMO Team Updates

- Progress on digitisation of definitive map

(Note the details of new diversions and DMMO modifications are regionally based and cover only half the county)

Fault Reporting Workshop

Since the meeting Ian Kelly has helpfully held a workshop to both explain the existing customer reporting system and seek customer views on how their needs are “best met” in a new IT based system which a specialist “Business Improvement” Team is developing.

4.0 Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to note the report.