NOTTINGHAM LOCAL ACCESS FORUM

M I N U T E S

of meeting held on **7th July 2010** at the Tea Room - Council House from 6.30 pm to 8.30 pm

✓ - indicates present at meeting

Malcolm Bescoby		Nick Hynes	✓
John Boland	✓	Chris Thompson	
Don Cameron	✓	Diane Moore	✓
Roger Codling	✓	Trevor Muxlow	
Angela Cooke	✓	Councillor Jane Urquhart	
Councillor Brian Grocock		Bill Wright	✓
Tom Huggon	✓		

Also in attendance

John Lee, Public Rights of Way, (Nottingham City Council Advisor).
Matt Leek, Traffic Management, (Nottingham City Council Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

1.1 Malcolm Bescoby, Councillor Brian Grocock, Trevor Muxlow, Chris Thompson, Councillor Jane Urquhart.

2 MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING.

2.1 In relation to item 3.12 of the previous minutes, John Lee advised that the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme had now been withdrawn. Some Rights of Way improvements that were due to take place as part of the programme may now not go ahead.

2.2 Don Cameron enquired as to which BSF schemes would still progress. In response, John Lee advised that as far as he was aware, those projects where building works had already commenced would be progressed.

2.3 In relation to item 4.15 of the previous minutes, John Lee advised that he had obtained a quote to place an advert in the Nottingham Arrow of which the following costings apply: £750 – ¼ page advert, £1500 – ½ page advert, £2500 – full page advert.

2.4 In response to item 2.3, Tom Huggon stated that as a Statutory Committee for the City Council, he was surprised that the Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF) would be charged a fee to place an advert in the Arrow. John Lee agreed to make enquiries into getting an advert **John Lee.**

placed in the Arrow for free.

3 THE ROLE AND AWARENESS OF THE NLAF: PROMOTING THE NLAF TO COLLEAGUES AND OTHER PARTNERS.

3.1 At the NLAF meeting dated 14th April 2010, John Lee agreed to draft a publicity letter to senior managers within the Authority to make them aware of the role of the NLAF. John Lee presented this draft to the forum and invited comment over its content.

3.2 Angela Cooke advised that the letter should be no more than one side of A4 to which Bill Wright, Tom Huggon and Nick Hynes agreed.

3.3 After some debate, John Lee agreed to revamp the publicity letter which will be given to John Boland for final approval. When the letter is finished, it can be given to Councillors Grocock and Urquhart for their signatures. **John Lee**

4 HOW CAN THE NLAF LINK UP WITH THE POLICE IN TERMS OF DESIGNING CRIME OUT (JOHN BOLAND / CHRIS THOMPSON).

4.1 John Boland: In many respects, it is the architects who design out crime and not the Police.

4.2 Tom Huggon: The Police are involved in planning applications by acting as consultants on crime issues. The Police should be aware of the need to liaise with their LAF on relevant applications before they make their submission. Tom gave Smedley Close as an example of when considering the planning application and subsequent development which resulted in the gating order due to the poor design of the housing layout.

4.3 John Boland asked the group what they thought the way forward should be. John Lee suggested having the names of relevant people within the Police such as the Crime Reduction Manager and Architectural Liaison Officer would be a starting point for future liaison.

4.4 Diane Moore: There seems to be a strong link between item 4 and the publicity letter in item 3. Could the letter be edited so that it can be sent to the Police and other agencies as well?

4.5 John Lee believed that this was a good idea and will speak to Kevin Brown (Crime Reduction Manager / Architectural Liaison Officer) to see if he thinks the letter will be of benefit and also suggested that Kevin consult the relevant people within the Police Authority. (UPDATE: Kevin Brown will attend the next meeting to agree how this can be progressed). **John Lee**

5 UPDATE FROM GATING ORDER AND PLANNING APPLICATION SUB GROUPS.

5.1 When the group first looked at the request for a Gating Order at Wing Walk and Angel Alley, letters were sent to adjacent properties to gather additional information. One log sheet has been returned. The Police have asked for further log sheets to be sent out.

5.2 Diane Moore: It should not be the number of incidents that dictate whether a Gating Order should be introduced, it should be the seriousness of the incidents. In addition, is it a good idea to disclose the addresses of those who are involved with the Gating Order process as this may be the reason why there is a lack of response?

5.3 John Lee: There has to be a balance between anonymity and satisfying the statutory criteria. It would be difficult to keep the identity of the adjacent premises anonymous, especially when there are only a limited number of such premises, it would not be difficult to work out which premises had provided the Council with incident reports to support the Order.

5.4 John Boland: Do all requests for Gating Orders go to Area Committee?

5.5 John Lee: If the statutory tests are not satisfied, the request will not go to the Area Committee.

5.6 Tom Huggon: The City Centre Plan identifies Poultry Arcade as a path to be protected. Once we allow one path to be gated, they will all be gated.

5.7 John Lee: Poultry Arcade – Additional sheets have been sent to encourage adjoining premises to provide evidence.

5.8 Tom Huggon: If the paths were cleaned, the problems would not take place.

5.9 John Boland: If no-one owns the paths, does ownership revert back to the City Council.

5.10 John Lee: No, it reverts to the Crown Estate. An Extinguishment Order undertaken at Crossdale Walk resulted in the City Council discussing the purchase of land from the Crown Estate so that the Order could be progressed. The procedure is long and can put people off which can be the reason why some areas are left neglected.

5.11 Nick Hynes: In general, there has been a reduction in crime which may explain the low response rate for additional information being submitted for Gating Order requests.

5.12 John Lee: A review of the Brewsters Park Gating Order will commence shortly. John Lee to keep the LAF up to date. (UPDATE – The Police's

Drug Action Team have confirmed that there has been a substantial decrease in drug related incidents since the Order came into force).

5.13 John Boland: The planning sub-group have not yet had a meeting to discuss current planning applications. From a personal standpoint, the majority of applications appear to be trivial. However, some can be complex. Reference was then made to Planning training session that was due to be given by Planning Aid on 20th July 2010.

5.14 Diane Moore: Helen Metcalfe (Planning Aid) will be providing this session and is keen to know what information to include in her workshop.

5.15 John Boland: In response, John Boland suggested general concepts and how to influence the big applications.

5.16 General discussion took place regarding a previous proposal to provide planning application training for the forum. John Lee advised that this was not going to progress due to a lack of uptake from the forum.

5.17 Diane Moore: What about organising training County wide? John Lee suggested that it would be more beneficial to tailor needs to the City.

5.18 Tom Huggon: Why don't we have a special session whereby people post their questions in advance.

5.19 John Boland: Who would provide the session?

5.20 In response, Tom Huggon said that he would be happy to answer questions half an hour before the next LAF meeting.

5.21 John Lee: What about the Public Rights of Way Planning and Development Guide? We can then look at a particular planning application with public rights of way implications (see item 7.4 below).

5.22 John Lee and Tom Huggon agreed to arrange a question and answer session that will take place ½ an hour before the next LAF meeting. **John Lee, Tom Huggon.**

6 UPDATE ON PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY WITHIN NOTTINGHAM: PUBLIC PATH ORDERS, CREATION AGREEMENTS, GATING ORDERS AND MODIFICATION ORDERS (JOHN LEE).

6.1 Budget Cuts: Today's Nottingham Evening Post reported cuts in the Road Safety budget. Traffic Management are in a similar position. It's not known how deep the cuts will be but central government is asking for all Local Authorities to look at efficiency savings of up to 25%

6.2 Diane Moore suggested that by working alongside the Council, the

NLAF can help identify where efficiency savings can be made.

6.3 Tom Huggon agreed with Diane Moore but suggested that the group wait until John Lee advises where the cuts are going to be.

6.4 Diane Moore: If you sit and wait, you may miss opportunities.

6.5 John Lee: A comprehensive spend review will tell us how much Councils are to lose.

6.6 Tom Huggon: There is a difference between capital and revenue budgets.

6.7 John Lee: Depending on the outcome of the spend review, the Local Transport Plan (LTP) may also be reviewed.

6.8 Roger Codling: Is it possible to cut the LTP?

6.9 John Lee: Yes, the money may not be there and we have to deal with the priorities. John Lee then used the maintenance budget as an example of where monies are reduced each year but the highway network continues to grow.

6.10 John Lee: Nottingham Train Station – 13 objections have been received and a meeting has taken place with the objectors who want the planning application to be changed so that the development will accommodate the existing public right of way or a new bridge be provided. However, these matters are not open for discussion. It is likely that it will result in a Public Inquiry next year.

6.11 John Lee: The Penfold Report highlights a number of recommendations. In the future, the Stopping Up process may be incorporated into the planning application process.

6.12 John Lee: Barrier Policy – Is in the final stages and will be taken to the relevant Council body for approval and adoption later this year.

6.13 John Lee: An application under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 has been made to add the footpath on the north side of Victoria Embankment to the Definitive Map and Statement which has been triggered by proposals for the flood defences.

6.14 John Lee: Evidence for the path at Greenwood School only shows two years user. Tom Huggon to chase Richard Brown who has evidence of over 20 years user. **Tom Huggon.**

7 **AOB**

7.1 Tom Huggon: The Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) is supposed to be finished by January 2011. When are we going to

commence with this?

7.2 John Lee: When the funding uncertainties are clarified, we will be in a better position to know what will or will not be funded and what the priorities will be.

7.3 Diane Moore: Are there any references to ROWIP2?

7.4 John Lee advised the forum that the Guide to Public Rights of Way, Planning and Development will be considered by Councillor Urquhart on the 20th July and if approved will be sent to Members in due course.

7.5 John Boland asked the group if there were any unfinished jobs. In response Tom Huggon stated that some projects had fallen off the timetable.

7.6 John Boland suggested that members write something down to bring to sub-meeting which John Lee suggested should take place at the end of August. **All**

7.7 Tom Huggon: Should this meeting take place over training?

7.8 Nick Hynes: The spending review will not have been completed until 20th August, should we wait until after then?

7.9 Tom Huggon: It's better to be ready knowing what we have done.

7.10 The following decided to have a sub meeting to discuss ROWIP progress: Diane Moore, Tom Huggon, John Boland, Nick Hynes, Angela Cooke, Bill Wright, Don Cameron, Roger Codling. **Matt Leek**

7.11 Angela Cooke: Having recently attended a cycling forum, it was pointed out that Gary Smeardon White of the Cycling Development Group did not know the LAF existed.

7.12 John Lee advised that he had spoken to Gary in the past about the LAF.

7.13 Discussion took place regarding a group outing. Suggestions included the River Leen cycle route. Angela Cooke to lead. Matt Leek to send out dates. **Matt Leek**

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

18:00 on Wednesday 6th October 2010 in the Dining Room at The Council House. (PLEASE NOTE EARLIER START TIME IN RELATION TO ITEM 5.22 OF THESE MINUTES).