

NORTH YORKSHIRE
LOCAL ACCESS FORUM

THURSDAY 25TH FEBRUARY 2010

RECORD OF ACTIONS

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 Following the November meeting of the Forum members requested that a log be kept of actions arising from meetings of the Forum. This report sets out actions completed since the November meeting

2.0 ACTIONS COMPLETED

2.1 Letter sent to Andrew Bainbridge, LTP Team Leader, highlighting the importance of integrating LTP3 and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and ensuring that the needs of vulnerable non road users are specifically recognised. (Appendix 1)

2.2 Letter sent to Richard Brooks of the MOD requesting his attendance at the February meeting to speak on integration of access into plans for the Catterick Garrison development (Appendix 2)

2.3 Letters sent to s94 bodies advising of the need to consult with the Local Access Forum. (Appendix 3)

2.4 Consultation response sent to DEFRA on proposals to amend the CROW Act 2000 for Coastal Land (Appendix 4)

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 It is recommended that members receive this report for information

Contact Officer:
Aidan Rayner
Public Rights of Way Team Leader
01609 533077

North Yorkshire Local Access Forum
Countryside Service
Public Rights of Way Section
County Hall, Northallerton
North Yorkshire DL7 8AH
Tel: 01609 532418
Fax: 01609 760794
E-mail: kate.gray@northyorks.gov.uk

19 November 2009

Dear Mr Bainbridge

Consultation - Local Transport Plan 3

I write in response to the consultation exercise on LTP3, on behalf of the North Yorkshire Access Forum. As you will be aware our primary function is to advise the Highway Authority, among others, as to the improvement of public access to land.

In response to the consultation, the Forum would like to highlight the importance of integration between the LTP and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan, building particularly on the opportunities which exist to create and publicise the health benefits of the Non Motorised User transport network as a whole.

The Forum also wishes to highlight the importance within this process of ensuring that the needs of vulnerable non road users are specifically recognised.

We appreciate that a more detailed round of consultation will commence in the new year and wish to be involved in that process.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Ramsden
Chairman

Your ref:

Economic and Rural Services

Our ref: 72/LAF/SR/PN

Contact: Kate Gray

Ext: 2418

County Hall, Northallerton
North Yorkshire DL7 8AH
Tel: 01609 780780
Fax: 01609 779838
E-mail: Kate.Gray@northyorks.gov.uk
www.northyorks.gov.uk

19 November 2009

Dear Mr. Brooks,

NORTH YORKSHIRE LOCAL ACCESS FORUM – DEVELOPMENT AT CATTERICK GARRISON, NORTH YORKSHIRE

I enclose a copy of the circular that the NYCC LAF is sending to all sec.94(4) bodies to remind them of the obligation to consult with the LAF prior to any development.

As Catterick Garrison is undergoing major development, we should like to invite you to our next meeting in February to advise us how access is being integrated into your plans.

We are aware that equestrian access across the Garrison has been challenging in the past due to a lack of off-road routes that avoid heavy armoured vehicles, and we would be particularly interested to learn what schemes you have put in place for all those without a car to travel safely.

If the morning of 25 February 2010 is convenient for you, may I suggest the LAF secretary contact you nearer the time to arrange a precise time. We anticipate half an hour of presentation to include time for questions and discussion.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could possibly provide an outline of the future strategy for access and the existing provision, at least one month before our meeting, so that members are usefully informed in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Ramsden
Chairman of the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Mr Richard Brooks
Environmental Advisor
Building 97a, Land Warfare Centre
Imber Road
Warminster
Wiltshire BA12 0DJ

Your ref:

Our ref: LAF/Sec94

Contact: Kate Gray

Tel: 0845 8 727374

Local Access Forum

Countryside Services
County Hall, Northallerton
North Yorkshire DL7 8AD
Tel: 01609 532418
Fax: 01609 532202
E-mail: kate.gray@northyorks.gov.uk
www.northyorks.gov.uk

Dear

Duty to consult with North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

You will already be aware that there is a duty under Section 94(4), Countryside and Rights of Way, 2000 (CROW) to consult with the Local Access Forum (LAF) regarding matters affecting public rights of way and access to the countryside.

Although set up and funded by North Yorkshire County Council the North Yorkshire Access Forum NYLAF is independent and North Yorkshire is one of the bodies statutorily required to consult the Forum. The area of the Forum is the County of North Yorkshire outside the National Parks who have their own LAFs.

The 15 members of NYLAF represent a wide range of people one third of who represent users of the rights of way and access land, one third other users or persons having interests in the countryside and one third landowners. In addition three county councillors are members of the forum.

Following the publication of North Yorkshire's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) and its incorporation into the County's Local Transport Plan 3, the Forum wishes to draw your attention to the attached sheet, which gives some principles on the method of the LAF operation.

We believe it will be helpful if all key personnel and departments in your organisation are reminded of this duty to consult.

From experience we have found that many planning matters, government initiatives relating to local delivery, developments in tourism and recreation and parish development can involve issues related to rights of way and access to the countryside.

These are all areas where consultation with a LAF would be either necessary or, where a statutory duty isn't essential, at least useful.

Continued...

8AD or email kate.gray@northyorks.gov.uk , or telephone 08458 72 73 74. The matter will then be passed to the Forum chairman. Letters should specifically mention the Local Access Forum or they may be dealt with as Rights of Way Section correspondence.

Please note that the Forum only meets 4 times a year normally in February, May, August and November. Consultations received between meetings will either be dealt at the next meeting or if of extreme urgency a special meeting will be held. If you would like to address the Forum and present your consultation in person we would be pleased to consider it.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Ramsden
Chairman North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

If you require any further information regarding this letter or wish to initiate a consultation please contact Mrs Kate Gray of Countryside Services, at County Hall, Northallerton, DL7

1. Chapter 2

1. Do you agree with the description of coastal land types (a) and (b) at paragraph 2.2 that should be included in the coastal margin ? If you do not agree, please give your reasons.

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment: But see comments to Questions 2, 3 and 4 below.

2. Are there any other coastal land types you think should be included?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment: It should be made clearer that all land types seaward of the route, including land types such as woodland that are not currently defined as open country and which are not excepted land under schedule 1 will be coastal margin.

3. Do you agree that the coastal margin should also include the categories of land set out in paragraph 2.3(c)? If you do not agree, please give your reasons.

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment: At no time should the removal of an area of land's present access land status, as open country or common land, result in the loss of any access rights currently enjoyed, be they by right or permission. If this was to be the case the land in question should remain as access land under the current criteria or the rights and permissions which would be diminished should be safeguarded in other ways such as dedication.

4. Do you agree that, where circumstances allow and subject to the provisions at paragraph 2.6, the route should be 4 metres wide? If not, what width do you think would be appropriate and why?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment: Yes, but where shared use of the route is proposed or an existing bridleway is put forward for use as part of the English coastal route the 4 metres width should be, wherever possible, a minimum width not a maximum to allow safe concurrent use of the route by all users.

Chapter 3

5. Do you agree it is important that users should have certainty that the route will be open?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment: Yes it is vitally important that the route is continuous and provides a high quality walking environment. If the public, not just experienced walkers, are to use the new English coastal route and enjoy the wider benefits of its associated spreading room then a high level of certainty of usability and standard of quality will be needed.

Interruptions and gaps in the English coastal route will disrupt walks and severely curtail public enjoyment. Some deviations along the coastal route around such area as ports, Ministry of Defence sites etc. will be necessary but these deviations must happen in a planned way with all other sections of the route being as close to the sea as possible and as free from restrictions and exclusions as possible.

6. Do you agree that powers under section 22 of the CROW Act for landowners to restrict or exclude access, at their discretion, for up to 28 days per year are not appropriate for the coastal land and should be removed ?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment: We agree with the proposal not to allow discretionary restrictions (available to landowners under the CROW Act) on the coast, as to do so would mean frequent blocks and detours to the English coastal route some of which would be in place at short notice or for short periods making alternative routes difficult to put in place. To allow such restrictions would risk the integrity and continuity of the route.

However, restrictions for land management will still be required and Natural England should look at this need when drafting their reports. This will mean that any seasonal alterations or dog restrictions can be in place from day one.

7. Do you agree that the powers under section 23 of the CROW Act for landowners to restrict access for people with dogs, at their discretion, for lambing purposes and on grouse moors are not appropriate for coastal land and should be removed?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment: Although some members felt that the very low level of discretionary lambing restrictions currently in place on access land and lack of coastal grouse moors reduces the need for these discretionary restrictions in a coastal setting. Where such restrictions are needed they could be put in place via the local consultations during the implementation programme, so enabling alternative routes and other land management systems to be used to reduce the impact on the English coastal route and spreading room, and after the opening of each section of route via normal restriction system for land management.

8. Do you agree that the relevant authority (Natural England) should be able to give directions for an exclusion or restriction of access under section 24 of the CROW Act without an application by a landowner?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Any restrictions for land management need to be put in place via consultations and discussions with landowners and managers as well as representative bodies of users . Any proposed restrictions, which under the current restriction system would be classified as “long term”, should also undergo a public consultation as currently undertaken.		
9. Do you agree that the line of the coastal route should be exempted from the provisions in section 25 of the CROW Act which enable the relevant authority (Natural England) to restrict or exclude access for the prevention of fire risk?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: There was a split in views on this issue, on balance the answer being No		
10. Do you agree that the relevant authority (Natural England) should be able to give directions for the exclusion or restriction of access on the coastal margin to protect land adjoining the margin?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: No uniform agreement on this point, some members felt If the adjoining land has no right of access it should not be a consideration in any restrictions or directions as to do so would not be following the least restrictive option or in line with current guidance. Restrictions to any right of access should be judged only on how that right affects land to which the public has rights. Any such is almost certainly to be fenced from the coastal margin.		
11. Do you agree that Natural England should be able to restrict or exclude access to saltmarsh and mudflat where they are not appropriate for access?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: We do support the use of restrictions, via a new type of direction, to limit access where needed to saltmarsh and mudflat but only as the alternative put forward was to include these land types in the list of excepted land. Many saltmarshes and mudflats are suitable for the route of English Coastal Path and open access spreading room, indeed many flats and salt marshes already allow access without problems or conflicts. Sea walls and defences are able to accommodate access easily and safely without large inland detours in many places and Natural England should aim to include as much safe access as possible to saltmarsh and mudflats in its proposals.		

12. Do you agree that Natural England should be the relevant authority for all coastal land?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment:

13. Do you agree that it should be possible for Natural England to delegate the relevant authority role to National Park authorities if appropriate after the implementation phase?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment:

Chapter 4

14. Do you agree with the proposals to retain the categories of excepted land listed in paragraph 4.3 as they relate to the coastal margin? If not, please state your reasons.

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Comment:
Again the group was split on this point, those members who felt the categories should not be retained made the following points:

Parks and Gardens

We disagree with the proposal to retain Parks and Gardens as a category of excepted land. We regret that the opportunity to declassify park land on the coast as excepted land was not taken during the Bill’s passage through parliament and we do not believe that the existing mechanisms for voluntary agreements will lead to increased open access and so will result in unnecessary detours for the English Coastal Route.

While agreeing that the new coastal route and spreading room should not unduly compromise personal privacy or property and that private gardens should be exempt from the coastal access right we do not believe that this exemption should apply to park land on the coast. Parks and gardens are different and should not be considered together within one classification. A route could pass through a large park, particularly one where no building or dwelling was present on site, without compromising privacy. Excluding parkland could lead to large inland detours.

15. Do you agree that, in the context of the coastal margin, land within 20 metres of a dwelling should not be accepted from the right of access?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: We agree with the proposal to remove land within 20 metres of a dwelling from the existing categories of excepted land. In a majority of cases this removal will not affect the current situation on the ground as a majority of land within 20 meters of a dwelling will be included in the curtilage of that dwelling. Moreover, it will mean that the large numbers of existing public rights of way and even existing coastal paths that are currently within 20 meters of a dwelling can be used as part of the English coastal route.		
16. Do you agree that, in the context of the coastal margin, land within 20 metres of a building used for housing livestock (not being a temporary or movable structure) should not be excepted from the right of access?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: There were differing views on this point – those members who felt this land should be exempted thought that it made sense, considering the nature of the coast, the need for a continuous route and that in some locations the coastal margin may not be large. The number of occasions when these buildings are within 20 metres of the coastal margin will be rare.		
17. Do you agree that, in the context of the coastal margin, land habitually used for the training of racehorses should not be excepted from the right of access?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Removing land habitually used for the training of racehorses from the list of excluded land on the coast makes sense, considering the nature of the coast, the need for a continuous route and that in some locations the coastal margin may not be large. This must be a fairly rare occurrence within the coastal margin. In any case, such land should be fenced from the coastal path for safety reasons.		
18. Do you agree that the route should be able to pass along the edge of a cultivated field where this forms the most suitable route?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Ideally where this is the case we would like to see targeted agri-environment schemes used to enhance the route and provided for a more enjoyable walking environment and to act as an incentive to landowners and farmers to allow a wider area of open access alongside the route. Doing so would also enable the government to fully meet its vision of a route <i>“within a wildlife and landscape corridor that offers enjoyment, understanding of the natural environment and a</i>		

<i>high quality experience”</i>		
19. Do you agree that where there is no suitable route to the seaward of a golf course the route should be able to pass through the golf course?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comment: There is no policy statement on the potential danger caused by golfers to users of nearby rights of way, and, in particular, on how close rights of way should be to fairways. There does however appear to be general agreement that new courses should be designed so that rights of way do not cross fairways.</p> <p>The following are recommendations which may improve the safety of rights of way across golf courses:</p> <p>Tees: The nearest edge of the teeing area to be not less than 15 m from any right of way.</p> <p>Fairways: At a distance of 200 m from the front edge of the teeing area the edge of the fairway shall be not less than 50 m from any right of way. No part of any fairway more than 200 m from the front edge of the teeing area shall be less than 50 m from any right of way.</p> <p>Greens: Greens should normally be sited so that no right of way is closer than 50 m from the edge of the green. For rights of way situated beyond the green, this may be reduced to 30 m provided the whole of the right of way is clearly visible from the area from which the shots are likely to be played.</p> <p>Greater safety margins may be needed for bridleways because horses can be unpredictable and dangerous if startled.</p>		
20. Do you agree that licensed or annually certified camp and caravan sites on the coast should be a new category of excepted land except to allow for a route through?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Yes it is vitally important that a route through is allowed.		
21. Do you agree that residential park home sites should be excepted land except to allow for a route through?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Most park homes are excluded by way of the exclusion of buildings and their curtilage under schedule 1. But it is vitally important that a route through is allowed.		
22. Do you agree that temporary camp or caravan sites should not be excepted land?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: The existing restriction system used for open access land should be used following the criteria as outlined in criteria set 20 of the Relevant Authority Guidance where appropriate.		
23. Do you agree that highways should be added as a new category of excepted land?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: On balance the view was that Highways should be excepted although there was a strong view that all the RoWs in the coastal path should be incorporated into the coastal path. This will give the same rights over the entire coastal path and allow rights of way to be adjusted automatically should the coastal path have to be moved rather than go through the separate and possibly long winded process of diversion. The sections of the coastal path based on existing RoW would carry the same rights of use as they had previously unless they can be upgraded. The only drawback to this is if the coastal path legislation were repealed or radically altered. This seems unlikely and a reservation could be included to the effect that if it happened all pre existing rights of reverted to their previous status.		
24. Do you think that it is important that graveyards and cemeteries should be a new category of excepted land for land which is coastal margin? Do you have particular examples of such land uses on the coast which you think it would be useful for us to consider as part of this consultation exercise?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Usually most graveyards and cemeteries which are still in use would be classified as curtilage of a building and where they are not they may well have de facto access. An example of this can be found at Whitby Abbey (English Heritage site) on the Cleveland Way where a large area of open coastal head-land associated with the ruined abbey is an old graveyard but has allowed open access for some time. Including such a category would in effect reduce the coastal margin in such a setting and result in a reduction in the level of access.		
25. Do you think that it is important to include school playing fields as a category of excepted land for land which is coastal margin? Do you have particular examples of such land use on the coast which you think it would be useful for us to consider as part of this consultation exercise?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Although we do not know of any situations where this will apply, some members felt that excluding school playing fields could lead to large inland detours.		

26. Are there any other categories of land found in built up areas that are not covered by existing categories of excepted land and which you think should be excepted from the right of access? Do you have particular examples of such land uses on the coast which you think it would be useful for us to consider as part of this consultation exercise?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment:		
27. Do you agree with the proposal not to add a new category of excepted land to Schedule 1 to cover specifically any land used as a marina, yacht club or boatyard?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: We agree with the proposal not to add a new category of excepted land to Schedule 1 to cover specifically any land used as a marina, yacht club or boatyards as in a majority of cases these areas will be excepted land by being included in the curtilage of a building.		
28. Do you agree that slipways, hards and quays should be included in the right of access?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: To include them can only add to the overall enjoyment of the coastal landscape.		
29. Are there any other structures typically found along the coast that you think should be included in the right of access? Do you have particular examples of such structures on the coast which you think it would be useful for us to consider as part of this consultation exercise?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Some members felt that it is good that in Natural England's outline scheme it is proposed that the English coastal trail will "often be aligned along the coastal defence structure itself, if it is safe, suitable and convenient for public access" as we believe that sea walls and coastal defences will be invaluable in improving access in large areas of coast.		
30. Do you have any comments on the definitions? Should any of the definitions be amended as they apply specifically to coastal land and, if so, how?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p>Comment: 2 Land covered by buildings or the curtilage of such land. The line “including moveable ones like tents and caravans.” needs removing as these structures will be excepted as part of the new category of excepted land for licensed or annually certified camp and caravan sites (except to allow for a route through) and their inclusion here may lead to confusion as to why and under which category of excepted land they are being excepted.</p> <p>3 Land within 20 metres of a dwelling. All of point 3 needs removing as this category of excepted land will not apply on the coast.</p>		
<p>7. Land used for the purposes of a golf course, racecourse or aerodrome. All reference to golf courses needs to be removed from point 7 as these areas are to be dealt with in a different way on the coast as set out in chapter 4. To leave in the guidelines of excepted land would lead to possible misunderstanding as to the existence of a right of access on the English coastal route.</p> <p>10 Land within 20 metres of a building which is used for housing livestock. 12 Land habitually used for the training of racehorses. All of points 10 and 12 need removing as these categories of excepted land will not apply on the coast.</p>		
<p>Chapter 5</p>		
<p>31. Do you agree that the restriction requiring dogs to be kept on a lead between 1 March and 31 July should be disapplied for land that is coastal margin?</p>		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comment:</p>		
<p>32. Do you agree that there should instead be a general requirement to keep dogs under effective control on the coastal margin as discussed in paragraph 5.3?</p>		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comment: Yes except in areas which have been traditionally used for dog walking and have no animal or wildlife implications</p>		
<p>33. Are there any other requirements that you think should be reflected in a description of effective control in addition to those at paragraph 5.3?</p>		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Comment: Where a total dog restriction is involved, particularly to protect a safe bathing beach, an alternative route off the coastal path should be indicated appropriately beforehand to allow walkers with dogs to exit the coastal path and find an appropriate alternative route.</p> <p>One member felt that it would be simpler to require dogs to be on leads on all times on all access</p>		

land. This would remove any ambiguity about the situation		
34. Do you consider that paragraphs 1(f) and 1(j) of Schedule 2 to the CROW Act should be amended to remove the restrictions for the purpose of fishing in the sea and tidal waters on land that is coastal margin?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: Some members felt that they should be amended so long as it doesn't affect traditional or previously permitted practices.		
35. Are you aware of any situations on the open coast or on the tidal part of estuaries where taking this approach would affect other existing arrangements for providing access to the water in order to exercise the public right to fish?		
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment: See 34		
36. Do you agree that there should be a new restriction to prevent obstructions to the coastal route?		
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Not sure	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comment:		
There are two types of restrictions:		
1 by personally obstructing a route by telling someone they cannot come through etc.		
2 by physically obstructing the route by erecting a barrier or parking a vehicle/agricultural machine on the route.		
In either case the obstruction is likely to be caused by a person having rights to be on the land so restricting him from the land would not be possible.		
A new offence similar to the section 14 offence (displaying on access land notices deterring public use) should be included making deliberate obstruction of the coastal route an offence as a deterrent to wilful obstruction.		
Legally, what is a restriction to prevent obstructions? It is only effective if punishable.		
Any other comments: Wherever feasible, the coastal path should be upgraded/widened to allow higher rights to horseriders and cyclists.		
Thank you for your response		