


Date of issue: 22nd December, 2009

MEETING	LOCAL ACCESS FORUM Laurie Tucker (Chair), Councillors Dodds and Parmar, David Coe, Toby Evans, Malcolm Hellings, Margery Hitchman, Ian Houghton, Margaret Innis, and Ken Wright
DATE AND TIME:	TUESDAY, 12TH JANUARY, 2010 AT 5.30 PM
VENUE:	COMMITTEE ROOM 2, TOWN HALL, BATH ROAD, SLOUGH
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER: (for all enquiries)	TERESA CLARK 01753 875018

NOTICE OF MEETING

You are requested to attend the above Meeting at the time and date indicated to deal with the business set out in the following agenda.



RUTH BAGLEY
Chief Executive

NOTE TO MEMBERS

This meeting is an approved duty for the payment of travel expenses.

AGENDA

PART 1



<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>REPORT TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME ALLOCATED</u>
1.	Apologies		
2.	Declarations of Interest (Members are reminded of their duty to declare personal and prejudicial interests as set out in the Slough Local Access Forum Terms of Reference)		
3.	Minutes of Last meeting held on 10th September, 2009	1 - 6	
4.	Matters Arising (other than those on the agenda)	7 - 10	15 mins
5.	Membership Update	11 - 12	5 mins
6.	Evergreen Trust (Alan Woodley) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bioersivity Opportunity Area-Action Plan for Britwell • Garrard Road to Long Furlong Drive Diversion Order-Update 	13 - 18	15 mins
7.	Cycling Training Update- (Clare Robinson)		10 mins
8.	Gating Order Proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mildenhall to Lerwick Drive • Shaggy Calf Lane to Borderside (Esther Deacon) • Salt Hill Park Tunnel 	19 - 20	10 mins
9.	Route K- Walking and Cycling Route		10 mins
10.	Cinder Track Update		5 mins
11.	Regional and National Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EAF Meetings • DEFRA Consultation on 'Guidance on DDA 1995 and Structires on Rights of Way'. 	21 - 56	15 mins
12.	AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE, LAF Newsletter- Slough contribution • Beechwood Gardens Modification Order 		10 mins

Update

- Britwell Regeneration- Planning Application
- Draft 2009 Annual Report- Volunteers

13. Next Meeting Date- 12th May, 2010 at 5.30 p.m.

Press and Public

You are welcome to attend this meeting which is open to the press and public, as an observer. You will however be asked to leave before the Committee considers any items in the Part II agenda. Special facilities may be made available for disabled or non-English speaking persons. Please contact the Democratic Services Officer shown above for further details.

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Access Forum – Meeting held on Thursday, 10th September, 2009 at the Mayor's Conference Room, Town Hall, Bath Road, Slough

Present:-

LAF Members

Laurie Tucker, (Chair)
Malcolm Hellings
Margery Hitchman
Margaret Innis
Councillor Parmar
Ken Wright

Officers, Slough Borough Council

Savio DeCruz, Team Leader Integrated Transport
Bruce Hicks, Community Parks Project Officer
Gerald Pleace, Parks Development Officer
Vinay Vyas, Community Safety Projects Officer
Jacqui Wheeler, Rights of Way Officer

Observers

Les James

Apologies for Absence:- Councillor May Dodds, Toby Evans

35. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Parmar advised that in respect of item number 6 – Update on Mildenhall Road to Lerwick Road Gating Order, he was a resident of Mildenhall Road but would approach the matter with an open mind.

36. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting held on 13th May, 2009 were approved as a correct record.

37. Matters Arising

Letter to Eton College

JW advised that there were plans to put signage up on Bridleway no. 17. Eton College had confirmed that they were not in favour of widening the footpath.

Canal - Site meeting with British Waterways

JW reported that a letter had been sent to Slough BC outlining the Council's support of the Canal Basin Regeneration Scheme.

Cinder Track linked to Farnham Royal

The Forum noted that a letter had been received from Bucks County Council confirming their support for the proposal to upgrade the Farnham Royal footpath linking to the Cinder Track to a Bridleway as well as the Cinder Track.

38. Membership Update

There were no changes to the current membership to report. Les James indicated that he was happy to become a member of the Forum and it was agreed that JW would send him the necessary application form. **Action: JW**

39. Update on Mildenhall Road to Lerwick Drive Gating Order

Vinay Vyas advised the Forum that the initial questionnaire that had been sent to residents had been redrafted because it was felt that the original one was not clear in its purpose. Following objections received from Toby Evans and Ian Horton, Local Access Forum Members, the Council's Legal Team had decided that the Gating Order could not be made. Therefore a new questionnaire had been designed. The Officer asked the Forum to forward any comments regarding the questionnaire to him. An assessment of the relevant costs for the works was being considered at present and the questionnaire would then be sent to residents and a decision made on whether or not the Order should be pursued. It was noted that when previously circulated the questionnaire had been sent to 534 houses and 138 completed forms were received.

Councillor Parmar suggested that the same format should be used for future Gating Order questionnaires.

Agreed – That Forum Members would consider the detail of the revised questionnaire and forward any comments to Vinay Vyas.

40. Meeting with Transport Planning Consultants regarding SEGRO proposals for Slough Trading Estate- Update Report

JW advised that she had attended a meeting with Toby Evans, Ian Houghton and Dan Jenkins, Senior Consultant Development and Regeneration, Atkins. Possible improvements had been identified which included a cycle hire scheme between the railway stations and a surfaced pathway through Fenner Brockway to link with Whittaker Road and Littlebrook Avenue. The off road route from Pentland Road to Wentworth Avenue across Kennedy Park was discussed and it was thought that this was a good candidate for improvement. Dan Jenkins had advised that at present SEGRO was in the process of resolving technical disagreements and these needed to be resolved before specific schemes could be considered. It was thought that the applicant could be asked to contribute a sum of the money towards certain

Local Access Forum - 10.09.09

pedestrian/cycle schemes and the detail would be covered when the funding was received. JW was awaiting further information from the Consultant.

Agreed – That the current position be noted and that an update be brought to the next meeting in January 2010. **Action JW**

41. Cinder Track- new action plan- Environmental Visual Audit (EVA)

The Forum noted the Cinder Track Action Plan – June 2009 and was advised that a site visit had taken place on 19th May, 2009 attended by Jacqui Wheeler, Slough BC Officers, Ken Wright and other local residents. A number of outstanding issues were highlighted relating in particular to lighting and the new surface of the pathway. The Forum discussed the history of the Cinder Track and it was accepted that the track was a high priority for residents in the area. JW advised that she visited the Cinder Track regularly and there was a small budget available for use where necessary.

Agreed –

- (a) That JW would chase the progress on lighting with the relevant engineer. **Action JW**
- (b) That JW contact Kam Bhatti to discuss whether the community pay back scheme could be involved with necessary works on the Cinder Track. (It was also noted that Laurie Tucker was meeting with Kam Bhatti in the very near future and would approach this subject).
Action JW
- (c) That the subject of the Cinder Track be added to the Forum agenda as a standing item. **Action JW**

42. Regional and National Update including:

The Forum noted the content of the minutes of the England Access Forum meeting held on 30th June, 2009 and a report on the Defra Consultation on Coastal Change Policy and Natural England's Coastal Paths Audit Report. JW highlighted that there were concerns that the surfacing of shared use public rights of way were becoming a national problem due to the urbanisation of the countryside. It was felt that providing a hard surface for one category of user, cyclists, was forcing other legitimate users off the route. JW felt that as an urban Borough Slough was continually looking at routes to access rural areas out of the urbanised area.

Agreed – That JW would write to Natural England to advise that the issue was one that affected Slough and was concerned that action should be taken to address this. **Action JW**

In relation to the Defra consultation on the Coastal Change Policy, JW advised that she had considered the document with the assistance of Margery Hitchman and it was felt that the only part that was relevant to Slough was the section relating to Natural England's work with others to develop ways of

Local Access Forum - 10.09.09

managing access to the coast, its amenity and landscape value while allowing for the inevitable changes that coastal erosion brings about.

Agreed – That the Local Access Forum note the current position.

43. Feedback on meeting with John Coombe, Bucks LAF Member

JW tabled the notes of the meeting with John Coombe held on 12th August.

Agreed –

- (a) That a letter would be drafted on behalf of the Forum and forwarded to Parish Councils', Healthy Eating Groups etc. to advise that the Forum would be looking at issues to improve boundary links so that a connection between the local authorities areas bordering on Slough would be established. **Action JW**
- (b) The subject of boundary issues be considered by the Forum as a standard agenda item. **Action JW**
- (c) That work be done by the LAF to record details of the relevant routes. **Action JW**

44. Garrard Road to Long Furlong Drive Diversion Order

JW tabled details of a diversion order that was currently under discussion and it was noted that the Access Forum would be asked to comment on this in the near future.

Agreed – The Access Forum note the current position.

45. Any Other Business

It was noted that the South East LAF Members Newsletter had been received by Members.

Agreed – That the Slough Local Access Forum would explore ways in which it could have more input into the Newsletter.

Dog Waste Bags in Cippenham

JW referred to the problems caused in Cippenham whereby an individual was throwing bags containing dog waste into trees. Bruce Hicks reported that this same problem was occurring in other locations. Members were asked to consider ways in which this issue could be resolved.

Agreed – That the Local Access Forum would endorse any action necessary to resolve the issue.

Local Access Forum - 10.09.09

Beechwood Gardens – Modification Order Update

It was noted that the objection to this order lodged by the landowners had not yet been withdrawn, but that attempts were being made to persuade them to do so. JW was working on this at present.

Slough International Freight Exchange

Laurie Tucker advised the Forum that the Goodman Property Group was developing proposals for a new freight exchange facility on land to the north of the A4 in Colnbrook. This would be subject to a planning application and if approved would become one of the three to four new intermodal exchanges that were required to serve London and the South-East. The project had previously been refused on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate and was an enormous site, having 1600 lorry movements each day. He was particularly concerned about the public rights of way that ran through the subject site and understood that there would be a proposal to reroute these public paths which would involve the diversion of bridleways. He advised the Forum that it would be involved in future debate with regard to access issues.

Agreed – That the current position relating to the Freight Exchange be noted.

Ken Wright advised that a member of the public who lives in Quinbrooks had asked whether a path could be installed in the location for cyclists. JW commented that she would look at the site in question and discuss this with the relevant Officer but it very much depended on the ownership of the land.

Action: JW

46. Next Meeting Date

The Forum noted the dates of future meetings:

12th January, 2010.

12th May, 2010

8th September, 2010.

(Chair)

(Note: The Meeting opened at 5.30 pm and closed at 6.55 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

17 November 2009

Slough Local Access Forum

Buckinghamshire LAF
c/o Local Access Forum Secretary
Buckinghamshire County Council
County Hall, Walton Street,
Aylesbury
Bucks
HP20 1UA

Replies to: Jacqui Wheeler,
Officer to Slough Local Access Forum
Highways Engineering
Slough Borough Council
P.O Box 580
Slough, SL1 3UQ

Tel: 01753 477 479
Fax: 01753 875 660
Email: Localaccessforum@slough.gov.uk
Ref: Cross boundary links

Dear Buckinghamshire LAF,

The importance of walking and cycling links from residential areas to areas of urban fringe countryside is now widely recognised and has been established locally through the process of preparing Rights of Way Improvement Plans. Regular walking in attractive natural environments has proven benefits to overall health and well-being.

With Slough being mainly urban but surrounded by countryside, the Slough Local Access Forum has decided to look at issues local residents face in accessing the countryside just across the borough boundary.


To this end as an initial reference point the Chair of the Slough LAF met with a member of the Buckinghamshire LAF in the summer to have a discussion and attempt to identify the main issues. These were seen as including the following:

- Identification of cross boundary access currently available and assessing it's condition and quality.
- Public Transport availability to close by countryside
- Joint circular routes between areas – seen as most desirable to encourage new or occasional walkers.
- Importance of well marked routes. To enable the route to be followed without a map.
- Effective Marketing ie; leaflets targeting groups who wouldn't normally walk
- Requirement for practical joined up working involving other community groups eg; Parish Councils, healthy walking groups, local doctor's surgeries etc in both areas.

It is accepted that not all cross boundary paths will offer suitable opportunities for improvement or will meet the needs of local users. Therefore the Slough LAF wants to begin by producing an initial catalogue of current access available across the borough boundary, its condition and quality in terms of enjoyment to be gained for local users. Opportunities for improvements to routes and for promotion can then be identified based on data gathered.

Whilst we appreciate that this project is focused on providing routes for Slough residents, at some point it will require co-operation between adjoining areas and everyone can benefit from improved access. So if there is anyone with an interest in this issue within your organisation; or if you would like to offer another perspective please contact us at Slough LAF.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Laurie Tucker', written in a cursive style.

Laurie Tucker
Chair 2009, Slough Local Access Forum

Cc. Bucks Local Access Forum
Windsor and Maidenhead Local Access Forum
Spelthorne Local Access Forum
Hillingdon Local Access Forum
Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Britwell Parish Council
Wexham Court Parish Council
Wexham Parish Council
Burnham Parish Council

Tel: 020 8541 7634
Fax: 020 8541 9447
Email: susan.briant@surreycc.gov.uk
Your ref
Our ref DS/SB/3/1/

RECEIVED
DEC 2009

Surrey Countryside Access Forum

Ms Laurie Tucker
Chair 2009
Slough Local Access Forum
Highways Engineering
Slough Borough Council
P.O.Box 580
Slough
SL1 3UQ

c/o Sue Briant
Environment & Infrastructure
Room 365a, County Hall
Kingston upon Thames
Surrey, KT1 2DY

30 November 2009

Dear Ms Tucker

CROSS BOUNDARY PATHS

I write to you on behalf of the Surrey Countryside Access Forum which was established as an independent organisation¹ under the terms of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Its purpose is to advise relevant bodies on the improvement of public access to land in Surrey for the purpose of open air recreation and the enjoyment of the area. All Section 94(4) bodies have a statutory duty to have regard to the advice of the Forum.

Thank you for your letter of 17 November 2009. I have forwarded it to members of the Surrey Countryside Access Forum and will come back to you in due course.

Yours sincerely



Susan Briant
Secretary (Acting) to Surrey Countryside Access Forum

Please note that in the interests of open government, responses to this letter may be disclosed to the public and may be summarised for inclusion in committee reports.

¹ Please note that the advice contained within this letter is that of the Surrey Countryside Access Forum which, although administered by Surrey County Council, is entirely independent.

This page is intentionally left blank

SLOUGH LOCAL ACCESS FORUM – 12th January 2010

REPORT ON: LOCAL ACCESS FORUM MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL DATES

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

For members information.

2. List of Membership Renewal Dates

Member	Area of Interest	Renewal Date
Laurie Tucker (Chair)	Disabled Access	31 May 2010
Ian Houghton (Vice Chair)	Cycling	31 May 2010
Dave Coe	Environmental	31 May 2010
Margaret Innis	Environmental	31 May 2010
Margery Hitchman	Disabled access	31 May 2010
Ken Wright	Walking	24 June 2011
Toby Evans	Cycling	24 June 2011
Malcolm Hellings	Walking	24 June 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Britwell Biodiversity Opportunity Area Action Plan

SBC Owned & Managed Land

In bold – action that group is working on at present

Location	Habitat Type	Action	Responsibility	Timescale	Comments
Llamas Meadow	Wetland	Open stream up into culvert	EA/SBC		Stream - no real scope for opening up as no stream existed (above ground) through the valley just Lammas Pond near Whittaker Road. Water from outlet takes spring water from former Lammas Pond area and some rain water from the local area.
Lynch Hill Meadow Bunds	Grassland	Sew top of bund with wildflower seed mix and plug plant	SBC/Enterprise /David Kilby	Nov 09 onwards	Important to ensure no non-natives are planted that can spread to the LNRs. Look costings for comparing increase mowing from 5 – 8 cut or spraying off invasive weeds. Group to decide way forward
Lynch Hill Meadow Bunds	Grassland	Removal of invasive weeds from top of bund in Lynch Hill Valley BEFORE wild flower seed mix is planted	SBC/Enterprise /David Kilby	Dec/Jan	Look at costings for comparing increase mowing from 5 – 8 cut or spraying off invasive weeds
Llamas Meadow	Grassland	Leave unmown strips round edges to create a natural buffer zone to encourage insects	SBC/Enterprise /David Kilby	Jul	The unmown areas could be designed to create a border around the trees. This would provide good structure - and may help deter anti-social behaviour under the trees. Trail areas were left July/sept

Lynch Hill Meadow	Grassland	Install an additional fireproof litter bin at Long Furlong Drive end of Lynch Hill meadow or look for solution to solve litter problem at this spot. Focus work on the Lynchill 'bowl' area	SBC/ Enterprise/David Kilby/Britwell NAG	Oct 09	Trial litter bins have been installed along long furlong drive. Group to feedback on whether bins are in the best location.
Llamas Meadow Lynch Hill Meadow Cocksherd Green	Grassland	Put in additional small wooden posts to restrict mowing round margins of grassland (as used by Evergreen on edge of green walk)	Evergreen/Enterprise/David Kilby	Feb/March 10	The unmown areas could be designed to create a border around the trees. This would provide good structure - and may help deter anti-social behaviour under the trees.
Lynch Hill Meadow	Grassland	Create dog toilet areas to allow dog walkers to share access to area – install additional dog bin	Vinay Vyas Irene King/Britwell NAG	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New litter bins are multipurpose bins and can take dog waste • Work with community wardens to enforce dog fouling FPN wherever possible and dog warden Jackie Singer
Lynch Hill Meadow Llamas Meadow Cocksherd Green	Grassland	Change mowing regime to create some areas of longer grass suitable for native wild flowers and insects – create a mosaic mowing regime to provide a natural fire break. Longer grass would also discourage illegal motorcyclists	SBC/Britwell NAG/BBOWT	April 2010	At present there is a problem with illegal motorcyclist through Lynchill Meadow, Llamas and Cocksherd wood Look at installing barriers in Cocksherd wood. Work with community wardens to review situation in other sites and look for solutions in Lynchill Valley

Lynch Hill Meadow	Grassland	Fence off small area to allow biodiversity to flourish Install some protective fencing around any areas where planting has taken place or	SBC/Britwell NAG/Evergreen	Dec/Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group has decided location of areas for planting – species to be needs to be agreed
Lynch Hill Meadow	Wetland	Create pond in area at bottom of Lynch Hill valley where the area is wet and water table is higher	Evergreen/BBO WT		Pond Conservation may be able to help with this as part of the Million Ponds project -
Lynch Hill Meadow	Woodland	Tree planting – filling in gaps along bottom of valley	Evergreen	Completed March 2010	50 trees to be planted across many sites as part of Evergreen tree o'clock event in Dec
All areas	All habitats	Strengthen links to SEGRO for management of 'Millie' in light of their recently published 'Master plan' http://www.sloughite.com/Park/STE/MasterPlan	SBC/Evergreen		Work with SEGRO Slough Business Community Partnership (SBCP) to encourage SEGRO to play an active part in the project.
Green Walk	Hedgerow	Infilling gaps in hedgerow	Evergreen	Completed March 10	Part of Evergreen aggregates levy funding bid
Lynch Hill Valley		Improved disabled access, improve paths	SBC/evergreen/ Britwell NAG		Through the LAF discuss with Rights of Way officer Jacqui Wheeler to look at improving paths and disabled access
Lynch Hill Valley, Llamas Meadow (please can you let me know sites with no or poor signage)		Improve directional signage and site names	Evergreen/ SBC/Britwell NAG		Through the LAF discuss with Rights of Way officer Jacqui Wheeler to look at improving paths and disabled access

BBOWT Managed Land - Haymill LNR

Haymill LNR	Woodland	Open up the path on East side of Haymill NR so rubbish can be removed	BBOWT	Have some contact already- we aim to strengthen these links. Already have corporate links with some of the companies on the site.
Haymill LNR	Woodland	Strengthen links to SEGRO for management of 'Millie' in light of their recently published 'Master plan' http://www.sloughte.com/Park/STE/MasterPlan	BBOWT	
Haymill LNR	Woodland	Open access to southern end of Haymill	BBOWT	This is not possible- permission has already been denied by the EA
Haymill LNR	Woodland	Look at installing a bridge at southern end of Millie to allow completion of the circular walk	BBOWT	Aiming to open out and improve the entrance to NR on Eastern side-need to link with SBC as they have a little patch of land outside of that entrance which also has issues and needs work.
Haymill LNR	Woodland	Create new access points (or reopen existing) to make footpath on east side of Haymill Valley NR safer for visitors	BBOWT	We are hoping to put in at least 1 bridge, hopefully 2 but the locations are severely limited by EA permission being needed. Stepping stones would not be possible- impede the flow of the water. Also Health and Safety concerns.
Haymill LNR	Woodland	Create a circular walk round Haymill LNR – put in stepping stones to assist with river crossing	BBOWT	Have some contact already- we aim to

				strengthen these links. Already have corporate links with some of the companies on the site.
Haymill LNR	Woodland	Discuss with EA whether possible to provide access round the reservoir	EA/BBO WT	

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

SLOUGH LOCAL ACCESS FORUM – 12th January 2010

PHOTO OF SALT HILL TUNNELL WITH NEW LIGHTS



This page is intentionally left blank

SLOUGH LOCAL ACCESS FORUM – 12th January 2010

REPORT ON: DEFRA GOOD PRACTICE GUIDANCE ON DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION ACT AND STRUCTURES ON RIGHTS OF WAY FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

For information and to agree future recommendations to Slough Borough Council

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This guidance is concerned with structures on rights of way that interfere with the unrestricted public right of passage.
- 2.2 It is meant to offer good practice to help local highway authorities realise their obligations under the DDA legislation. The DDA applies to a highways authority's provision of public rights of way services. So that in carrying out their functions, authorities must make reasonable adjustments to ensure that it is not impossible or unreasonably difficult for people with disabilities to benefit from those functions, ie; use of rights of way.
- 2.3 Considerations extend to not only people in wheelchairs, but also; those with problems of mobility, manual dexterity and physical co-ordination.
- 2.4 Three main reasons for lawful existence of barriers, like gates and stiles on a public right of way.
 - A right of way came into being with structures already on it
 - An authority may agree to structures in making an order to create a new right of way or in diverting an existing right of way.
 - For footpaths and bridleways, structures may be authorised later by the authority under S147 Highways Act 1980 where there is a need to control stock for agricultural reasons.
- 2.5 The principle of "least restrictive access" needs to be followed in determining and balancing the needs of users, residents and landowners.

3. DEFRA GUIDANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 As a matter of good practice authorities should;
 - a) Have a published policy on how they will meet the requirements of the DDA in relation to public rights of way.
 - b) Ensure that any structures they give lawful authority to are clearly specified and documented
 - c) Consider including in any specification, provision to remove or vary the structure when the need for it changes or ceases
 - d) Consider displaying information on all lawful structures (including the accessibility) to enable somebody with limited mobility to plan routes other than just those that are officially designated as "easy access"

4. LAF ACTION TO BE AGREED

4.1 When the guidance is fully ratified from its draft form the Slough Local Access Forum make the following recommendations to Slough Borough Council;

- a) A policy is developed on how it will deal with structures on rights of way. This could be a stand alone document, part of a wider DDA or access policy or addressed within the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.
- b) Ensure that all available information on structures and limitations on rights of way in the borough be displayed on the map based internet site where and when possible.

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and structures (gate, gaps & stiles) on rights of way

Good practice guidance for local authorities

Version 1 draft 3_1

June 2009

Status: draft only – no official status

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
Telephone 020 7238 6000
Website: www.defra.gov.uk

© Crown copyright May 2009

Copyright in the typographical arrangement and design rests with the Crown. This publication (excluding the royal arms and departmental logos) may be reused free of charge in any format or medium provided that it is reused accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Information about this publication is available from:

Sponsorship, Landscape and Recreation Division
1/02 Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6EB
E-mail: recreation.access@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Telephone: 0117 372 6274

This guidance is also available on the Defra website at *(when published)*
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/access/index.htm>

Published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Contents

Guidance.....	4
Annex A – Terms of reference	7
Annex B – The Disability Discrimination Act and its relevance to rights of way	8
Annex C – Disability discrimination legislation and its application to rights of way.....	12
Annex D – Authorities’ policies on structures on rights of way	15
Annex E – More on structures and limitations.....	17
Annex F – Other legislation permitting the authorisation of structures	22
Annex G - Specifying structures.....	24
Annex H - Open and permissive Access.....	27
Annex I - Should structures be recorded as limitations or authorisations?.....	28
Annex J – Providing information to people with disabilities	29
Annex K – Other relevant or useful sources of information	30
Annex X – Document revision history	31

Guidance

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to offer good practice guidance to public authorities on the way in which disability discrimination legislation impacts on their functions in relation to gates, stiles and other such structures on public rights of way. It is intended to help authorities realise their obligations under this legislation.

Government is keen to encourage more outdoor physical activity and enjoyment of the countryside, because of the health and well-being benefits that this brings. Public rights of way are the primary means by which people access the countryside. But one of the key factors influencing the desire of people to use rights of way is how confident they can be that, in doing so, they will not encounter difficulties, including physical barriers. And for people with varying degrees of mobility the difficulties posed by gates and stiles can be a significant deterrent. If the Government's policy of encouraging access to the countryside is to be realised, removing or minimising such barriers will play a major part.

Background

Unlawful barriers, such as barbed wire across a path, can be tackled by authorities using the powers available to them. But dealing with barriers such as gates or stiles, which in many circumstances are lawfully erected on or across the route, requires more considered management.

A highway authority has a duty, under the Highways Act, to assert and protect the right of the public to use and enjoy a highway. The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) adds a further dimension, by requiring (broadly) that in carrying out their functions, public authorities must make reasonable adjustments to ensure that it is not impossible or unreasonably difficult for people with disabilities to benefit from those functions as others would do, or to show that there are good reasons for not doing so.

There is no specific reference in the DDA to any aspect of rights of way management and, as yet, no body of case law that can be referred to in the application of the DDA to rights of way. Nonetheless, it is clear that authorities are required to have regard to their obligations under the DDA wherever changes or additions to the rights of way network are proposed and are encouraged to make improvements to structures wherever appropriate opportunities arise.

The scope for improving accessibility

Improvements that would make it easier for people with disabilities to use rights of way would also make it easier for other users of rights of way, for example: parents with young children in buggies. But these have to be balanced against the operational needs of landowners. Authorities will need to take account of the wider context, such as the accessibility of the route as a whole and also need to be aware that some rights of way are valued, by those who use them, because of their challenging nature or intrinsic character. Other local factors that may need to be taken into account, when considering potential improvements, include the historical or aesthetic character of the existing

structures and landscape features and local custom and practice. Authorities will need to take all these factors into account in deciding what structure is appropriate in each case.

There are three main reasons for the lawful existence of barriers, such as gates or stiles, on a public right of way.

- A right of way may have come into being with such structures already on it.
- An authority may make an order to create a new right of way, or divert an existing right of way, and agree to such structures in making the order.
- In the case of a footpath or bridleway, such structures may be authorised later, where there is a need to control animals for agricultural reasons.

In all three cases, there are opportunities for authorities to make improvements that benefit people with disabilities, and in doing so meet their DDA obligations.

Where there are existing rights of way with existing structures, it is open to the authority to make incremental improvements in accessibility by negotiating agreements with land owners and managers. This is arguably where there has been the most scope for change for the better and many local authorities, with the co-operation of land owners and managers, have made significant network improvements in this way, by the widespread replacement of, for example, stiles with gates or kissing gates.

Such agreements may be informal or statutory¹. With such existing structures, there is no obligation on land owners and managers to enter into agreements of this kind and so it will be up to authorities to build on any likely mutual benefits. Whilst, in terms of future enforceability, there are long term advantages in statutory agreements, authorities will need to balance these against the willingness of land owners and managers to enter into binding agreements, on the basis that an improvement that is not binding is better than no improvement.

Where an authority is considering an order to create a new right of way or divert an existing right of way, or considering authorising a structure on an existing right of way, it has an opportunity to influence the type and standard of structure agreed to as part of this process. An authority has powers to deal with gates or stiles which are not installed and maintained as agreed and it is therefore in the interests of the authority and the public to both negotiate the “least restrictive” option in terms of accessibility and to specify each structure as clearly as possible in the legal documentation. As part of this process, authorities should consider including conditions that require the removal or modification of a structure once the original purpose for its installation no longer applies.

Policies & standards

Government considers it good practice for authorities to develop, and work to, an approved policy on structures on rights of way: this may be part of their Rights of Way Improvement Plan or part of a wider policy on the DDA. This policy should include a standard for structures, incorporating the “least restrictive access” principle. The standard and its associated designs may be an external one, such as BS 5709, or it

¹ See paragraphs C13 and C14.

may be one that has been developed locally with suitable expert advice. Following the standard put in place when specifying to new structure, or improving an existing structure, will help the authority meet its obligations under the DDA. Authorities may consider incorporating such a policy into their Rights of Way Improvement Plan; this Plan should, in any case, include the authority's assessment of the accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted persons and others with mobility problems².

The initial investment, in producing a standard for structures on public rights of way, may well be offset by making it easier to specify structures included in subsequent orders and by making it easier to resolve disputes over what kind of structure was permitted in each location. The single word "gate" for instance can potentially encompass structures which are lawful or unlawful and therefore cannot be relied upon to provide a DDA-compliant structure.

The DDA imposes certain obligations on public authorities and authorities may be required to demonstrate compliance with the DDA if challenged. It is for each authority to specify in their policies, procedures and standards how compliance might be achieved locally. But having a policy on structures will make it easier for authorities to both comply and demonstrate compliance with the DDA.

Main Recommendations

As a matter of good practice, authorities should:

- 1) have a published policy on how it will meet the requirements of the DDA in relation to public rights of way – see Annex D;
- 2) ensure that any structures they give lawful authority to are clearly specified and documented – see Annex G;
- 3) consider including in any specification, provision to remove or vary the structure when the need for it changes or ceases – see Annex C;
- 4) consider displaying information on all lawful structures (including the accessibility) to enable someone with limited mobility to plan routes other than just those that are officially designated as "easy access" – see Annex J.

At the moment, disabled people cannot be sure that a walk they have chosen from a map will be free of such impediments. While able-bodied walkers merely grab their Ordnance Survey maps and boots and can expect to get along the paths, disabled people have to forgo this spontaneity as no OS maps or, in my experience, council leaflets show the position of barriers. We have to rely on the kindness of able-bodied supporters checking out the route beforehand, to avoid having to turn around and to ensure there is a way through to our planned destination.³

Rosie Norris – from "Farewell to Kissing Gates"

² The statutory guidance on Rights of Way Improvement Plans can be accessed through the following link - <http://defraweb/wildlife-countryside/pdf/access/prow/rowip.pdf>

³ Open Space magazine Summer 2008 vol 29 no2 p 2-4. Reproduced by permission of the Open Spaces Society

Annex A – Terms of reference

A.1 This guidance has been developed with the assistance of a subgroup of the Rights of Way Review Committee which was convened in order to address the implications of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, as amended by the Disability Discrimination Act 2005, for structures on public rights of way.

A.2 It applies only within England.

A.3 It gives advice to public authorities on recording, authorising, managing and maintaining those gates, stiles and other such structures on public rights of way.

A.4 It is not statutory guidance as may be issued by the Secretary of State under section 69(2B) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

A.5 The guidance sets out Defra's policy on structures on public rights of way and its view of the law. It does not take the place of the legislation, but seeks to give an overview of it within a policy context

A.6 The relevant Acts referenced in this guidance as follows.

- The 1949 Act means the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949
- The 1980 Act means the Highways Act 1980
- The 1981 Act means the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
- The 1990 Act means the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
- The 1995 Act means the Disability Discrimination Act 1995
- The 2000 Act means the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- The 2005 Act means the Disability Discrimination Act 2005
- DDA means the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 as amended by the Disability Discrimination Act 2005

Public Authorities with rights of way and other access functions

A.7 Surveying authority: Where there are two tiers of authority, the county council is the surveying authority. Unitary authorities are the surveying authorities for their areas. Surveying authorities are responsible for the definitive map and statement.

A.8 Highway authority: Where there are two tiers of authority, the county council is the local highway authority. Unitary authorities are the local highway authorities for their areas. Broadly, local highway authorities are responsible for the management and maintenance of the rights of way network. Public path orders may be made by district councils that are neither the surveying authority, nor local highway authority. A national park authority may take over the rights of way functions from highway authorities by agreement.

A.9 Access authority: For land within a national park this is the national park authority and elsewhere is the highway authority. The access authority is responsible for implementing the open access functions of the 2000 Act.

A.10 The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: The Government Minister responsible for all matters relating to public rights of way.

Annex B – The Disability Discrimination Act and its relevance to rights of way

B.1 The DDA comprises the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 as amended by the Disability Discrimination Act 2005. There are numerous references to “the public” or “persons” in rights of way legislation; these terms will encompass those members of the public with a disability and the DDA therefore applies to all public rights of way. Section 146(1) of the Highways Act 1980 for instance requires a landowner to maintain a gate or stile to a standard that prevents unreasonable interference with the rights of the persons using the way.

B.2 The 1995 Act specified that the legislation is applicable to those who are “providers of services”. Section 19(2)(b) states that a person is a provider of services if they are “concerned with the provision, in the United Kingdom, of services to the public or to a section of the public”. The 2005 Act introduced section 49 to the 1995 Act which states that every public authority shall have specified duties under the Act where a public authority includes any person certain of whose functions are functions of a public nature. Under the two stated sections all functions of rights of way departments must therefore consider that the provisions of the Act(s) apply to their service.

B.3 It is important to understand the full scope of the term “disability” in relation to the legislation. For the purposes of the 1995 Act the definition provided is that a person has a disability if he or she has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on his or her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. A disabled person is a person who has a disability or who has had a disability in the past. The government has provided further [explanation](#)⁴ of this definition.

The Social Model of Disability

B.4 Some local authorities have adopted the ‘*Social Model of Disability*’. This model is based on the principle that disabled people do not face disadvantage because of their disabilities, but experience discrimination because of the way we organise society. This includes failure to make public services accessible, failure to remove barriers of assumption, stereotype and prejudice, and failure to outlaw unfair treatment in our daily lives. The social model looks beyond a person’s disability to *all* the relevant factors that affect their ability to be a full and equal participant in society.

B.5 The traditional view of disability is called the ‘*Medical Model of Disability*’, because it sees people as having medical problems. As a result people with disability are expected to see their disability as their problem, something they will have to make the best of and accept that there are many things they cannot do.

B.6 The social model of disability starts from a different perspective. Instead of focussing on a person’s disability, it presupposes that everyone is equal and that society erects barriers that prevent disabled people participating and restrict their opportunities. In terms of access to rights of way, instead of asking: “*How do people’s disabilities or health problems prevent them from using rights of way?*”, the social

⁴ Equality and Human Rights Commission website : “What is the definition of disability” page January 2009

model of disability would ask: “*What is it about public rights of way that makes it difficult for people with disabilities to use them?*”.

B.7 For the purposes of this guidance it is important that anybody involved with the potential implementation or maintenance of structures on rights of way does not restrict their DDA considerations purely to, for instance, the effect on people in wheelchairs. A non-exhaustive list would also encompass ensuring that the needs of those with problems of mobility, manual dexterity or physical coordination are considered and catered for. Within this context, gates that require excessive force to open, or have latches that are difficult to operate would fall within the ambit of the DDA.

B.8 The DDA goes further than just requiring that a public authority does not discriminate against disabled persons. Section 49A requires positive steps to be taken to:

- eliminate discrimination that is unlawful under the Act;
- eliminate harassment;
- promote equality of opportunity between disabled persons and other persons (this may mean treating disabled persons more favourably)
- promote positive attitudes towards disabled persons
- encourage participation by disabled persons in public life

B.9 The discrimination provisions are subject to certain exceptions, which contain an element of proportionality and reasonableness. With regard to cost, the Act says costs could be a factor in justifying non-compliance where “*treating the disabled person equally favourably would in the particular case involve substantial extra costs and, having regard to resources, the extra costs in that particular case would be too great*”.

B.10 There are further exemptions involving the protection of the rights and freedoms of others and ensuring that any requirements are a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. The Disability Rights Commission has produced a [Code of Practice](#)⁵ that describes the working of the DDA in greater detail (section 11 of the code relates to the matters discussed in this paragraph).

B.11 All of this applies only to functions within the authority’s powers and will not apply where a public authority is exercising a statutory power and has no discretion as to whether or how to exercise that power, or no discretion as to how to perform its duties, for example: adding an existing right of way with its existing limitations to the definitive map and statement.

Which individuals and bodies does the DDA apply to?

B.12 The DDA applies to a highway authority’s provision of public rights of way services.

⁵ Disability Discrimination Act 1995 Code of Practice. Rights of access: services to the public, public authority functions, private clubs and premises : Disability Rights Commission 2006

B.13 Guidance provided in 1997 by the Disability Unit of the Department of Social Security⁶ indicates that the owner of land over which a right of way runs is not regarded as a provider of services. Exclusion from the provisions of the DDA might not be extended to a landholder who is providing permitted access to their land. If the landholder is in receipt of payment for the permitted access it is less likely that they will be excluded from the DDA provisions.

Which areas of rights of way work does the DDA apply to?

B.14 The DDA will have an impact in a number of areas of rights of way work:

- the presence and character of structures such as gates and stiles on the ways
- the condition and character of the rights of way network
- production and implementation of a Rights of Way Improvement Plan

B.15 The first area is the subject of this guidance. The second is not addressed in detail in this guidance but as an illustration, making an order proposing to divert a section of tarmac path onto a new section of poorly drained, unsurfaced land would be likely to contravene the DDA due to the reduction in accessibility. The production of a Rights of Way Improvement Plan specifically required local authorities to engage with representatives of groups of users with mobility problems to determine their requirements, and the issue of structures on rights of way should have been addressed in drawing up the document.

B.16 More than most of the other legislation affecting rights of way, the DDA requires an authority to interpret the requirements when deciding how it applies to the provision of the service. While guidance and case law will provide information on which individual authorities can base their decisions, each case is a matter of judgement and authorities should bear in mind that they may be called upon to demonstrate that they have considered the DDA requirements involved in each judgement that they have made.

Guidance and reference documentation

B.17 Several documents have been published which clarify what is necessary to meet the requirements of the legislation and inform practitioners and interested parties of good practice in relation to structures on a right of way. These are

- The Rights of Way Improvement Plan adopted by the local authority. This document should have been informed during its development by the “Rights of Way Improvement Plans Statutory Guidance to Local Highway Authorities in England” [*published*](#)⁷ by Defra in 2002.

⁶ Guidance Note : The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 : Access to the countryside : Disability Unit (Department of Social Security) 1997

⁷ Rights of Way Improvement Plans. Statutory Guidance to Local Highway Authorities in England : Defra November 2002

- “By all reasonable means: inclusive access to the outdoors for disabled people” published by the Countryside Agency in 2005. Now [available](#)⁸ from Natural England’s website
- “BT/Countryside for All Good Practice Guide” extended CD edition published by the Fieldfare Trust in 2005. An [overview](#)⁹ is available from the Fieldfare Trust’s website.
- BS 5709:2006 “The British Standard for Gaps, Gates and Stiles” 3rd edition published by the British Standards Institute 2006 (latest) ISBN 0 580 48107 7. [Guidance](#)¹⁰ is available from the Pittecroft Trust on the application of the standard.

DRAFT - this document has no official status

⁸ By all reasonable means: inclusive access to the outdoors for disabled people : Countryside Agency 2005

⁹ Fieldfare Trust Website : “Countryside for all” page January 2009

¹⁰ Understanding the British Standard for Gaps Gates and Stiles BS5709:2006 explained : The Pittecroft Trust 2007

Annex C – Disability discrimination legislation and its application to rights of way

New rights of way

C.1 The point in time at which a new section of right of way is being planned, i.e. the drawing up of an agreement or a creation order or a diversion order, is the time at which any structures which are to become limitations must be specified. The authority's duties under the DDA are exercisable at this point. Negotiation between the parties should ensure that any order or agreement that goes forward contains the minimum number of structures that can legally be justified, each of which is the least restrictive under the individual requirements.

The recording of 'limitations'¹¹ in public path diversion orders

C.2 Where a diversion is being proposed, an authority will be in a strong negotiating position in relation to limitations. Firstly, it is under no legal obligation to exercise its power to make an order. Secondly, it may contend that an order that is not DDA compliant would not meet the confirmation requirements – that the diverted path is not substantially less convenient to the public and regard should be given to public enjoyment of the path or way as a whole – where “the public” will include those with a disability.

The recording of limitations in public path creation orders

C.3 A public path creation order will be laid out by the authority and that authority must satisfy itself that their actions are DDA compliant.

The recording of limitations in public path agreements

C.4 An authority may find itself in a delicate negotiating position when presented with an offer of a new right of way, or the addition of rights to an existing way, if the associated limitations that are required present greater barriers than would normally be acceptable. While there will be a case for accepting the best public path agreement offer that can be obtained, the DDA still applies under these circumstances and its effects should be considered against the advantages of the proposed scheme. An authority should be wary of entering into an agreement where public funding is being used to compensate the landholder and there are limitations proposed that do not meet the least restrictive access principle.

Existing rights of way with existing structures

C.5 Where there are existing rights of way with existing structures, it is open to the authority to make incremental improvements in accessibility by negotiating agreements with land owners and managers. Many local authorities, with the co-operation of land owners and managers, have made significant network improvements in this way, by the

¹¹ For more information on 'limitations' see Annex E

widespread replacement of, for example, stiles with gates or kissing gates. Such agreements may be informal or statutory – see s C13 and C.14.

The recording of structures authorised under section 147 of the 1980 Act

C.6 When a highway authority has received a valid application for the installation of a structure that otherwise meets the requirements of section 147 of the 1980 Act, the valid agricultural requirement to control animals must be balanced against the obligation of the authority to comply with the DDA. The assessment process should seek to define a suitable structure to satisfy both requirements.

C.7 Section 147(2A) of the 1980 Act requires an authority, in authorising a structure, to have particular regard to the needs of people with mobility problems.

Provision for the removal of structures when the original justification no longer applies

C.8 Paragraphs C.9 and C.10 apply in equal measure to a structure to be recorded as a limitation in a proposed public path creation order, diversion order or creation agreement and a proposed structure to be authorised under s147 of the 1980 Act (collectively a “proposed structure”).

C.9 Whilst the law provides for new structures to be introduced to the rights of way network under appropriate circumstances, an authority has no powers to remove a well-maintained, lawful structure unless specific provision is made within a public path order, agreement or s147 authorisation. There is therefore an inbuilt tendency within the system to increase the number of structures. In order to counter this tendency, authorities should consider making use of powers to include a stipulation within a public path order, agreement or s147 authorisation which would allow a structure to be removed, or altered to reduce its impact on users of the way, at a point in the future when it no longer fulfils the original valid need.

C.10 Suitable stipulations may be set out in an order, agreement or authorisation providing that when the grounds for requiring a structure originally stated by the applicant (or successor) no longer apply, the structure is no longer lawful and it then represents an obstruction that can be dealt with under section 143 of the 1980 Act. Should the landholder’s requirements change so markedly that the original terms of an order, agreement or authorisation no longer apply, there is no impediment to the submission of a further application for a different type of structure. Where a lawful structure bridges a boundary between the holdings of two landholders it will be necessary to take additional care over such stipulations as an applicant may have just as great an interest in controlling the ingress of, for instance, a neighbour’s stock as in controlling the egress of his own.

C.11 While each case will be judged on its individual merits, it will be helpful for an authority to have set out in its policy document (Annex D), the general considerations it will make in relation to the removal of a redundant structure. Careful thought will need to be given to what is a reasonable period after which the condition, requiring the removal of a structure, is engaged. Factors such as the local agricultural practices or safety considerations will clearly carry weight.

C.12 Irrespective of DDA considerations, the specification of a gate as a lawful structure, rather than a stile, offers more flexibility to all parties, as it can be either locked back or taken off its hinges when justifications change, thus replacing a gate with a gap very quickly as the need arises (or vice versa).

Other rights of way legislation specifically referring to the needs of people with disabilities

C.13 There is provision within section 147ZA of the 1980 Act for an existing lawful structure to be improved to permit those with mobility problems to be able to pass it without undue difficulty. An authority may enter into an agreement with a landowner, lessee or occupier of the land (but must obtain the consent of all of those affected parties who are not party to the agreement) to enable that authority to replace or improve an existing structure so that it can be used more easily by those with mobility problems. Subsections (3) and (4) provide for enduring conditions to be included in the agreement to ensure ongoing maintenance and accessibility for the public and these should be used where required to minimise the impact of the structure on the users of the way.

C.14 A lawful limitation (recorded on unrecorded) or a structure authorisation made under section 147 of the 1980 Act is permanently superseded by the details of the replacement structure specified in an agreement made under section 147ZA of the 1980 Act from the effective date (subsections 5(c) and 5(b) respectively). The effective date is either a date specified in the agreement or the first anniversary of that agreement. Section 53 of the 1981 Act therefore requires that the definitive statement should be revised by means of a legal event modification order to record the updated details of a limitation superseded under a section 147ZA Highways Act 1980 agreement.

The concept of “overall” benefit of a proposed scheme

C.15 The earlier paragraphs of this annex have focused on how the DDA applies to an individual structure in isolation. A situation that may arise from time to time is where there appears to be an overall benefit to a scheme but with an isolated drawback (for instance the diversion of a way to an alignment that requires fewer structures upon it but has a single unavoidable limitation that will cause some problems to one group of people with limited mobility). The legislation on its own is not always going to assist an authority in deciding where its duties lie. Looking at the effect of the new limitation in the example would lead to the conclusion that the requirements of section 21 of the DDA are not being met in that it may make it impossible for a person to make use of the service because of the limitation, whereas the rerouting of the way to an alignment that reduces the number of structures may make the route more accessible to other people with different problems, thus meeting the promotion of equality requirements of section 49A of the DDA. In coming to a conclusion under these difficult circumstances the authority will need to be able to show that it has made all reasonable efforts to understand where the balance of benefit lies and that the scheme pursued (if it is decided to proceed) contains the maximum benefits available (i.e. that options that avoided the defined limitations were assessed).

Annex D – Authorities’ policies on structures on rights of way

Policy

D.1 Government considers that it would be good practice for each highway authority, if it has not already done so, to develop and publish a policy on how it deals with structures on rights of way. Whether this is a document in its own right, part of an authority’s wider DDA or access policy or is addressed within a Rights of Way Improvement Plan is not as important as the fact that the policy exists. This guidance makes a small number of further recommendations but they are at the level of a principle and do not go into the detail of the local implementation – this is what will be specified in the policy. A non-exhaustive list of factors that might be considered for inclusion in a policy is:

- the standards for the design of proposed structures (paragraphs D.3 to D.10)
- dealing with existing structures that appear to be unlawful
- removal of existing structures
- repair and replacement of existing structures
- conditions for the authorisation of structures
- the authority’s approach to historical structures, those of characteristic local design or structures affected by landscape considerations
- dealing with proposed diversions and the structures that a landholder wishes to install on the created section of the way.
- dealing with proposed path creation agreements and the structures that a landholder wishes to install on the created section of the way.

D.2 The standards for the design of proposed structures will be a major part of showing compliance with the DDA and these are considered in more detail below.

BS 5709

D.3 The British Standards Institute have developed “BS 5709 - The British Standard for Gaps, Gates and Stiles” to provide guidance to practitioners in specifying rights of way structures that can be conveniently and safely used by the public. In isolation “BS” standards have no explicit statutory force. They can acquire statutory force by means of being referenced in primary legislation. But this is not the case with either the DDA or any rights of way legislation. It has however attained a high degree of credibility and the public are likely to be reassured by the fact that a structure complies with a “BS” standard. Some of its eight key rules have been endorsed in other publications – particularly rule one which calls for the least restrictive option when selecting a structure to be approved. The options, each of which has their functional requirements laid out in BS 5709, are in increasing scale of restriction:

- Gap
- Gate
- Kissing Gate (not applicable to bridleways)
- Stile (not applicable to bridleways)

It is difficult to envisage a locally produced standard that will materially vary from this rule while ensuring that an authority adheres to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination legislation.

D.4 Some misunderstandings have arisen regarding the degree of constraint imposed by the BS 5709. It does not merely provide identikit designs of stiles and gates, but puts forward an approach and the performance requirements required of any structure which is to meet the standard. Illustrations of some conforming structures are presented in the standard as examples.

D.5 There are a number of suppliers who design and manufacture structures that can conform to BS 5709 if appropriately installed. It must be emphasised that simply buying a “BS 5709 compliant” structure does not meet the standard. Assessment of the specific requirement must be made in the first instance and the most appropriate form of structure then selected.

D.6 At that point, if it has been found necessary to implement a structure, the best value model can be selected from a supplier. As an illustration, installing a “BS 5709” gate where a gap is appropriate would not meet the standard. It should also be borne in mind that a BS 5709 specification for a structure covers more than just the physical entity, as it will define additional factors such as ground conditions and manoeuvring space requirements.

Local standards

D.7 As there is no legislation applicable to rights of way that prescribes the standards for structures, it is open to an authority to develop their own local standard. This would necessitate the enrolment of persons with a good knowledge of engineering, the requirements of the legislation and the needs of people with disabilities. In addition, it is likely to require public consultation on any proposals that are brought forward.

D.8 There are authorities that have developed their own standards, or have based their standards on BS 5709 with specified variations that have been found necessary because of local requirements. It is recommended that where authorities are contemplating moving away from BS 5709 they should be clear about their reasons for doing so and their ability to demonstrate compliance with the DDA if challenged.

D.9 It is also recommended that those elements of the local standard that describe matters other than the physical structure are clearly specified. This requirement would include matters such as the state of the ground in the vicinity of the structure and the position of the structure in relation to other features (setting a bridle gate back from the roadside, for instance, to allow manoeuvring space).

Annex E – More on structures and limitations

E.1 This guidance is concerned with structures on rights of way that interfere with the unrestricted public right of passage. Structures that are commonly encountered are stiles and gates but will include gaps if the public is restricted in the use of what is otherwise defined, in the definitive map and statement, as the full width of the way (or the width commonly used where there is no statement).

E.2 Any restriction imposed by a structure on the free exercise of public rights of the lawful user classes on any right of way is an offence under section 137 of the 1980 Act and also a common law nuisance unless :

- it meets the specification of a limitation insofar as it is recorded on the definitive map and statement under section 53 of the 1981 Act or
- it meets the specification and stipulations¹² of an authorisation made under section 147 of the 1980 Act or
- it has been installed by an authority using their powers under section 66 or 115B of the 1980 Act or has been installed as the result of the making of a gating order or a traffic regulation order or
- it can be shown to have existed at the time that the way was dedicated (i.e. it represents an unrecorded limitation).

E.3 A structure recorded either as a limitation or as an authorised structure is referred to as “*lawful*” in this guidance.

E.4 In the past, due to genuine misunderstandings or faulty records of existing lawful structures, highway authorities have occasionally supplied gate or stile kits for landowners or user groups to install at locations for which there was no lawful authority for such a structure. The act of donating or contributing to the installation of a structure confers no legality to that structure.

Limitations

E.5 When the definitive maps and statements for England were first drawn up under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Act required authorities to record not only the route and, in some cases, the width of each right of way, but also the rights that existed along it. In addition, the Act required authorities to record: “*any limitations and conditions affecting the public right of way thereover, as in the opinion of the authority it is expedient to record*”. It is the limitations and conditions that this guidance is concerned with.

E.6 A limitation, in the context of rights of way, can be defined as anything (save for the authorised structures described in paragraphs E.17 to E.25 and Annex F) which would represent an illegal interference with the public’s entitlement to full enjoyment of the specified rights associated with the way, were it not for the fact that the way had originally been created or dedicated subject to the limitation. The limitation may be the

¹² The legislation actually uses the term “conditions” however the term “stipulations” is substituted in this guidance to minimise confusion with use of the separate term “condition” used in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 as referred to in paragraphs E5 and E6.

result of a natural feature or it may be a physical feature installed by the landowner, such as a gate or stile. What was meant in the 1949 Act by a condition has never been satisfactorily settled.

E.7 What is defined and accepted as a limitation when the way is created is then fixed unless, as case law confirms¹³, the right of way is effectively rededicated without the limitation or an agreement is made between the landholder and the highway authority to make a structure recorded as a limitation more convenient for the public to use (see paragraphs C.13 and C.14).

Limitations on rights of way that come into being through a public path diversion order or path creation agreement

E.8 Public rights of way that have been dedicated by a landowner as part of a public path creation agreement (section 25 of the 1980 Act) or a section of a way that has been created by means of a diversion order (section 119 of the 1980 Act) may come into being with specified limitations on them. There is no constraint on the scope of, or reasons for, a limitation proposed by a landowner, although the overall effect on the public of all of the proposed limitations must be taken into account by an order making authority when deciding whether or not to make an order or enter into an agreement.

Limitations on rights of way that come into being through a public path creation order

E.9 Public rights of way that come into being through a creation order (section 26 of the 1980 Act) are not created by the landowner, indeed by their nature they may well come into being against the landowner's wishes, but may nevertheless be created with limitations specified by the order making authority.

Limitations on rights of way that come into being through presumed dedication or on the basis of historical evidence

E.10 A public right of way may have come into being through presumed dedication rather than by means of a public path order or a public path creation agreement. In most cases the qualifying period of use will cover the statutory elapsed 20 years. Under this circumstance the way will have been used, since the start of the period, with any limitations in place, and therefore those limitations must be recorded on the definitive map and statement. In the case where a right of way has been proved to have come into being by means of evidence provided by historical documentation, then that documentation may also show that there had always been a limitation at a particular point on a way. In either case there is no freedom to negotiate over the scope of any limitation as the rights will have come into being with those limitations in place.

Structures that may be recorded as limitations

E.11 In principle any structure may be recorded as a limitation on a right of way if it is proved to be present at the time that the right of way is dedicated. By this mechanism a gate can be a lawful limitation on a restricted byway (RB) or byway open to all traffic

¹³ Gloucestershire County Council v Farrow [1985] 1WLR 741

(BOAT). In the case of a RB only, a gate can also be recorded as a limitation as the result of a diversion order, creation order or creation agreement made, respectively, under s119, s26 or s25 of the 1980 Act. Lawful gates may therefore be encountered on restricted byways and byways open to all traffic. Diversion orders made under s116 of the 1980 Act cannot however give rise to gates on restricted byways and byways open to all traffic. Structures that are clearly incompatible with lawful use of the highway, such as a stile on a bridleway, indicate that further investigations into either the status of the way or the legitimacy of the structure are required.

Maintenance of structures recorded as limitations

E.12 Section 146 of the 1980 Act imposes on a landowner the duty to maintain a lawful limitation consisting of a gate, stile or other structure across a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway in a safe condition and to a standard that prevents unreasonable interference with the rights of someone using the way. If a landowner fails to maintain a structure recorded as a limitation to the required standard then the structure automatically becomes an obstruction and can be dealt with under section 143 of the 1980 Act. Where a highway authority fails to carry out its duties in dealing with an obstruction, the public are entitled to serve notice on the authority under the process defined in sections 130A-130D of the 1980 Act.

Recording of limitations

E.13 Because a limitation would otherwise be regarded as an obstruction on a public right of way, it is important that these details are accurately recorded on the definitive map and statement. This duty is imposed on surveying authorities by section 53(2)(b) of the 1981 Act. Where a new creation agreement, creation order or diversion order is being brought forward it should therefore clearly specify all proposed limitations for inclusion in the definitive statement should the order be confirmed or agreement completed.

Publicising records of limitations

E.14 Members of the public have a statutory right to view the definitive map and statement, details of which include the recorded limitations.

Is a bridge a limitation?

E.15 By the definition laid out in paragraph E.6, a structure which permits full use of the defined highway is not a limitation. Section 328(2) of the 1980 Act makes clear that if a highway passes over a bridge or through a tunnel then the bridge or tunnel is part of the highway. An order or creation agreement should define the route as intended, and therefore all bridges should be fully specified in the public path order or agreement describing the way. Where a bridge results in a reduction in the width of the width of way such that it warrants recording on definitive statement, this should be expressed as a change in the width of the highway rather than a limitation.

Authorised structures

E.16 In addition to limitations, landholder may lawfully install structures on certain types of highway by means of a specific authorisation under section 147 of the 1980 Act, application for which may only be made on restricted grounds.

E.17 Section 147 of the 1980 Act permits an authority to authorise the erection of stiles, gates or other works on a footpath or bridleway to prevent the ingress or egress of animals so that agricultural activities, including forestry and the keeping of horses, can be carried out efficiently. The authority, in granting authorisation, may make that authorisation subject to stipulations. In doing so it will specify the manner in which the structure shall be erected and maintained, such that if the stipulations are not met the structure is deemed to be an obstruction and is subject to the powers of removal under section 143 or section 333 of the 1980 Act.

E.18 There is no scope under section 147 of the 1980 Act to authorise a landholder to install any structures on a restricted byway (RB) or a byway open to all traffic (BOAT) (paragraph F.3 separately references an authority's right to install a cattle grid in a highway).

E.19 The authorisation process for a structure requires the completion of several stages:

- The landowner, lessee or occupier (landholder) of the land affected must apply in writing to the highway authority (many authorities maintain standard application forms)
- The authority should make reasonable efforts to satisfy themselves of the landholder's status
- The authority must satisfy themselves that the land is either already in use or being brought into use for agriculture (including forestry or the breeding or keeping of horses)
- The authority must satisfy themselves that the structures are for the purpose of preventing the ingress or egress of animals
- The authority may consider alternative means of controlling the animals that do not involve placing structures across the right of way, such as the erection of fencing alongside the path to leave a clear corridor along the line of the route. There is a balance to be struck between placing a burden on the landholder and imposing inconvenience on the public using the right of way. An example that might need careful consideration is where a field is being divided into a number of horse paddocks, the boundary of each of which crosses a right of way.
- The authority must consider the stipulations that they wish to impose under section 147(2) of the 1980 Act for maintenance and for enabling the right of way to be used without undue inconvenience. This is the point at which the authority's duties under the DDA are exercisable. The provision of section 147(2A) to have regard to the needs of persons with mobility problems must be adhered to and therefore suitable designs of structure should be specified (see paragraph G.4).
- The landholder must sign agreement to the terms

Subsequently

- Installation of the structure must be to the standards and stipulations specified. Following the satisfactory installation of a structure the landholder is entitled to a 25% minimum contribution from the highway authority towards any maintenance costs of the structure that are subsequently incurred, subject to any conditions in the authorisation.

E.20 The authorisation of a structure under section 147 of the 1980 Act by a highway authority is a discretionary power, however authorisation should not be unreasonably¹⁴ withheld where a clear and legitimate need has been demonstrated.

Removal of redundant authorised structures

E.21 Section 147 of the 1980 Act makes no specific provision for the removal of an authorised structure once the original justification is no longer valid. It does however make provision for the authorisation to be conditional and authorities may consider an authorisation that permits them to require the removal, or reduction in effect on a user, of a structure once the need for it has passed or changed.

Maintenance of authorised structures

E.22 Section 146 of the 1980 Act imposes on a landowner the duty to maintain an authorised gate, stile or other structure across a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway in a safe condition and to a standard that prevents unreasonable interference with the rights of someone using the way. If a landowner fails to maintain an authorised structure to the required standard then that authorisation lapses and the structure automatically becomes an obstruction and can be dealt with under section 143 of the 1980 Act. Where a highway authority fails to carry out its duties in dealing with an obstruction, the public are entitled to serve notice on the authority under the process defined in sections 130A-130D of the 1980 Act.

Records of authorised structures

E.23 Copies of the application, supporting information and authorisation, including the specification and stipulations applying to any lawful structure, should be retained by the highway authority.

Publicising records of authorised structures

E.24 At present there is no specific right to view records of currently authorised structures, although section 320 of the Highways Act 1980 requires any authorisation to be in writing and any such document can potentially be the subject of a Freedom of Information (FOI) or Environmental Information (EIR) request.

¹⁴ Where the definition of “unreasonable” follows the Wednesbury principles

Annex F – Other legislation permitting the authorisation of structures

F.1 Diversion of a public right of way can be achieved by confirmation and, where required, certification of orders made under section 257 of the 1990 Act. Unlike equivalent diversions made under the 1980 Act there is no specific reference in the Act to any limitations and they cannot therefore be recorded under this legislation. Following the confirmation of a diversion order made under the 1990 Act a highway may consider the implementation of structures on the new section of the way under the powers described below in paragraphs F.2 and F.3. Where appropriate, a landholder may also apply for the authorisation of a structure under the provisions of section 147 of the 1980 Act, following the diversion of a right of way under the 1990 Act.

F.2 Sections 66(2) and 66(3) of the 1980 Act permit a local authority to provide and maintain in a footpath, bridleway, restricted byway or byway open to all traffic any barriers, posts, rails or fences as is necessary to safeguard anybody using the highway. In many cases this provision is exercised to place barriers alongside the way to stop users endangering themselves. As an example, barriers which stop children running out into a vehicular highway at the end of a footpath are often provided. The authority may also remove any barrier erected under this provision. An authority should be aware that in installing a barrier under the provisions of section 66 of the 1980 Act, while benefiting one group of the wider public, they may also be adversely affecting another group in the exercise of their lawful rights. The rights of all legitimate users should be balanced when considering the implementation of a structure under the particular circumstances encountered in each case.

F.3 Section 82 of the 1980 Act permits an authority to install a cattle grid in a public vehicular highway. The installation may follow representations made by landholders that a grid is necessary to control the passage of animals. It will be necessary to provide a means by which animals under control can bypass the cattle grid.

F.4 Section 115B of the 1980 Act permits an authority to place structures on a highway for, amongst other reasons, providing a service for the benefit of the public. If at some point in time the structure no longer fulfils the requirement for which it was installed, then the authority will be under a duty to remove it in order that it does not, by definition, become an obstruction.

F.5 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 permits a traffic authority to manage and control traffic on any highway, including all of the individual categories of right of way, on either a permanent or temporary basis, by means of a traffic regulation order. The scope for traffic regulation encompasses complete closure, governing the types of user permitted, the hours of use and the direction of permitted travel. In many cases the control will be exerted by the installation of structures at either end of the affected section of highway. But unlike the other measures covered by this guidance, orders made under this legislation do not authorise the structures themselves, but instead remove the right of access. Although the principles of the DDA will still apply to a local authority where a traffic regulation order is being sought this particular circumstance will not be explored further in this guidance.

F.6 Sections 129A to 129G of the Highways Act 1980 provide for the making of gating orders. A gating order permits a highway authority to restrict access to most types of highway, including all classifications of rights of way, for the purpose of reducing crime. The order is effected by the installation of a lockable gated barrier at either end of the specified length of highway and may be for all times of the day or for specified periods. In most cases the effect is to close of a right of way to the public, although the public rights themselves are not extinguished. In principle public use of the way may later be enjoyed if it is decided at one of the periodic reviews of the gating order that the restrictions are no longer required due to a reduction in criminality. Although the principles of the DDA will still apply to a local authority where a gating order is being sought or renewed this particular circumstance will not be explored further here.

DRAFT - this document has no official status

Annex G - Specifying structures

G.1 Because of the need to comply with their duties under the DDA, it will be in the interests of authorities to clearly specify any lawful structures on rights of way that they agree to. A specification of a “gate” in a public path order or an authorisation, which might previously have been satisfactory, defines the structure insufficiently to be able to show the authority’s compliance with the DDA and may hamper the authority in the exercise of its enforcement duties.

G.2 Detailed specification of a structure in the legal records will simplify the task of ensuring that DDA compliant structures are installed and later maintained to the required standard. In addition, while a more detailed structure specification than has previously been used requires a degree of additional work at the stage where an order or an agreement is being drawn up (albeit just a reference to a published standard in the majority of cases), that level of detail will place a highway authority in a much stronger position should any general maintenance or enforcement issues arise later on.

Number of structures

G.3 The number of structures on a route should be kept to the minimum that are necessary. There should be a clear and justifiable reason for each structure.

Type of structure

G.4 The type of structure should be the least restrictive that is consistent with the landholder’s requirement. The authority may consider defining a specification which is variable according to the changes in land use. It might, for instance, indicate a gate while a field crossed by a path is used for grazing animals, but a gap if the land is subsequently converted to arable use; careful consideration would need to be given to what is a reasonable period of time over which a change of use should trigger a change to a structure.

Standard and design

G.5 The standard and design of each lawful structure should ensure that the DDA obligations are met and it should be documented to such an extent that if there is a disagreement over the standard of the installed structure, or subsequent maintenance issues, the documentation will conclusively show what is lawful. The standard which is being met should be recorded and this will need to specify the version of the standard which is operative at the time because there is no implicit obligation on a landowner to upgrade lawful structures if or when a new version of a standard is released. For instance if BS 5709 is to be specified then the version should be documented, e.g. BS 5709:2006, and a gate built to that standard will always meet that requirement, whereas a gate built to BS 5709 (implicitly the current version) may not meet a future version of the standard. Similarly, if an authority has drawn up its own specifications and standards the version number should be stated in the documentation e.g. Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3.

G.6 It is not only physical dimensions of a structure that are of relevance when defining a standard for structures. The means of latching, the reasonable force required

to open a gate and the manoeuvring space available are all matters that will have a major bearing on the ease of use of the structure.

G.7 In principle there is no reason that some form of rolling standard (“a bridle gate to the latest version of BS 5709”) cannot explicitly be written into an authorisation or limitation. It is not recommended that this approach is followed however, as it runs the risk of imposing an unquantifiable future liability on landholders and is at risk of making every structure installed to this specification an obstruction overnight if a new version of the standard is published.

Model description of a limitation on a public path order or agreement

G.8 The order or agreement should describe all of the limitations that will be encountered on the proposed new section of way. This will include, for instance, existing structures on the land that are to be retained, such as gates. For reasons of legal clarity it is recommended that if there are to be no limitations then the order or agreement should record this.

G.9 For reasons of transparency and scrutiny it is considered good practice to define the detail of any limitation in an order (or to cross reference a design document) containing the following;

- Style of structure e.g. gate
- Standard (and version) e.g. BS 5709:2006 or Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3
- Any variances from the standard (the reasons for this are likely to need to be documented)
- Design e.g. Fig 3
- Position e.g. grid reference X,Y
- Variation or stipulations which might require removal e.g. gate permitted if land is being used for grazing, gap to Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3 Fig 1 at the same position otherwise.
- It is assumed that overall design details of the limitation, such as provision for manoeuvring space, ground condition or fencing adjacent to the actual structure, are included in the standard used by the authority. If this is not the case then these details should be included.

It should be borne in mind that a limitation included in a confirmed order is not capable of being revised (subject to rededication referenced in paragraph E.7 or the completion of an accessibility agreement made under section 147ZA of the 1980 Act).

Model description of an authorised structure

G.10 The form of authorisation for a structure under section 147 of the 1980 Act is not defined and is open to local preference. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the specification section of the document should follow the principle set out in paragraph G.9 (or to cross reference a design document) containing the following;

- Style of structure e.g. bridle gate

- Standard (and version) e.g. BS 5709:2006 or Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3.
- Any variances from the standard (the reasons for this are likely to need to be documented)
- Design e.g. Fig 3
- Position e.g. grid reference X,Y
- Variation or stipulations which might require removal e.g. gate permitted if land is being used for grazing, gap to Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3 Fig 1 at the same position otherwise.
- It is assumed that overall design details of the limitation, such as provision for manoeuvring space, ground condition or fencing adjacent to the actual structure, are included in the standard used by the authority. If this is not the case then these details should be included.

A highway authority may wish to consider putting a provision in the stipulations section of an authorisation that would permit the rescinding of the authorisation on any reasonable grounds.

Model description of a structure which is the subject of an improved accessibility agreement

G.11 In drawing up an agreement between a landholder and a highway authority to specify the replacement or improvement of a structure under section 147ZA of the 1980 Act it is recommended that the structure is defined to the same level of detail as required for a limitation or a section 147 Highways Act 1980 authorised structure. In principle maintenance and enforcement issues should be more straightforward than for other lawful structures because the highway authority itself will take over many of the maintenance responsibilities, however a full specification will nevertheless make clear to all concerned what is required.

- Style of structure e.g. bridle gate
- Standard (and version) e.g. BS 5709:2006 or Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3.
- Any variances from the standard (the reasons for this are likely to need to be documented)
- Design e.g. Fig 3
- Position e.g. grid reference X,Y
- Variation or stipulations which might require removal e.g. gate permitted if land is being used for grazing, gap to Xshire rights of way structures specification version 3 Fig 1 at the same position otherwise.
- It is assumed that overall design details of the limitation, such as provision for manoeuvring space, ground condition or fencing adjacent to the actual structure, are included in the standard used by the authority. If this is not the case then these details should be included.
- Particulars of the agreed maintenance responsibilities.

A highway authority may wish to consider putting a provision in the constraints section of an agreement that would permit it to remove a structure on any reasonable grounds.

Annex H - Open and permissive Access

H.1 Structures such as gaps, gates and stiles are also to be found providing access to land designated as access land under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. In most cases the local highway authority acts as the access authority, the body responsible for managing the implementation of the access right, unless the land affected lies within a national park, in which case the national park authority acts as the access authority. As part of their duties the access authority will have identified any improvements necessary to permit the public to reach and enjoy the access land. An Access Management Grant Scheme was set up to provide funding to authorities and land managers to facilitate public access. The [guidance](#)¹⁵ makes it clear (stage 3 – consultation and stage 4 – identifying visitor management measures required and associated costs) that the needs of people with disabilities are to be considered and accommodated where it is reasonable to do so under the terms of the DDA.

H.2 Sections 34 to 39 of the 2000 Act permit an access authority to provide linear access to access land, either by agreement or imposition where necessary and also permit the improvement or creation of points of access to the land by agreement or imposition although, in deciding where that access should be provided, they must have regard to the requirements of efficient land management. This function also applies to maintenance of any structures. The access will be by means of [gaps, gates or stiles](#)¹⁶. As described in annex G, the specification of any structure will need to be clearly defined and, where necessary, available to the public in order to show that the authority's DDA obligations have been discharged.

H.3 As a matter of good practice, authorities should aim to apply the principles set out in this guidance to permissive footpaths and bridleways, particularly if public funding is used to encourage landowners to provide such ways.

¹⁵ Access Management Grant Scheme – Information and how to apply CA 177: Countryside Agency March 2005

¹⁶ Part 1 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Guidance on means of access (gates, stiles, etc) to and within access land : Defra

Annex I - Should structures be recorded as limitations or authorisations?

I.1 A matter of some controversy is whether, in making a diversion order, creation order or creation agreement, it is better to record structures on the new section of the way as limitations within the order or to leave all references out and to authorise any structures under subsequent section 147 Highways Act 1980 ("section 147") applications.

I.2 Structures that a landholder wishes to install from the outset, on the way that is to be created, must be recorded as a limitation in the diversion order (and the definitive statement if the order is confirmed). This is in any event the preferred option, since any such limitations will be shown on the definitive map and statement and it is clearer to the public whether a structure is lawful. Nevertheless, it remains open to a landowner to apply subsequently for the authorisation of structures provided they fall within the terms of section 147.

I.3 It should therefore be made clear to an applicant for a diversion that the authorisation of any structures subsequent to the confirmation of a diversion order will be made strictly in line with the requirements of section 147 of the 1980 Act and will relate to the agricultural need to control the ingress or egress of animals and nothing else. If the applicant feels that a structure is required for any reason other than that catered for by section 147, for example property security or the prevention of fly-tipping, then the only way to achieve this is to specify a limitation in the schedule to the order.

I.4 In either case, authorities should make clear to an applicant that any proposals for structures on the right of way concerned will be considered under the authority's DDA responsibilities and this will be one of the elements that influence the decision on whether or not to proceed with the proposal.

Annex J – Providing information to people with disabilities

J.1 There is a requirement to record limitations on the definitive statement and to record authorised structures on written documents, both of which the public have a right to inspect. For those authorities that are making the record of the public rights of way network available on their map based internet sites the possibility of displaying information on all lawful structures (including the accessibility) offers potential benefits to members of the public who are planning a walk or a ride. It would be possible for someone to assess the number of structures that they were likely to encounter on their chosen route and the degree of inconvenience that they were likely to experience. The presentation of the information would allow someone with limited mobility to plan routes other than just those that are officially designated as “easy access”.

J.2 While the production and maintenance of this information on a website is a significant undertaking (and may highlight problems of unauthorised structures) it offers a benefit that may encourage increased public use of rights of way.

J.3 It is understood that there are a number of authorities who have never had a full statement, or have a statement of poor quality, for the area for which they are responsible. Addressing this shortcoming is likely to be a major undertaking, could divert resources from other areas of work and is therefore left to local decision as to where it lies in the list of priorities. Under such circumstances it might still be possible to offer a useful service to the public by presenting data obtained from surveys of the structures found on the ground on a map based internet site, where such information exists.

J.4 *[add sources of how to produce material to aid communication for a wide variety of disabled people such as – Easy Read publications, Braille, etc]*

Annex K – Other relevant or useful sources of information

Institute for Public Rights of Way and Access Management – Good Practice Guide

[Disability Discrimination Acts - summary](#)

[Disability Discrimination Acts](#)

DRAFT - this document has no official status

Annex X – Document revision history

Version	Reason for revision	Date released
1	First issue	

DRAFT - this document has no official status

This page is intentionally left blank

SLOUGH LOCAL ACCESS FORUM – 12th January 2010

LETTER FROM CHAIR OF ENGLAND ACCESS FORUM RE: INVOLVEMENT OF LAFS IN DEVELOPING COASTAL ACCESS ROUTE

Dear Fellow Chair,

You will be interested to read the good news below. It follows from meetings which Matthew Balfour of Kent and I had with the Minister Hugh Irranca-Davies and the Shadow Minister Richard Benyon which had been agreed with EAF earlier this year.

We stressed the value-added of LAFs as a reservoir of expertise and local knowledge with a proven track record of sound advice and ability to be act as ‘honest brokers.’ It was agreed by both that the collective voice of LAFs through EAF was an important and balanced advocate nationally for access.

The extract is from Hansard and can be found at:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmhansrd/cm091026/debtext/91026-0010.htm>

"Mr. Benyon: The Minister mentioned local access forums. They are feeling a little unloved at the moment, so will he give his leadership and ensure that they are genuinely consulted? Local access forums have a wealth of experience and understand what is required in delivering greater access, and they do that for next to nothing. They are a cheap and welcome addition to the expertise that already exists, but the Minister might like to put his weight behind ensuring that they feel part of the process.

Huw Irranca-Davies: The hon. Gentleman makes a good point. I met the local access forums two weeks ago, and they want to play a pivotal role in the coastal routes’ development. Their members have expertise, they are volunteers, and they know the routes and the lie of the land. I cannot conceive how local access forums would not be part and parcel of the coastal routes’ development.

The ethos of the Bill is to use local knowledge from walking the routes to devise the proposal that will go to the Secretary of State. If the hon. Gentleman wants leadership in saying that local access forums, in all different shapes and sizes throughout the country, should be part and parcel of the scheme, I give him that categorical assurance."

Best Wishes

Duncan Graham
Chair of EAF and Cumbria LAF

PS. Note from Matthew Balfour:

I hope that you are as pleased as Duncan and I with what was said in the above....what Duncan didn't have when he sent out his letter above was the last quote from Nick Herbert in yesterday's Third Reading : "We would like to see much of the responsibility for the route devolved to voluntary access forums and local authorities. We believe that a top-down approach to coastal access is not the answer and that local groups are much better placed to designate and manage the shape of the route."

This page is intentionally left blank