



<p><b>Item 7</b> also referred to signposting and waymarking in BBNP. It was resolved to invite a Representative from BBNP to a future LAF meeting. GW offered to raise this issue at a BBNP Advisory Forum that he is attending on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010. KB thought that we should invite Eifion Jones of BBNP.</p> <p><b>Item 10</b> – Information about newly cleared or re-opened routes. JH express sympathy with MH’s view. JH also felt that it would be helpful if such information included reference to routes that were accessible to disabled people. EWJ suggested that MH was referring in the main to Byways and that he had been provided with that information. EWJ said that this could be addressed by future releases of CAMS (Countryside Access Management System) where there would be a facility to publish mapping on the internets and include information on multi-user routes. JT stated that there was a new release of CAMS in November and he was waiting for further details of its new functionality. Before any version of the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way was published a validation exercise would be necessary to check CAMS against the hard copy version of the Definitive Map – such an audit will, unfortunately, take some time. KB asked about maintenance and if job sheets were completed on CAMS. It was agreed to carry this item forward to the next LAF Meeting in January, after the latest CAMS release.</p> <p><b>Item 11</b> – JT reiterated that the date of the next LAF meeting had been moved from 13<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011.</p>	<p><b>GW</b></p>
<p><b>Item 5 Glastir – Update from GW from LAF Chairs Conference 12/10/2010</b></p> <p>GW produced a signage plate from the Tir Gofal Scheme and asked if any of the members had ever seen one actually in situ on a permissive access route in Carmarthenshire. The room was silent. GW commented that Tir Gofal had still failed to provide usable information on permissive access routes. JT said that he had chased the requested information but was still awaiting a further reply. GW stated that he had carried out his own mini-survey of permissive routes – out of 6 that he attempted to walk, 5 were blocked in some way. GW suggested that some landowners were using permissive access as an alternative to applying for a diversion of a public right of way. They then encourage people to use the permissive route so that the original PROW disappears or they can claim that it is not used. JT agreed that ‘public rights of way’ and ‘permissive access’ were quite different animals and that the fundamental problem with permissive access was that as indicated in it’s nomenclature it was access with permission not as of right and it could ultimately be withdrawn by the landowner. Even in schemes like Tir Gofal, once the agreement and payment period had ended the permissive route could be lost. CR said that Tir Gofal permissive routes were never adequately publicised. The CCW/Tir Gofal maps were very difficult to use. GW said that all these issues need to be carefully considered in relation to Glastir. KB asked if the Welsh Assembly Government could be asked to put bridleways onto the BHS EMAGIN web site. ED said that Glastir will be focused on multi-user routes for walkers/cyclists and horse riders. PS asked if GW could circulate his presentation. RJ said that he did not think that there would be much take-up of Glastir among the farming community. GW is attending a meeting in Builth on 19<sup>th</sup> October regarding Glastir. LT referred to the LAF’s special meeting at Tir Gofal offices on 23/08/2010 where he had raised the issue of problems regarding Common Land. He will contact John Thorley at the Commoners Association to explore that question further. ED stated that the full Glastir package is not being published until the Autumn. He also referred to the proposed waterside corridor which if taken up would, he said, mean that cattle would need to be supplied with additional water from an alternative additional source, as the river/water source would have been fenced off (if the relevant land was being used for stock).</p>	<p><b>GW</b></p> <p><b>LT</b></p>
<p><b>Item 6 LAF Chairs Conference 12<sup>th</sup> October 2010 – Update from GW</b></p> <p>GW reviewed the various issues discussed including:</p> <p><b>Funding for the RoWIP and the Coastal Path</b> – The conference considered how expenditure on countryside access could be justified in the current funding environment. A case could be made on the basis of the benefits to Tourism, Health and Employment. Further, if this area was neglected now the long-term costs of restoration would be greater as the network would have deteriorated more. A manifesto will be produced making the case for funding and sent to every Welsh Assembly member.</p> <p><b>Access to Inland Water</b> – The long awaited ‘Inquiry into Access to Inland Water in Wales’ Report had not taken the matter forward significantly. No progress was envisaged in the foreseeable future and it was a subject that would have to be returned to.</p>	

<p><b>Planning System in Wales</b> – GW explained that part of the problem with the current planning system is that whilst the application forms ask the applicant if the proposed development is affected by public rights of way the applicant may simply say no. JT explained the procedure in Carmarthenshire as he understood it. When the Planning Department receive an application they consult their recent copy of the Definitive Map and will refer applications that they think may be affected by public rights of way to the Public Rights of Way Team for comment. The PROW Team then reply to planning by letter asking for an appropriate note to be included in any planning permission granted stating that the particular public right of way within or abutting the land must not be affected or obstructed. It also advises the applicant to contact the Public Rights of Way Team if they have any questions. EWJ said there were still problems with Developers because the advice is a note on the planning permission rather than an actual 'condition'. KB also pointed out that the process is not perfect because there could be occasions where a planning application concerns an area of land which is subject to a claim for a right of way which is being processed. So if there are no rights of way in the vicinity it might not be referred by Planning to Public Rights of Way, as planning would be unaware of any such application. Nevertheless, it was agreed that it was positive that there was a consultation process in place which sought to protect public rights of way.</p> <p><b>Wales Coastal Path</b> – GW reported that overall in Wales there was a lot of gloom about the Coastal Path. 4 coastal counties have said that they are not going to meet the 2012 deadline for completion. There were, for example, problems in Gwynydd. Flintshire was however on course.</p> <p><b>National Assembly Elections</b> – The conference discussed the elections next May and referred to the fact that Jane Davidson AM Minister for Environment, Sustainability and Housing would be stepping down. EWJ said that she has been a great advocate of Public Access to the countryside.</p> <p><b>Wind Turbine Developments</b> – GW reported that the increasing numbers of wind turbine developments had been discussed at the conference with specific reference made to the Brechfa Forest scheme.</p>	
<p><b>Item 7 Annual Work Programme – Update from EWJ</b></p> <p>EWJ reported that Carmarthenshire County Council had contributed £30,500. There were 4 programmes with £500k to be spent on access projects this year. The Council was waiting for news from CCW regarding funding and grant for next year. The Welsh Assembly had requested feedback on the benefits of RoWIPs – the sums of money devoted to them are relatively small (£1.7 million across Wales) compared to other government expenditure and should be protected. Though small amounts they make a massive difference in terms of the benefit to society. EWJ said that he can use RoWIP money as match funding to access other grant funds. EWJ commented that the new Procurement process is demanding and time-consuming with detailed information required. EWJ reported that there had been no complaints from communities about the new Ranger programme. Some Rangers had also attended Community Council Meetings. PS said that CCC would need to publicise the Coastal Path as much as possible.</p>	
<p><b>Item 8 Effects of the current economic climate on the work of the Countryside Recreation and Access Unit – Update from EWJ</b></p> <p>The Comprehensive Spending Review is due on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010 and the outlook may become clearer then though, of course, it will ultimately also depend on how the Welsh Assembly Government decides to apportion their reduced budget. CCC had been expecting a cut of at least 25% over 3 years. EWJ said that we should have a clearer idea by the end of November with a report to the Executive Board due in December. The Council was trying to do things differently to reduce costs rather than cut jobs. GW said that members of the Forum should check with the Secretary (JT) or EWJ before saying anything in public on these issues. Member of the LAF should not in any case release information on the finances of the Countryside Access Unit.</p>	
<p><b>Item 9 Lost Ways</b></p> <p>GW said that he would contact Phil Stone to ask if he will attend a future meeting and provide an update. 'Other Routes with Public Access' should also be covered. KM stated that rights of way were being lost due to open-cast mining projects.</p>	
<p><b>Item 10 Mapped Ranger Service and PROW case officer areas – EWJ &amp; JT</b></p> <p>EWJ reported that A3 or possibly A2 maps would be available in due course showing the relevant Areas and distributed to all those who are interested. ED asked if complaints could be reported to</p>	

<p>the Community Councils. EWJ said only on an annual basis as those matters are now being dealt with by the Rangers.</p> <p>JT reported that he had now reorganised the Public Rights of Way Legal Team so that it reflected the same 4 geographical areas or regions that the Ranger Team covers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previously the whole county was divided into east and west and split between Kevin Thomas and Caroline Ferguson so they had very large areas to cover. Now their areas have been reduced and new areas created for Gary Carlsen and Mathew Palmer.</li> <li>• Each Officer will be responsible for both Orders and Enforcement and any other issues that fall within their area. In some cases where orders have already been started they may stay with the Original officer depending on how far progressed they are, for the sake of continuity.</li> <li>• Each Officer will liaise with the same Rangers and all will cover the same area – so it will enable them to establish a good working relationship and to build up local knowledge of their area. This should encourage a sense of ownership by Officers of their area and of issues and orders within it. They will also be liaising with the same community councils, councillors etc so it should enable them to build a good understanding with them.</li> </ul> <p>JT was developing a system for monitoring individual workloads and performance with general Team issues discussed at Team Meetings and individual performance at 1:1s.</p>	
<p><b>Item 11 Signposting of Bridleways in BBNP (Brecon Beacons National Park) – KB</b></p> <p>KB has written to BBNP and the surrounding Community Councils regarding the waymarking of bridleways which is particularly important as there are boggy areas which present a very real danger to horses and their riders. KB reported that Judith Harvey of BBNP has said that it is against their policy to waymark across a hill or across open areas of moorland. KB believes that some form of waymarking is required though not necessarily in the form of posts. At a minimum, boggy areas should be marked in some way. Riders were supposed to follow the bridleway but at present it was very difficult to do so as the route was not clear on the ground and it was even difficult to navigate using GPS. KB said that this issue had been ongoing for 2 years. KB asked if Eifion Jones of BBNP could be invited to a future LAF (GW had already agreed to explore that).</p> <p>GW said that waymarking was also relevant to walkers who are equally capable of falling into bogs! He had raised this with Judith Harvey of BBNP at least 6 years ago and had also been told of their policy not to waymark open moorland. LT suggested fencing the bog but GW pointed out that bogs have a tendency to shift. GW said that he understood that some parts of BBNP were designated as wilderness areas where no evidence of human intervention is allowed. GW will raise these matters at the BBNP advisory forum and with LAF in Wales. KB also said that there appeared to be some inconsistency as there were waymarkers in some of the northern parts of BBNP.</p>	<p>GW</p> <p>GW</p>
<p><b>Item 12 General News Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A Living Wales</b> consultation document – GW had read it. He said that protection of the environment is not a part of the LAF's brief. Therefore, the document should not be considered by the LAF.</li> <li>• <b>WCAIP (Welsh Coastal Access Improvement Programme) Launch Pendine</b> Jane Davidson – GW said that this was a good event and photos had appeared in the Carmarthen Journal.</li> <li>• <b>WCAIP Seminar</b> Trinity St Davids – EWJ had attended and said that people should lobby their elected representatives in support of the programme. PS asked EWJ for a lobbying pro-forma.</li> <li>• <b>Walking &amp; Cycling Strategy</b> - Port Talbot meeting – Kelly Shefford (Senior Countryside Recreation Officer – CCC) will be attending and will report to the LAF at the January meeting.</li> <li>• <b>Other emerging/relevant item(s)</b> – EWJ said that Cwm had a green waste project and were looking at trials with CCW and the Environment Agency. They will take it away and dispose of it so CCC could save money.</li> </ul>	<p>EWJ</p>
<p><b>Item 13 AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Crosshands Development</b> – KB said that the developers did not have to consider horse riders as part of development. KB had contacted Planning who said that the new UDP and LDP were currently being consulted upon. KB has contacted Eifion Bowen to ask where the interests of horse riders feature.</li> <li>• <b>Cycle Track in Brynamman</b> – ED said that there was a missing link in the cycle track by the rugby club. It may be outside the Carmarthenshire County Council boundary. EWJ said that he will take it up with Phil Snaith at CCC who deals with cycle tracks.</li> </ul>	<p>EWJ</p>

**Item 14 Date/Location of Next Meeting**

6pm 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011 Black Mountain Centre, Cwmgarw Road, Brynaman, Ammanford SA18 1BU

**Future Meetings**

07<sup>th</sup> April 2011 Laugharne Millennium Hall

30<sup>th</sup> June 2011 Bronwydd Village Hall

22<sup>nd</sup> September 2011 Cwmifor Village Hall

15<sup>th</sup> December 2011 Tumble Hall

The above may be subject to change.