

ATTENDANCE		
Name: Vivien Burdon Walkers (LAF Member) Sue Enfield LAF Member Duncan Green LAF Member Cllr Harrington CM Herefordshire Council David Howerski LAF Member Arthur Lee LAF Member Peter Newman LAF Member Nicola Short LAF Member Hugh Vernon LAF Member Joannah Weightman LAF Member	Name: Bruce Evans (Herefordshire Council) Callum Bush (Herefordshire Council) Jill Addis (Herefordshire Council) Lisa Creed (Herefordshire Council) Louise Hart (Herefordshire Council) Ceri Belli (Herefordshire Council) Crispin Abel (Herefordshire Council) Peter Keyse (member of the public) Malcolm Louch (member of the public) Will Steel (member of the public)	
APOLOGIES		
Ian Carr and Mark Averill		
AGENDA SUMMARY		
1.0	Welcome and apologies for absence	
2.0	Minutes	
3.0	Matters arising	
4.0	PROW Update	
5.0	Forum Business	
6.0	Rights of Way Report	
7.0	Proposed acceptance of Access, Maintenance & Improvement Work Group	
8.0	Working Group Reports	
9.0	Questions from members of the public	
10.0	Any other business	
	Any business submitted to the Chair prior to/or at the beginning of the meeting. To be discussed time permitting at the discretion of the Chair	
11.0	Proposed dates of 2023 meetings	
	TBC	
DISTRIBUTION		
LAF Members, Bruce Evans, Herefordshire Council website		
MINUTES AND CHECK LIST		ACTION
599.	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
	Apologies were noted as above. Current PROW team members were welcomed and introduced by name and job as above.	
600.	MINUTES	
	The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.	

MINUTES AND CHECK LIST	ACTION
601. MATTERS ARISING To be covered during the meeting.	
602. PROW UPDATE Volunteer Working BE said that recruitment for the Volunteer Co-Ordinator role was imminent. The parishes would be contacted to obtain an up to date list of PFOs. The role was currently going through Job Evaluation but he hoped it would be out within the next 4 weeks. He added that meetings were taking place for PFOs on 24 March. Capital Work CB went through the capital report he had prepared and handed out. DH suggested that BBLP have 'stranglehold' on work. Cllr H replied that although the PROW service had been taken back in house, HC currently did not have capacity to do larger schemes of 7.5m span and above. They were looking to change that. BE added that work would not go straight to BBLP. It would be scoped and evaluated and sent out to tender if necessary. JW asked how much scoping cost. BE replied that it was approximately £3000 per bridge as an engineer was required to consider the site-specific structural, foundation and environmental factors. DG asked how HC was prioritising work. CB said that the capital list was currently being updated. Inspectors had been out to look at all schemes to make sure nothing had changed on the ground. The schemes were then scored according to a number of factors, including route category and complaints received. DG noted access to HC computer system records would be ideal as he felt that the LAF could better understand priorities and what was being done. DH pointed to the number of enquiries that were awaiting inspection and was concerned that people who reported defects may lose confidence in the system if they were not addressed The enquiries awaiting inspection were a capacity issue. BE said that an overall review of IT at HC had held up a change in systems for PROW. Once this had been completed, PROW should be able to request a system that was more suitable for them. Cllr H asked for an update on this. BE said that using volunteers to carry out inspections and certain types of maintenance works was being looked in to. Cllr H added that better understanding was required with regards to volunteers and insurance. HV asked if there were any volunteer engineers who could assist in structural surveys, noting the high level of costs associated with scoping capital works... DG said that this would be a problem as they would need to maintain personal insurance for life. Structural assessments would need to be carried out by staff. Cllr H added that HC were looking at a future operating model which will review and look at where the technical staff would report to. Enforcement DG recalled that PROW used to have a 'three strikes' policy. He asked what had happened to that.	BE

MINUTES AND CHECK LIST	ACTION
<p>BE said that HC had an enforcement policy that was based on public interest and evidence. Rather than waiting for three strike, the Enforcement Officer would gather evidence and visit a landowner on site where possible. Legal action would be taken as a last resort. Cllr H added that Rich (the Enforcement Officer) had been getting good results.</p> <p>LAF members were concerned that HC appeared reluctant to enforce the protection of public rights of way with land owners, which might encourage non-compliance and felt that this perception needed to change. The decision to enforce is an operational one.</p> <p>DMMO</p> <p>DG is pressing Jesse Norman to support a repetition of the original Definitive Map process to add rights of way to the map. This was originally discussed at the last meeting.</p> <p>ROWIP</p> <p>JW said that she was glad to see this on the agenda and felt that giving it prominence is essential and giving progress on delivery at meetings on a regular basis.</p>	
<p>603. FORUM BUSINESS</p>	
<p>No update</p>	
<p>604. RIGHTS OF WAY REPORT</p>	
<p>Due to prior discussions in the meeting, time left was limited. CB asked the group to take the report away and send in any queries.</p> <p>JW noted that the report closed a defect where the risk was removed but the defect not rectified, therefore further work required. CB agreed to amend wording.</p> <p>DH noted that lack of resources is an issue and cause for concern but was not legally accepted as an excuse to keep closures indefinitely. . CB stressed that they were closed for safety reason. Cllr H added that structures could not be replaced if there were no funds to do this.</p>	
<p>605. PROPOSED ACCEPTANCE OF ACCESS, MAINTENANCE & IMPROVEMENT WORK GROUP</p>	
<p>The Terms of Reference and proposed membership of the newly formed HLAF Workgroup had been circulated. Its focus on Access to land for public recreation and Maintenance and Improvement of the PROW network gave it a broad remit. It was queried how this group differed from the LAF. JW replied that the HLAFAMI workgroup acted as a steering group where LAF members shared information, investigated issues and made plans for improvements to enable the LAF to be more effective. A show of hands gave unanimous endorsement of the new HLAF workgroup and the proposed membership.</p>	
<p>606. WORKING GROUP REPORTS</p>	
<p>JW referred to the 9 page report from the HLAFAMI workgroup, recently circulated, accompanied by a 7 page Appendix. A key issue concerned the way the team worked- it seemed a good idea for those responsible to step back and establish a vision of how the 'new' PROW team would work best, to draw in more resources available in the community via Parishes, etc.</p>	<p>BE</p>

MINUTES AND CHECK LIST	ACTION
<p>The Workgroup also sought an overview of how the additional capital money, allocated for PROW, had been spent in the past two years and how the additional £200k would be used this year (2022/23)</p>	<p>CB/BE</p>
<p>607. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</p>	
<p>None</p>	
<p>608. AOB</p>	
<p>Concerns were raised about the difficulty setting dates for LAF meetings and the unavailability of members. Membership needs to be reviewed in line with the Terms of Reference for the LAF. Any who have not attended meetings should be contacted for continued interest or membership cancelled if appropriate.</p> <p>LAF requested a schedule of meetings for the year ahead, meetings to be quarterly and preferably at a fixed date and time although this may need to be revised to accommodate staffing considerations.</p>	
<p>598. DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p>	
<p>TBC</p> <p>Meeting closed at 11.40.</p>	

Chairman: _____

Date: _____