

Borough of Bedford Local Access Forum

Minutes of meeting held on 10th September at
Borough Hall commencing at 6.30pm

<u>Members</u>	<u>Observers</u>
Bob Wallace	Phill Fox – Bedford Borough Council
Nigel Jacobs	Martyn Brawn - Bedford Borough Council
Brian Cowling	David Lant – Bedford Borough Council
David Mitchell	Apologies
Barry Ingram	James Russell
	Ann Kennedy
	Andrew Prigmore – Bedford Borough Council
	Steve Bumstead

1.	<p><u>Welcome by Chairman</u></p> <p>In the absences of Steve Bumstead and James Russell, it was agreed that Bob Wallace lead this meeting of the Forum.</p>
2.	<p><u>Minutes of previous meeting held in July 2015 to be agreed</u></p> <p>These were signed as a true and accurate record by the Chairman.</p>
3.	<p><u>Matters arising from previous minutes</u></p> <p>The BoBLAF Secretary information is now on the Borough Council website.</p>
4.	<p><u>Updates from Bedford Borough Council</u></p> <p>4.1 Update on consideration of moving a Public Right of Way</p> <p>David Lant, Bedford Borough Council Project Manager, was in attendance to discuss the considerations relating to the planning application for the Depot redevelopment which</p>

incorporates a diversion to FP18. It was highlighted on a supporting document, circulated to Forum members, that the main reason for re-routing the footpath is due to capacity and health safety issues relating to the depot's traffic arrangement, which otherwise would mean crossing the current F18 route. The proposed re-route was reviewed by members, which it was noted includes a 2.5metres corridor going around the boundary of the depot site and then joining up with Barkers Lane. Members enquired if the route is a bridleway path as well, which it was confirmed it is not, it is a designated footpath which cyclists do use, in addition to the proposed 2.5metres corridor width, there would also be a 2.4metres high fence. DL explained that the current grass are in the depot will be developed. DL added that it is also proposed to include new lighting for the rerouted path, members asked what would the local authority do if the diversion Order was not granted. DL expressed it would be extremely difficult to manage if that is the case, members then asked if there is a contingency plan in place, it was noted the matter would have to be revisited if the diversion can not go ahead. It was discussed what happens if two walkers with double buggy's meet on the path it causes an issue, it was detailed by Officers that the proposed new footpath route would be wider than the recommend standard of a fenced in footpath of 2metres wide. There were some concerns that the new route would not allow users a full sight of the path ahead, which for individuals walking by themselves at night may be uncomfortable, it was detailed the plan is to use palisade fencing so there is some visibility. A member questioned the cost of the re-route, these have not been confirmed as of yet. It was asked who will pay for the ditch needed, it was noted that the ditch is not within the site parameter so this will not be a consideration. There was a suggestion by a member that a footbridge be installed instead or the route moved to the other side of the depot, with a discussion on whether the Maia Close side could be better utilised.

It was in conclusion agreed by all Forum members present that the LAF recommend, having seen the details of the proposed re-route of FP18, that they full endorse the Forum's previous comments that the original route of FP18 be retained and the original route having traffic management systems installed. The Forum also noted that any changes would require an Order to go to the Secretary of State, therefore members felt it would be sensible for the Council Officers to consider alternative solutions if the Secretary of State does turn down the application for the path to be moved.

4.2 Definitive Map update

There was a request that a future item focus be the Deregulation Act. **Action: Secretary**

Members had fed back their comments on the Definitive Map information discussed at the last meeting, MB thanked members for their input, and welcomed all input and comments from members, at meetings and between meetings.

MB shared the latest work programme with members, which did include conclusion information, though it was detailed that sometimes this is difficult to capture due to the long history with some of the items, with Wilden FP6 used as an example which has been an ongoing issue for 15 years.

There was a specific question relating to an extinguished path in Riseley, and a relocation, this led onto to a discussion around the sometimes difficult and delicate discussions that have to take place with landowners. Members appreciated this aspect, and that there is a risk that landowners change their mind, so it is a difficult for Officers to manage this. Members commented it would be helpful to have list of the items in a

	<p>priority order and felt the local authority needs to allocate more resources to take this matter through to completion as per the statutory guidance and given time-scale. It was detailed that with the current restructure discussions and reviews the staff structure may be different going forwards, and one of the considerations has been additional human resources needed for this area of work.</p> <p>The Forum expressed that in their role as advisor to the local authority, they recommend that additional resources are secured for this work to be undertaken as a priority given the known time frames.</p> <p>Discussion then moved to the current budget consultation and restructures being looked at by the local authority, it was noted SF's department have all been issued with at risk letters, however, it was also noted that AP's department have not been issued with these letters.</p> <p><i>MB was thanked for his input and took leave at this point of the meeting.</i></p>
5.	<p><u>Break</u></p> <p>Members took a brief break at this point</p>
6.	<p><u>By Way Draft Action Plan</u></p> <p>PF reported that there is a new programme of works including works to be done on Fourty Foot Lane which members commented is pleasing to hear, and the document circulated to members showed the different type of work planned at each location. There is now such work embedded in the highways five year programming, as well as bridge works built into the programme. It was noted that by being in the programme is no guarantee that all works will be carried out, but they are now at least on the main highways priority list, which they had never been previously. PF was asked for the clearance programme to be provided to the Secretary so they could be circulated to all Forum members.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action: PF and Secretary</p> <p>Members were then provided with detailed information on recent bridge works, the bridge at Pinchmill Islands is being widened in the Sharnbrook/Felmersham and Radwell area, the work will start shortly and last for 12 weeks as well as the path being cleared. All the listed byways work is costing a total of £13k it was added, and that big machines are being used to undertake the clearance work.</p> <p>It was asked why the SVC had been reduced by 25% at the last minute, it was explained that DH had produced an initial plan, due to DH being ill, tis was reworked by ZB and YG, they reviewed further and the change was made with then feedback from users expected, however, none was received. Members felt it would have been courteous to inform those parishes when they did not get their expected cut so they could have passed this information on.</p>
7.	<p><u>East West Rail consultation</u></p> <p>This public consultation link had been circulated to members, it was discussed the foot cross near the retail park is to have a proposed footbridge over the railway, this in the supporting documents is categorised as the Woburn Road Industrial Estate. The Forum agreed a response should be sent highlighting that it would not be sensible spending the</p>

	<p>monies on a new footbridge, it would be much more cost effective to open up the underpass as this location, which would also increase access through the Green Wheel.</p> <p>Action: Secretary</p>
8.	<p><u>Administrative matters</u></p> <p>8.1 Annual Report</p> <p>This had been circulated to members, awaiting SB's input for the Chairman's comments. It was fed back that there to be reference on the Westminster briefing BC had attended the Deregulation Bill as well as BW attending the 2014 National Conference. Action – SB and Secretary</p> <p>8.2 LAF Membership</p> <p>It was noted that an individual had contacted the Secretary about joining the LAF, details had been passed to the appointing authority.</p>
9.	<p><u>Any Other Notified Business</u></p> <p>None was received.</p>
10.	<p><u>Next Meeting</u></p> <p>Thursday 19th November at 6.30pm - Borough Hall, Bedford.</p>

Signed:

Date: