

SUB-GROUP MEETING OF THE NORTH YORKSHIRE LAF
Thursday 28th January 2010

Present: Rachel Connolly(chairman), Edward Dennison, David Gibson, Tom Halstead (note taker), Tony Martin, Stephen Ramsden, Hugh Spencer, John Taylor and Penny Noake (NYCC Definitive Map Officer)

Apologies: none received

Business

1. **Local Development Framework (LDF)** Since the last meeting each District Council had been contacted by a member of the Forum to inquire about their LDFs. There was a wide variation in the stages they had reached, and it was agreed that a blueprint 'menu' of the values the LAF expected to be included should be prepared. John Taylor would compile a preliminary list to circulate so that members could comment on it. Once the list had been approved by the full LAF, each member would then re-contact their District Council and send them the 'menu' together with the LAF principles, and scrutinise any documents that 'their' council produced to see if they satisfied the LAF expectations. Discussion would be encouraged.

2. **Consultations:**

David Gibson told the group of a recent consultation by Defra proposing certain changes to the **Disability Discrimination Act (DDA)** although the consultation had not reached the Forum. Apparently Defra had not sent it to the Yorkshire and Humberside Area as there was no regional co-ordinator to distribute it. DG said there was a need for a regional co-ordinator for the LAF's with responsibility for arranging two meetings a year and for collating various replies from LAFs. He wondered if NYCC could take over this function (It was discovered after the meeting that Aidan Rayner had already considered this but it was not possible within the County setup). DG stated that Defra have said that they will circulate consultations to LAF secretaries in future. DG offered to draft any responses to the DDA consultation for the Chairman to submit on behalf of the LAF.

A 160 page consultation on **Natural England Coastal Access scheme** was not available for comment but would be circulated shortly. The main provisions seemed to be changes to the amount of land that could be 'widened' from the access strip and the restriction of equestrian access to beaches. As the deadline for comments was 5 February 2010 any member wishing to comment was invited to do so on their own account.

Rachel Connolly reported that all households in Richmondshire had received a questionnaire about **district transport strategy**. It was disappointing that the LAF had not been included in consultations. Most of the options such as speed zones and the placing of bus stops were not within the remit of the LAF, but off-road links between settlements were. She was authorised to reply on behalf of the sub-group reminding NYCC about the need to consult and the principle of inclusiveness for non-motorised travellers benefitting from new safety schemes..

- 3 Criteria for scoring the suggestions from the ROWIP**
- a. After the last sub-group, Penny Noake had provided lists of the 1000 plus suggestions, and a scoring scheme used by another authority.
 - b. It was unanimously agreed that the scheme was over-complicated, possibly misleading and that a different approach should be adopted.
 - c. PN tabled an alternative scheme involving 12 criteria, each to be scored 0 - 3.
 - d. After discussion it was agreed to reduce the number of criteria to 9 and to increase the range of scores up to 5, although one member expressed concern that by increase the range of scores from 3 to 5 the scheme might become less discriminating.
 - e. PN would provide a revised version for circulation with the minutes for the next LAF meeting.
- 4. DMMOs** In response to another enquiry, PN said that when dealing with DMMOs, the
Department adopts an impartial stance.
- 5. Ratione Tenurae**
- a. PN reported that the Land Charges had supplied a digital map showing all 900 Ratione Tenurae (RTs) in the County.
 - b. A student from Bishop Burton College was keen to help classify and record these, as part of a project, and was intending to categorize them as follows:
 - i. RTs that form a connection between highways, ProWs, or a highway and a PRow,
 - ii. RTs that connect to a highway or PRow,
 - iii. RTs that do not connect to either a highway or a PRow.
 - c. It was possible that the results of the project would be available at the next meeting on the 25th February, as part of the assessment of what size of challenge it would be to put these routes on the Definitive Map so that they are not lost in the 2026 cut-off. It was hoped to make a case for including these in a blanket aim to improve fragmentation of the network through LTP3.
 - d. PN made the point that it was not a duty of the County Council to record these routes on the DM, but it did make sense as the County Council was required to protect the public rights which exist on them.
- 6. Staff Addition.** In response to an enquiry, PN said she thought that an appointment for a new Improvement Officer was likely.
- 7. Parish Project** Tony Martin said that so far the project had been a disappointment and had gone nowhere as it remained for NYCC to decide in what way they could or would support local initiative to maintain and improve the path network. He was still hopeful that progress would be made.