

North Yorkshire Local Access Forum**11 April 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 The next meetings of the Local Liaison Groups take place on 17 April (South West) and 26 April (North East).

6.0 Other Issues

- 6.1 The Tees Valley LAF has provided, through Paul Sherwood, the article attached at Appendix 3 about their Traffic Lights for Dogs scheme.

7.0 Recommendation

- 7.1 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	Responded to Publication Draft Craven Local Plan	<p>Thank you for attending the meeting of North Yorkshire LAF yesterday. I hope that you found our comments useful. As you saw, broadly speaking, we gave the Plan the thumbs-up. We appreciate that at this stage, further comments may not be incorporated, but I hope that you will be able to give consideration to the following points. They are points only of emphasis, and do not affect the substance of the Plan, which the LAF welcomes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan objectives might usefully include a reference to access as one of the objectives. 2. Local green spaces. The LAF was impressed by the Plan's commitment to the creation and protection of green spaces with public access. Obviously, existing public parks will be protected, but the idea of creating entirely new green spaces is ambitious. We hope that the plan succeeds and that the public will enjoy the sort of rights of access to these green spaces that they already enjoy in public parks or commons. 3. The 'enhancement' of the public rights of way network. We recognise that it is very difficult for Authorities to create entirely new rights of way, but we encourage the Authority to do so, especially in new housing developments that may have poor connections, or no connections at all, to the existing public rights of way network. The needs of cyclists and equestrians who are presently frustrated by gaps in the bridleway network should be a challenge that is met with early solutions. 4. Access for disabled people. We welcome the Plan's commitment to improvements in the network of paths that can be negotiated by wheelchair users and the less mobile. Making improvements that result in attractive circuits, beginning and ending in car parks that have disabled parking spaces and disabled lavatories would be a real achievement. 5. Byways. We welcome your liaison with NYCC's expert rights of way department.
Hambleton Rachel Connolly	Commented on a Hambleton planning application	<p>Application 18/00331/FUL Austin Reed</p> <p>The Local Access Forum is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the plan for 110 houses on the old Austin Reed site. Having scrutinised the plan we are concerned about a number of aspects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developers have not included a link into the local rights of way network, the obvious one being Green Lane, which links the Sowerby area of Thirsk with the station, avoiding Thirsk centre. This would enhance the plan by providing a safe (off-road) route which would encourage sustainable transport in line with NYCC's LTP4. Green lane is an old unclassified road, and should therefore be regarded as a multi-user route (bridleway) to provide the maximum range of users and best value – in line with the Forum's Principles. This link could be created between houses 77 and 78 on the plan. Any surface on the improved track should reflect safety for all the users, which excludes the use of SMA or a similar smooth tarmac, a gritted surface being perfectly acceptable. • There is no marked area for visitor cars and in a development of this size one would expect two such areas to provide for the inevitable overspill, and some secure parking for cycles too. • Again, in an estate of this size, the Forum expects a high standard of design and as such wonders why no provision has been made for a play area and some open space, as none is marked.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • And with regard to space it is noted that houses 75-79 have been allotted only one car parking space in addition to their small garage, and houses 67/40/41 have car parking arrangements that are so inconvenient as to encourage parking on the estate roads which is a disincentive to people cycling from their homes. • The LAF wonders if there is scope for using CIL or Section 106 contribution to improve the current half-decent cycleway into town. <p>In conclusion, the Forum feels the developers have sacrificed amenity for density and recommend the plans be revisited to reflect our concerns.</p>
	Drafting comment on NYCC planning application in the Hambleton area	<p>Northallerton School & Sixth Form College have made an application to North Yorkshire County Council for an extension to existing car parking area (480 sq. metres), creation of new car parking area (500 sq. metres), new pedestrian access route along the western boundary, erection of 2.4 m high metal weldmesh fence and entrance gate, creation of footpath, 2 No. pedestrian crossings, tree and hedge removal and hard and soft landscaping works.</p> <p>Following on from email correspondence among LAF members, Rachel is preparing a draft response for discussion and agreement at the LAF meeting.</p>
District & Lead	Activity	Summary
Harrogate Richard Smith	Responded to Publication Draft Harrogate Local Plan	<p>In addition to the introductory comments below, 49 detailed comments were submitted on specific sites, and are available on request from the Secretary.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The North Yorkshire Local Access Forum (NY LAF) welcomes the opportunity to respond to Harrogate District Local Plan - Publication Draft Consultation 26 January - 9 March 2018 (HDLP). The LAF understands that all representations received during this stage of consultation will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, who will appoint an independent inspector to conduct an examination in public.</p> <p>The LAF understands that at this stage, representations should only be made on the legal and procedural compliance of the HDLP, the soundness of the HDLP and whether the HDLP is in conformity with the Duty to Cooperate. In this response, the LAF will address only issues of soundness in respect of the HDLP.</p> <p>In 2017, during the initial rounds of consultation, the NY LAF made a submission to the Harrogate District Council about the plan at that stage. In that submission the NY LAF acknowledged (and were encouraged by) the inclusion at that stage, key underlying principles and aims which stated repeatedly the importance of rights of way and access issues within the communities. At the end of our response we stated clearly Members of the NY LAF are expecting to see practical and tangible evidence that the above commendable statements of principle are both reflected and evident in the detailed plans, due to be published after this period of consultation.</p> <p>Following that consultation, officers from Harrogate District Council attended a LAF meeting and outlined the overall nature of the consultation. They also indicated that the aims of improving local access would be ensured through each site with the proposed development having site requirements which would include :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements developed from the policies in the plan. • Generic site requirements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Maximise sustainable travel including provision for walking and cycling (inc. storage). o Enhance/create high-quality networks of green infrastructure. • Site-specific requirements including, where relevant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Pedestrian and cycle linkages to surrounding areas including PROW network.

		<p>o Identification of PROWs potentially affected.</p> <p>In making this response now to the HDLP, the NY LAF will address the soundness of the proposed plan by ensuring that these requirements are met and therefore the soundness of the HDLP is maintained. When considering the proposals The NY LAF seeks to maximise every opportunity for improved access, providing safer non-motorised journeys for the widest range of users practicable. The principles governing the NY LAF are attached.</p> <p>General Points regarding the NY LAF Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the NYLAF is fully aware of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) with its emphasis on public transport, walking, cycling and other access issues. In making its response to the HDLP, the NYLAF has been concerned to see that the principles within the NPPF have been applied within the HDLP. • Secondly, the NY LAF welcomes the inclusion of site requirements throughout the HDLP and acknowledges that these requirements attempt to improve access throughout the area. • Thirdly, each site will be considered and any omissions and lack of emphasis will be indicated which undermine the soundness of the HDLP. • Fourthly, if there are no rights of way nearby or across the proposed site and the site requirements uphold the general access requirements then no comment will be made. • Fifthly, the NY LAF acknowledges that responses are required for individual sites. The NYLAF has submitted responses for each site where appropriate and has therefore included this general statement in TI1 Sustainable Transport <p>Some General Comments Applicable to all Sites</p> <p>NY LAF acknowledges the soundness of the overall plan and supports the inclusion within the plan of the following :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian and cycle routes both to, between and within the sites proposed. • The emphasis – where applicable – on the development of links (both cycle and pedestrian) between the sites. • The emphasis in several sites of the development of green and open spaces. • The requirements to extend existing footways – and create new footways – both approaching the sites and within the sites, so as to encourage walking within a safer environment. • The NY LAF is concerned with some of the wording used in the site requirements relating access to footpaths near or across the site. There are some instances where the wording used to indicate pedestrian and cycle access to a nearby footpath, could be seen as indicating that cyclists have access to that footpath. This inference within the statement used, undermines the soundness of the proposals. Currently cyclists do not have use of footpaths; if they do, then they would be committing a trespass against the landowner. Alternative wording should be used within the proposals to make this clear. The soundness of the proposals would be enhanced when referring to access to nearby footpaths if ONLY pedestrian access to those footpaths was required. <p>Transport</p> <p>The NY LAF welcomes the statements made in the HDLP in respect of sustainable transport ... Promote improvements to public transport, including the provision of better parking at rail stations and park and ride facilities, the creation of walking and cycling routes, provision of electric vehicle charging points for both cars and bikes, the Harrogate car-share scheme and measures to reduce air pollution. At this stage in the proposals, it has only been possible to determine the creation of cycling and walking routes and they have been commented on when appropriate for each site. No examples of charging points (as a site requirement) have been found throughout the proposals.</p>
--	--	---

Richmondshire David Barraclough		
Ryedale Roma Haigh	Responded on a series of NYCC planning applications in the Ryedale area	<p>I understand that you are the Planning Officer responsible for the various planning applications relating to the fracking operations in Ryedale.</p> <p>We, as the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum, are becoming increasingly concerned that rights of way are being ignored, or are not been taken fully into account, in the fracking operations in Ryedale.</p> <p>I have looked at the various planning applications cited above, and although there are various references and good intentions relating to a variety of concerns (archaeological/environmental/screening etc) and how they will be covered, there seem to be few (if any) mentions of rights of way.</p> <p>Please could you let me know how you are proposing to deal with any disruptions to any public rights of way</p> <p>We are obviously very keen to be reassured that, should any disruptions be necessary, the parties involved in that disruption will make proper provision for an appropriate diversion at their cost and after proper consultation with user bodies (including walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders, off-road vehicles etc - as appropriate to the PROW).</p> <p>Please could you also let me know what has happened to the footpath at the Kirby Misperton site which I understand was closed for a brief period but now seems to have been closed on a much more permanent basis.</p>
Scarborough Doug Cartwright	Responded to Network Rail consultation	<p>Footpath 30.10/6/1, Scarborough Road, Gristhorpe</p> <p>Following email consultation with the Chair of the LAF, the LAF member who takes a lead for the Scarborough District has had a look at your letter regarding investigating the possibility of an extinguishment application in respect of the above footpath. He has also consulted the definitive map, from which it appears that the footpath concerned is a dead end footpath serving only the needs of the two properties. On the basis that local stakeholders are being consulted, the Local Access Forum accepts this proposal.</p> <p>May I also take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of the Forum for this early engagement and the opportunity to contribute at this stage of the process.</p>
Selby Barrie Mounty		

LAF Projects

Project	Lead	Summary
A66	Paul Sherwood	<p>Highways England Trans-Pennine A66 Route Non-Motorised User Group Meeting - 'Stage 1', Mercure Hotel (formerly 'Kings Head') Darlington 16th February 2018</p> <p>Pre-amble I attended the first of the 'Stage 1' meetings regarding the £1.2b improvements to the Northern Trans-Pennine A66 route on 18th October 2017. My report was issued to the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum at the time, and was briefly discussed at recent LAF meetings. That original meeting was a broad-spectrum event, Highways England have now proceeded to the formation of several 'user' groups. I quote the terms of reference, for the Non-Motorised User Group: - "Highways England has been tasked by Government to lead work to develop and appraise options for improvements to the A66. 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."</p> <p>Remit and Responsibility of Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent the views of their organisation throughout the options phase of A66 project. • Identify non-motorised user issues or interests that need to be taken account of, in the development of the A66 project options. • Where appropriate, communicate the activities of the NMU's and the latest updates on the design of the A66 to members of their own organisation. • Attendance by invitation only. • The meetings to be chaired by an officer from Highways England. <p>Organisations Invited to Attend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • British Horse Society [Caroline Bradley & Mark Weston] • Cycling UK [Terry Ratcliffe] • Highways England [Jacqui Allen + 8] • Cumbria & Lakes Local Access Forum [Charles Ecroyd] • Durham Local Access Forum [David Maughan] • North Yorkshire Local Access Forum [Paul Sherwood] • Ramblers Association [no representative] • Sustrans North [no representative] <p>Anticipated Programme Engagement (what is currently happening) 2017-2018. Selecting one of the possible options 2018-2019 (this is the first time that NMU's become involved). Detailed design, planning and Development Control 2019-21. Full public consultation 2021-2023 and assuming there's no appeals/inquiries, completion by about 2028.</p>

		<p>Report</p> <p>This was a fairly informal meeting lasting about two hours, with general discussion as to what the delegates of the various organisations hoped for, but at this stage very broad based as it will be several years before Highways England actually produce a defined proposal. Obviously financial constraints are a critical consideration.</p> <p>Two sections of the A66 have higher than average accident statistics, these are the single carriageway sections around Greta Bridge & Warcop. Only six sections of single carriageway remain on the fifty mile route.</p> <p>One of the current problems with the A66 is the lack of a suitable diversion route, if closed due to adverse weather or accidents, traffic turning off through Barnard Castle or Kirkby Stephen etc which causes urban traffic problems and local resentment. Highways England are still looking at the options for either an “on-line” improvement (basically widen the existing) or an “off-line” improvement (new road). The former is similar to the recent A1(M) work. However, the A1 is somewhat different as it needs a parallel route to accommodate ‘prohibited’ vehicles that are not able to use the motorway upgrade. 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. In North Yorkshire we only have about ten on our six-kilometre section.</p> <p>The BHS & Cycling representatives had fairly negative views based on their opinions of NMU engagement on the recent A1(M) upgrade and of the less recent sections of A66 upgrade (Gilling area).</p> <p>There was discussion regarding slow moving horse drawn items going to and from Appleby Fair using the A66, and the resultant fatal accidents. However, it was felt this could not be regarded as a special case obtaining additional funding.</p> <p>A further user group meeting is scheduled for later in the year.</p>
A1	Rachel Connolly	See attached correspondence regarding Local Access Roads
A59 Kex Gill	Rachel Connolly	Awaiting next steps
Yorkshire Wolds Way Partnership	Roma Haigh	The Yorkshire Wolds Way Partnership meeting was due to take place on 15 March 2018 at Pocklington
Teesdale Way	Paul Sherwood	

27 February 2018

Dear Mr. Bowe,

Attention has been drawn to the Local Access Forum that the upgrading of the northern part of the A1 is nearing completion, but there is one issue that is deeply concerning.

You will be aware that in Inspector Tipping's Report following the Public Inquiry in October 2006, various provisions would be made for the non-motorised users so they could link the rights of way and crossing points associated with the new lay-out of the A1 and its Local Access Roads. Amongst these measure was a 1m. hard margin on the LAR carriageways which cyclists could use and which gave a modicum of distance from the verges used by horses. However, this 1m. margin has not been provided, in some places not even a mere 0.6m. margin thus jeopardising the safety of vulnerable travellers. Such safety disincentives do not accord with the Government policy of encouraging travel by sustainable transport and as reflected in your own Local Transport Plan 4.

Highways England has been asked over the period of more than a year for a satisfactory explanation for departing from the Inspector's findings, but to date they have been unable to do so.

At the Public Inquiry NYCC Highways accepted the provisions promised by HE without objection, so the **Forum therefore urgently recommends that the County Council does not accept the handover of the Local Access Roads until the necessary remedial work has been carried out**, to meet the criteria promised by HE to the NMU stakeholders, and subsequently confirmed by the Inspector. We also suggest that, prior to the handover, NYCC require Highways England to mow the grass verges of the Local Access Roads as to date they have been much neglected and should be mown to full width to accord with the margins promised at PI.

An extract from the PI report is attached, and your attention is drawn to page 8 paragraph 3.3.20 and page 69 paragraph 6.3.3.13.

We look forward to your response.

Rachel Connolly
On behalf of the North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

Cc Barrie Mason

House Bridge would affect equestrians in particular; the suggested diversion via the Catterick Central motorway junction would expose riders to heavy vehicular traffic and create significant severance. In the course of consultations, a modification was put forward, now promoted by the HA as M11, providing an additional route via the proposed new Tunstall Road Bridge, with a connection to existing Bridleway 20.10/4. The HA's case regarding Cowfold Bridge is set out more fully in paragraphs 5.3.3 to 5.3.5.

- 3.3.19 The access to the retained and new crossing points would be improved by providing new PRow links and widened grass verges along the proposed LARs. In addition to connecting existing routes, the LARs would also significantly improve south/north NMU trips, exposing users to substantially lower volumes of traffic. The AADT flows on the LARs are predicted to be between 7,300 and 11,500 vpd in 2010, very significantly lower than on the A1.
- 3.3.20 There would be managed grass verges on each side of the LARs. The verge further from the motorway would be a minimum of 3 metres wide, and the nearer verge would be a minimum of 2.5 metres wide. Both verges would thus be generally significantly in excess of minimum design standards. Only at two "pinch points" some 40 to 45 metres in length would the width be less than as set out above, though nevertheless remaining at or above the minimum design standard. This minimum verge width would also be provided at the top of the embankments at the Baldersby and Leeming junctions and at the Gatenby and Londonderry bridges, but additional verge would also be available at the foot of the embankments. On each side of the LARs, a hard strip 1 metre wide would also be provided between the carriageway and the verge for the use of cyclists.
- 3.3.21 NMU crossing points on LARs would be provided with non-slip surfacing and horse corrals of the design urged on the HA by user groups in the course of consultation. Equestrian-style parapets would be provided on all overbridges except that at Street Lane, where predicted AADT levels of only 600 vpd would permit riders to use the main carriageway without unacceptable risk, and at Scotch Corner, where use by equestrians is not envisaged, though reduced speeds and traffic-signalisation would permit safe use by pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.3.22 Accepting that equestrians would not be able to use the Scotch Corner junction, a proposed modification to the Orders (M13) would provide a bridleway on the eastern side of the motorway south from Scurragh House Lane to join Bridleway 20.9/11 at the latter's junction with Gatherley Road. Equestrians would then be able to cross the motorway using the to-be-retained Catterick North overbridge and then return north along the LAR on the western side to Scurragh Lane.
- 3.3.23 Cumulative NMU severance is assessed by combining the impact of increases in journey length due to diversion with the benefit to NMUs resulting where a diversion no longer exposes them to large volumes of traffic. A full assessment of the impacts of the scheme on NMUs is set out at section 5 of HA/P4.
- 3.3.24 In summary, the HA's proposals for NMUs would constitute a significant improvement over the existing provision. They would replace the existing 20 usable crossing points with 22, and improve connectivity of other PRowS by

Other proposed NMU provision

6.3.3.12 I have considered the other additional crossings proposed by NMU groups and individual objectors. I have, however, concluded above that the scheme as promoted by the HA would improve NMU provision compared with the current situation, and that it is the current situation and not some other historical base against which the scheme's NMU provision should be assessed. With the motorway in place there would be an NMU crossing (including those shared with other traffic) on average every 2 kilometres or so [5.6.1]. Moreover, I can identify no unacceptable gap between the crossings proposed which might need to be filled with one of the extra crossings proposed by objectors. While I recognise the preference of NMUs for segregated crossings, there is no evidence to suggest that, as proposed to be designed [5.6.18], crossings shared with other traffic could not generally be made safe for use by NMUs.

6.3.3.13 Mrs Connolly considers that the LAR verges should be provided with fully segregated, fenced provision for equestrians [4.5.8]. However, the scheme proposals provide verges significantly in excess of those predicated by government guidance, with only very limited exceptions [3.3.20]. There would be very clear advantages to NMUs from the LAR provision, both by reason of the reconnection of currently unusable PRoW and minor road crossings of the A1 and of the marked improvement in the availability of north-south NMU routes [3.3.19]. The LAR provision would be further enhanced if OA10 is adopted. The provision of verges at both the foot and the top of the embankment approaching Gatenby Bridge would to my mind meet the concerns of Mr and Mrs McIntyre regarding the proposed re-opening of Bridleway No. 10.415/1 [4.14.1 and 5.14.1]. I note that a strip would be

provided on both sides of the LARs between the carriageway and the verge for the use of cyclists [3.3.20].

Mrs R Connolly
North Yorkshire Local Access
Forum

Barrie Mason
Assistant Director
Highways and Transportation
County Hall
NORTHALLERTON
North Yorkshire
DL7 8AH

Your ref:
Our ref: M13CR001.BM
Contact: Barrie Mason
Date: 28 March 2018

Tel: 01609 532137
Email: barrie.mason@northyorks.gov.uk
Web: www.northyorks.gov.uk

Dear Mrs Connolly,

Re: A1 (M) Local Access Roads and NMU provision

Thank you for your letter, dated the 27 February 2018, regarding the NMU provision on the Local Access Road (LAR), being provided by Highways England (HE) as part of the A1 (M) Upgrade scheme between Leeming and Barton.

The purpose of the LAR is to meet the needs of local and non-motorway traffic and to provide a means of relieving traffic in the event of an emergency incident on the A1 (M). Being an all-purpose road, the route of the LAR is available for all non-motorised users (NMU). In areas of new construction, the LAR has minimum verge widths of 2.5m and 3.0m on either side of the carriageway. Where the LAR has been provided over lengths of the old northbound carriageway of the A1, it has not been possible to provide these verge widths due to restrictions of the existing highway corridor. However the maximum available widths have been achieved.

In his concluding remarks, the Inspector does make note 'that the NMU provision in the scheme..... amounts to an improvement over the current situation and is satisfactory.' He also comments that 'the HAs (Highways Agency) proposals are well in excess of minimum standards and the LARs would generally be relatively lightly trafficked.'

Continued...

With regard to the provision of the 1m hard strip, this Authority was approached by HE (formerly the Highways Agency, HA) as they were unable to bring the scheme within budget and there was a real risk that the scheme would not be delivered. HE was considering a range of options on both the proposed Motorway and LAR, aimed at reducing costs. One of the proposals was to reduce the proposed width of the hard strip provision on the LAR, from 1.0m to 0.6m. This was considered, by both organisations, to be an appropriate provision given the traffic flows expected on the LAR. It should be noted that discussions with cycling groups had already confirmed that they would not use the hard strip as an area in which they would cycle.

I am aware that there are elements of the LAR, where due to site constraints it has not been possible to provide the hard strip of 0.6m wide. The section of LAR between the old Catterick North bridge and the new roundabout with the A6108 is the most significant part of the LAR where the 0.6m width has not been achieved. The reasons for this being that on the east side of the road there was only a minimal amount of carriageway beyond the white line and, on the west side, the hard shoulder simply broke away from the edge of the main carriageway and to have replaced this was prohibitively expensive as it would have meant removing and replacing large widths of existing carriageway over long sections.

In conclusion, given the nature and function of the LAR it is considered that the overall design of the route, including the reduced hard strips, is on balance the best achievable within the available budget.

With the above in mind, the County Council is not in a position to reject hand over of the LAR based on the reasons that you point out.

Maintenance of the grass verges, will become the responsibility of NYCC. In the meantime the Contractor has maintained the verges and will be required to do so until the LAR is handed over. You will find further details about the County Council's verge maintenance policy via the following link <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/grass-cutting-verge-hedge-and-tree-maintenance>

I trust that the above covers the points that you raise and clarifies the stance taken by the County Council on the design of the LAR for the A1 (M) Upgrade scheme.

Yours sincerely

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director
Highways and Transportation

CONTENTS	Page 2	Problems that cannot be solved ...	Page 8	Coastal margin in England	Page 16	Your Professional Development
	Page 3	Letter from the President	Page 11	... statutory vesting	Page 17	Administrative Enforcement
	Page 6	It matters not how strait the gate	Page 14	Membership News	Page 19	Case Reports
	Page 7	Help shape the future of Pathwatch	Page 15	Book Review	Page 25	(R)Amblings

Traffic Lights for Dogs:



Chris Scaife (cheeky grin) and Rob Brown at the start of the TLfD Project at North Brierton Farm, Hartlepool – not all sign posts looked as full as this one



Chris Scaife

IPROW member Chris Scaife explains about Hartlepool's Traffic Like for Dogs (TLfD) project

Background

At a routine quarterly meeting of the Tees Valley Local Access Forum (TVLAF), and following the enquiry at the close of the meeting: 'Is there any other business?'; Rob Brown, Vice Chair and landowner asked a question. He wanted to know how he could prevent dog attacks on his sheep flock; he has two public rights of way crossing his main permanent pasture fields and through his farm yard. He explained that he has no opportunity to divert the paths, as his farming neighbours whilst sympathetic, are reluctant to host additional public access on their land as part of a possible diversion route. The TVLAF members then agreed to invite the local NFU County Advisor to their next meeting to discuss the matter further.

Laurie Norris, County Advisor from the NFU, attended the next TVLAF meeting and described 'a common and growing occurrence' of sheep attacks reported to NFU members. He welcomed the

continued on page 4

Traffic Lights for Dogs:

**DOG CONTROL PROJECT
NORTH BRIERTON FARM**

**WHEN WALKING YOUR DOG ALONG
THIS PATH PLEASE FOLLOW OUR
TRAFFIC LIGHT SYSTEM**



Please can you consider not walking your dog along this public footpath or through the farmyard. Thank you for your co-operation.

Please ring **01429 523524** for more information




opportunity to work alongside the Forum and Rob Brown in a project hosted at North Brierton Farm and co-managed by the Hartlepool Borough Council.

I then posted a question on the IPROW Forum, guessing (correctly) beforehand what the responses would be like. IPROW Forum members didn't let me down and confirmed my enquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's legal position - that whilst PSPOs were a possibility; it was regarded as an infringement of rights to broadly prohibit the law-abiding dog walking community, when it was individuals at fault. Meanwhile, Beryl Bird who was researching potential dog management schemes across the UK, suggested that we develop the Danebury Dog Project managed by the Hampshire County Council, (as a means of protecting nesting birds) as a way forward.

Beryl and I then pulled together a list of partners who would actively participate in the project. Soon the partners had agreed the manner and structure of the response, agreed on the signage design and created a consultee list. One of the partners - Steve Jenkinson of the Kennel Club - met the three initial partners on site. His views were built into the project and an alternative permissive route was planned. At this time dog attacks were still continuing but luckily no losses had been reported.


**DOG CONTROL PROJECT
NORTH BRIERTON FARM**

**WHEN WALKING YOUR DOG ALONG
THIS PATH PLEASE FOLLOW OUR
TRAFFIC LIGHT SYSTEM**



Please keep your dog on a short lead.
Lambing Season
March to mid-May
Pregnant Ewes
Mid-October to end of February

Please ring **01429 523524** for more information



The summer of 2016 saw the first full meeting of the TLfD Project in Hartlepool. Co-ordinated by the Council and TVLAF; invitees included (as well as the main 'players' in the project): Stray Aid (a local dog re-homing charity), local vet practices, the local NFU, Elwick Young Farmers Club, Parish and Town Councillors covering the local wards, professional dog walkers, local residents groups, and the Council's Community Safety Team. The project was outlined and their views built in; assurances were given to consult and update quarterly.

By January 2017 the agreed signs with their interchangeable red, amber and green messages were installed and patrols had been agreed with Council Enforcement Officers.

Up and running

In June 2017 at the TVLAF meeting, Rob Brown reported on the scheme, and confirmed he had seen only four walkers who had ignored the signs and allowed their dogs off lead and out of control. The TVLAF members asked the Council to write to other landowners/managers who manage sheep and other stock in fields with rights of way in the Borough, inviting them to join the scheme. Up to date no farmers have come forward but with recent publicity; this may change.

Other Cleveland Police Sections showed an interest and in July 2017 I had a meeting with the Middlesbrough Section, outlining the project and offering my time, to help them pull together a site specific project. Should they take it forward, we will include any further improvements suggested by core partners.

On the 12 September 2017 the Council was invited to speak at the House of Lords, at the 'All Party Parliamentary Group on Animal Welfare' (APGAW). As I was unable to attend, Beryl represented the group. The APGAW Committee discussed a wide range of topics surrounding dog attacks on sheep; the CLA described their position on the idea of temporary rights of way diversions, Battersea Dogs Home and the Dogs Trust were very interested in training dogs and their owners and Sheep Watch's Terena Plowright spoke about the need to record every dog attack on the Sheep Watch web site as it was (for the first time) creating a national picture of the issue. I had sent out a full briefing paper prior to the meeting and this provided a good insight into what we were achieving with our project.

By October 2017 the APGAW Committee minutes were available, and a feature on the BBC Countryfile programme ensued, beginning with an interview with the Chair Angela Smith MP together with some emotive interviews with livestock keepers who have to manage the problem. The Ramblers' spokesperson was also interviewed for their response to the programmes perspective on 'right to roam', and made specific mention of the TLfD project in Hartlepool as a possible way forward.

**DOG CONTROL PROJECT
NORTH BRIERTON FARM**

**WHEN WALKING YOUR DOG ALONG
THIS PATH PLEASE FOLLOW OUR
TRAFFIC LIGHT SYSTEM**



This is a dog off lead area please continue the 'close management' of your dog, as attacks on sheep can still occur.

Please ring **01429 523524** for more information





Traffic Lights for Dogs:

In November 2017 the APGAW published its report on "[Tackling livestock worrying and encouraging responsible dog ownership](#)". Within the report; our project was one of the three case studies and was commented upon favourably.

I recently spoke to Rob Brown, the Project Farmer, and he was very effusive about the whole scheme, throughout the year. *"It's been surprisingly successful and I am amazed at how well it's gone over the year."* Rob continued: *"Overall walkers have kept their dogs on leads and this in itself has reduced a lot of concerns for me. The people I have spoken to are very supportive of the project and its aims. People seem to do what they have been asked to do and I am very thankful for all the help the Council has given."*

TLfD features

- The Council has correctly followed the procedure required to implement a PSPO on this site if necessary.
- However, this has not been the message we and the farmer have conveyed to dog walkers. The signs were not threatening or written in 'Counselees' language as Beryl likes to describe it! The signs described the attacks on the sheep flock, and asked for dog walkers' help. The signals we have since received are that the public are more aware and responsive/sympathetic to the farmer's plight. They also responded, with the vast majority keeping their dogs on leads within the sensitive areas of the farm.
- The landowner's family have had the opportunity to explain how they hoped the project would work with interested members of the public.
- The chance for the Council to manage a problem without an enormous financial outlay has been used, linking to volunteer groups with local expertise, together with support from the local Community Police Officers.
- The project could be re-shaped with alternative partners and considered as useful alongside horses in fields with public rights of way. We are now hearing of dog attacks on horses and even cattle.
- The existing partners could apply for funding to help develop the scheme.
- It could be introduced by other public bodies with similar responsibilities for managing rights of way networks including, for example, Network Rail.
- Part of the discussion centred on the landowner's health and safety issues as a result of unmanaged access and this needs investigating further.
- A more flexible approach to the idea of temporarily diverting paths could be developed, for set periods around key dates (lambing, for example). We, like all other rights of way officers, will see how this debate moves forwards.
- We have stopped using the phrase 'Dog worrying' as the sheep are attacked and not worried by dogs. This is, I think, a key change in how the public will respond to the issues.

Final Thoughts

We hope the Council's Enforcement Team will take a different view on dog related PSPO areas within Hartlepool town, considering the availability of open space for use of dogs 'off lead' exercise areas. Local Authorities who restrict such areas or remove them via a PSPO will only 'push' the problem into the countryside where there is no adequate dog control management in place.

Almost one year on Rob Brown has confirmed that the message continues to be relevant with no dog attacks during 2017. A fantastic achievement on a land holding that has suffered dog attacks on their sheep flock for years.

Our current view is to allow the signs to stay in place after the official pilot period of one year is completed. We understand this could lead to 'sign blindness', but the interchangeable nature of them, and the positive public relations messages that we intend to develop during the course of the next year we trust will re-enforce the positive outcome of the project.

Project Team:

Chris can be contacted on
Chris.Scaife@hartlepool.gov.uk
or at 01429 523524

Chris Scaife, Countryside Access Officer, Hartlepool Borough Council (HBC),
Beryl Bird, Development Officer, Tees Valley Local Access Forum (TVLAF),
Rob Brown, North Brierton Farm and PCSO Cath Jones and PC Keith Robinson, Cleveland Police,
Hartlepool Section.

