



Shropshire Council
Legal and Democratic Services
Shirehall
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury
SY2 6ND

Date: Wednesday, 9 October 2019

**Committee:
Shropshire's Great Outdoors Strategy Board**

Date: Thursday, 17 October 2019

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Bridgnorth Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

You are requested to attend the above meeting.
The Agenda is attached

Claire Porter
Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer)

Members of Shropshire's Great Outdoors Strategy Board

Alex Carson-Taylor (Chairman)	Cecilia Motley
Mark Weston (Vice Chairman)	Stewart Pickering
Peter Carr	Lezley Picton
Lee Chapman	Nigel Pocock
Sarah Faulkner	Ronald Repath
Ruby Hartshorne	Jack Tavernor
Chris Mansell	Andrew Wood

Your Committee Officer is:

Tim Ward Committee Officer

Tel: 01743 257713

Email: tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk

AGENDA

1 Welcome. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

2 Public Question Time

To receive any questions or petitions of which notice has been received from members of the public. Deadline for Questions is 10.00am on 15 October 2019

3 Declarations of Interest

Members are reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

4 Minutes of the Last Meeting (Pages 1 - 4)

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2019 are attached for confirmation

5 Green Infrastructure Strategy

A briefing note is to follow

6 Cultural Strategy

To receive an update from the Interim Head of Culture and Heritage

7 Glover Review (Pages 5 - 16)

A copy of a report that was presented to a meeting of the Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership on 8 October 2019 is attached for information.

8 General Updates

All members are asked to give a short update on key activities/ priorities/ issues

9 Other items (Pages 17 - 22)

Shropshire Riding and Carriage Driving Forum

The minutes of the meeting of the Shropshire Riding and Carriage Driving Forum held on 4 February 2019 are attached for information. The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2019 are to follow

10 Dates of Future Meetings

Members are advised that meeting of the Shropshire's Great Outdoors Strategy Board will be held on:

Thursday 6 February 2020 at 2.00pm
Thursday 4 June 2020 at 2.00pm

This page is intentionally left blank



Committee and Date

Shropshire's Great Outdoors
Strategy Board

INSERT NEXT MEETING DATE

SHROPSHIRE'S GREAT OUTDOORS STRATEGY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2019

**In the Ludlow Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND
10.00 am - 12.00 pm**

Responsible Officer: Tim Ward

Email: tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257713

Present

Alex Carson-Taylor , Peter Carr, Cecilia Motley, Lezley Picton, Nigel Pocock,
Ronald Repath, Jack Tavernor and Andrew Wood

1 Welcome, introductions and apologies for absence

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies for absence had been received from Chris Mansell, Stewart Pickering and Mark Weston.

2 Public Question Time

- 2.1 There were no questions from members of the public.

3 Declaration of Interests

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest made.

4 Minutes of the last meeting

- 4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2019 had been circulated.
- 4.2 Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Shropshire Outdoors Strategy Board held on 7 February 2019 be agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

5 Shropshire's Great Outdoors Strategy progress and action plan

- 5.1 Members received a presentation from the Interim Head of Culture and Heritage which gave an update on progress made against the Shropshire Great Outdoors Strategy and priorities for 2019 – 20. An updated Action Plan was circulated to Members.
- 5.2 The Interim Head of Culture & Heritage advised the meeting that:

- Funding for the Wild Teams had been secured for the forthcoming year and work was ongoing to secure future funding.
- There was further work to be done on the Shropshire Great Outdoors Website, but this was on hold as there was no capacity within the team to progress this at this time
- The Leader project had been extended to June to enable the final allocation of remaining funds.
- Place Plan meetings had been held and it was felt that Parish Councils now had a better understanding of the Place Plan process.
- Work was ongoing to increase income from outside contracts and an A4 leaflet had been produced to advertise the service.

5.3 The Chairman thanked the Interim Head of Culture and Heritage for her presentation and asked Members to email the Head of Culture & Heritage if they had any further queries or comments.

6 Shropshire Cultural Strategy

6.1 The Interim Head of Culture & Strategy advised that a working group had been set up to formulate a Cultural Strategy for Shropshire.

6.2 A discussion took place around the differing definitions of culture and heritage that people had.

6.3 Members agreed that the strategy needed to feed in to all parts of the community.

6.4 The Interim Head of Culture and Leisure informed the meeting that the Working Group would produce a draft strategy which would go out to consultation and asked members to feed any comments to her by email.

7 Rural Economy Report- Rural Services Network

7.1 Members were informed that the Rural Services Network had issued a document calling on Government to produce a rural strategy.

7.2 Mrs Motley commented that it was important that the needs of rural areas were considered and that all policies were "rural proofed". She advised members that a lot of work was being done on this in Westminster and that a House of Lords select Committee had produced a report on the state of the rural economy.

7.3 Mrs Motley advised that the RSN was keen that all Councils produced their own strategies and that Councillor Gwilym Butler, and the Director of Place were leading on this for Shropshire Council. Members were keen that this should run alongside the Cultural Strategy and that it should ensure that the needs of rural areas were firmly at the top of the agenda.

7.4 Members asked that they be kept updated with progress with the Strategy.

8 General updates

8.1 There were no updates from Members

9 Other Items

9.1 An update on the Wild Teams had been given as part of agenda item 5

10 Agenda items for future meetings

10.1 The following items were suggested for inclusion on future agendas:

- Green infrastructure strategy
- Local Enterprise Partnership

11 Dates of Future Meetings

11.1 It was agreed that the Committee Officer would circulate dates of future meetings when they were to hand.

Signed (Chairman)

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank



Committee and Date Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership 8 th October 2019	Item 4
--	-----------------------------

REPORT OF THE GLOVER REVIEW – INITIAL DISCUSSION

Responsible Officer Phil Holden, AONB Partnership Manager
e-mail: phil.holden@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 254741

Summary

This paper provides a summary of the Glover Review final report and some topics for initial discussion.

Recommendation

The Partnership is recommended to consider the proposals in the Glover review report and the implications for the Shropshire Hills AONB.

Background

After about a year of taking evidence, meetings and visits, the final report of the Glover Review was published on 21st September 2019. Some of the key recommendations had been trailed in media coverage and the letter of interim findings in July, but much of the detail only emerged in the final report.

The published summary of the report with the 27 proposals is reproduced in Appendix 1. Some other key passages of the report relevant to us are reproduced here:

New legal purposes – proposed for National Parks and AONBs:

The exact wording will no doubt be subject to debate and legal discussion, but the substance of what they should be aiming to do, we think, can be achieved through the following:

- 1. Recover, conserve and enhance natural beauty, biodiversity and natural capital, and cultural heritage.**
- 2. Actively connect all parts of society with these special places to support understanding, enjoyment and the nation's health and wellbeing.**
- 3. Foster the economic and community vitality of their area in support of the first two purposes.**

To properly strengthen AONBs, we propose:

- *Giving them the same reformed statutory purposes (and ensuring that the 'Sandford Principle' also applies) as for National Parks. This reflects the reality that AONBs deliver the same purposes as National Parks.*

- *Increasing their funding*
- *Giving them statutory consultee status to strengthen their role in the planning system*
- *Renaming them 'National Landscapes'. Their national importance should be properly reflected by something much less unwieldy that elevates them alongside National Parks.*

Duties of public bodies

The requirement of 'regard' to landscapes' existing purposes should be strengthened to one of 'furthering' the reformed purposes. Second, a requirement should be established in law on relevant bodies to support the development and implementation of national landscapes' Management Plans.

Nature recovery

National landscapes therefore can, and should be playing a major role in enhancing the resilience of the network, by providing large areas of high quality wildlife habitat. They should be at the centre of coordinated action to integrate effective ecological networks with landscape objectives and other uses, including farming, education, recreation, tourism and the provision of other ecosystem services. To do so, however, requires Nature Recovery Networks to be built on a sound foundation of:

- *a clear national strategy, closely geared into local delivery*
- *strong partnerships and the agreement of common goals among diverse actors*
- *sufficient on the ground advisory staff and other capacity, including accurate data*
- *being fully aligned with a range of policy tools, such as ELMS and net gain.*

The design and implementation of Nature Recovery Network actions on the ground in national landscapes must take momentum not only from conservation and landscape led policy but also other government priorities, including, for example, the aim of achieving net zero carbon emissions and steps toward more climate change resilient landscapes.

New Environmental Land Management system

Individual Management Plans should be the guiding framework for setting landscape-scale priorities for future payments for public goods which support and enhance the value of nature and natural beauty in all its forms.

All other forms of environmental payments should be made in line with the Management Plans too, for example, grants for woodland planting or rural development.

We want to see the special significance of national landscapes for biodiversity, natural beauty and cultural identity reflected in decisions about ELMS.

We do not propose that national landscapes directly administer the new Environmental Land Management Scheme. Moving the complex business of payments to 44 separate bodies does not make sense. Rather, their Management Plans should set the framework for all ELMS payments within their landscapes. The focus first should be on working with others to set priorities, and supporting farmers with the transition.

Planning

AONB bodies should become statutory consultees in the planning system. They need to be formally consulted on planning cases, and have a formal voice in the decision making process. This does not mean AONBs should become consumed with putting in advice on

every single planning application; they don't do this now, nor would they be expected to. They should agree with their local planning authorities what they should be consulted upon and be free to comment if something of significance appears.

Some additional resource and expertise is likely to be necessary too, but the vast majority already employ officers with planning expertise. There is also expertise across the wider family of national landscapes that can be better shared and some additional resource could be provided at a national level through the new National Landscapes Service we propose, reducing duplication across all 44 bodies.

We heard in the Arnside and Silverdale AONB how two local authorities came together to support a single Development Plan for the AONB. This is a good model. We want AONBs to work with local authorities to develop local plans and policies which set out a vision, explain how conservation and recreational purposes will be implemented and how the needs and requirements of the local community will be met within the broader context of achieving sustainable development appropriate to these nationally important landscapes.

Landscapes for everyone

Our national landscapes should be alive for people, places where everyone is actively welcomed in and there are unrivalled opportunities to enjoy their natural beauty and all it offers: landscapes for all. We need:

- *England's national landscapes to reach out and actively connect all parts of society with these special places to support the nation's health and wellbeing. Their legal purposes should be explicit about this, and the same purpose applied to AONBs as to National Parks.*
- *National landscapes must develop ambitious, targeted plans for helping those who currently fail to benefit from our most special places to do so, and be held to account for delivery. This must include excellent, but currently local, examples being established everywhere. The National Landscapes Service should have a key role in spreading these best practices and holding bodies to account for delivery.*
- *Ambitious programmes should include, but not be limited to:*
 - *children and young people;*
 - *Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities;*
 - *people with health conditions and disabilities;*
 - *volunteering.*
- *A truly warm and helpful welcome, wherever you want to go – better signs, information and websites are needed, and critically, a National Landscapes Ranger Service.*
- *Our national landscapes must become our most welcoming and easily accessible places. Here, more than anywhere else, people can get out into nature and enjoy it. This means joining up with others to make the most of what is already there, but also asking ourselves whether they could be more accessible than they are now.*

Tourism

National landscapes should also be encouraged to bid to become 'tourism zones' under the new Tourism Sector Deal, helping pioneer truly sustainable tourism. We hope they will be encouraged to apply to become tourism zones under the new Tourism Sector Deal. Such

areas would see destination management organisations, local authorities, local enterprise partnerships, and local businesses working together to develop solutions that address local market failures in relation to tourism. For areas that are successful in their bid to become a Tourism Zone, a package of support would be offered and they would create a sustainable development plan to reduce environmental impacts.

Living in Landscapes

Our landscape management teams need to think hard about the various communities in their area: farmers and landowners, businesses, towns and villages and above all, schools. How can they help those various communities really benefit from living and working in a national landscape? How can they ensure that they identify with the brand, and are inspired to take forward the living past into the future? How can they create the long-term partnerships with these communities that will ensure our national landscapes have a sustainable future? Positive action is required here.

Our landscapes should encourage the kinds of economic and social activity that promotes renewed purposes of national landscapes.

We want to see a National Landscapes Affordable Rural Housing Association formed to help meet the need. It should have clear, well-designed purposes and a defined scope (and in particular 'rural' should mean 'rural') with leadership from the new National Landscapes Service. It should be debt financed (the equity should be publicly owned) and should attract environmental, social and government investment funds. In addition it might in limited circumstances get some 'public monies for public goods' as farming support is reformed.

Local planning authorities in AONBs should also make use of the provision that allows them to demand on-site affordable housing contributions on all sites, including developments of five homes or fewer.

National Parks are well placed to take on an active role in coordinating and promoting transport. They are the bodies best placed to communicate with visitors, and to have a single strategic vision. We think that the pressures and need for strategy is the same in AONBs.

Governance

National Parks should be governed by smaller 9-12 person boards, in line with best practice in governance as recommended for charities and companies. The board should be advised by a partnership group, bringing together stakeholders of all kinds, to ensure the board is well informed about a wide range of interests and specialist expertise.

The structure above should apply to AONBs where possible. We recognise that for some smaller ones it may be overelaborate, or challenging to put in place. For larger ones, it is appropriate.

AONBs may choose to establish similar Planning Sub-Committees, but, given their role is not to decide planning matters but to comment, hopefully in future as statutory consultees, they should ensure such committees are proportionate in size.

AONBs may also have on their main board of 9 to 12 one local authority member drawn from the local authorities who contribute funding to the AONB, determined either by the agreement of those local authorities, or if not, by ballot.

Finally, we think there is merit in the idea of a citizen service for selecting community representatives for main National Park and AONB boards, and would like to see the new National Landscapes Service work with national landscapes to trial this.

Funding

Central government funding should continue, and be both extended and secured across a five-year period. However the system needs to move away from over-reliance on core grants towards more diverse, larger and more sustainable flows of funds – towards a new funding model. We also recommend stopping the complex routing of funds via Defra. Responsibility should pass to the new National Landscapes Service. The payment of AONBs in arrears, should also be addressed.

The National Landscapes Service should negotiate a multi-annual financial settlement with Defra which both secures existing resources, services and programmes, and also ensures a focus on growth, innovation and efficiencies.

The settlement should cover the current grant in aid distributed by a modernised and simplified funding formula to all existing National Parks and AONBs and in future to all national landscapes. No organisation should receive a cut in grant.

There should be a new and larger settlement for AONBs and this should include new resources to reflect their enhanced purposes, responsibilities and activities.

We believe that in time, there should be an across-the-board formula for national landscapes using a banding system to reflect the imprecision of a formula, containing a number of elements, the weighting of which would need to be carefully calibrated.

In the meantime, AONBs need an uplift. We believe their total funding should be doubled from the current £6.7m to £13.4m, with the uplift in funding that would no doubt come from a revised funding formula implemented over a longer period.

The local authority funding element for AONBs should continue.

Any new national landscapes must be funded with new money.

Importantly, alongside central government funding changes, national landscapes should prepare medium to long term financial plans that reflect a more diverse range of income sources to their organisations, complementing core central government grant-aid with growth in philanthropic giving, trading activities and large-scale externally-funded projects.

This should draw ambitiously on the potential of natural capital principles.

The financial model for national landscapes should be diverse to ensure growth, stability and a greater sense of self-direction.

The new National Landscapes Service has a key role to play in finance. It should be entrepreneurial: it should understand its brand value, enter into commercially successful partnerships, be skilled at fundraising and achieve efficiencies in operations by encouraging parts of the system to work together.

There should be an ambitious commercial and philanthropic programme of fundraising.

Either a wing of the new National Landscapes Service or a separate but constitutionally-linked charity should be set up with clear charitable aims, strongly commercial and well-connected trustees and a professional team skilled in fundraising.

Next steps

It is important to remember that this is an independent report to government, and while the designated landscape bodies will be able to take on directly some of its recommendations straight away, many of the more significant ones will require government action. The government's response to the report is therefore vital as a next stage. We have no indications of the timescale for this, but we understand that senior staff resource at Defra has been allocated to it.

The NAAONB is meeting with Lord Gardiner on the 9th October to discuss the Environment Bill, the duty of regard, and the role of designated landscapes in nature recovery. This will, amongst other things, ensure the Colchester Declaration maintains profile during this spending review. They are also meeting with Marian Spain (CEO) and Tony Juniper (Chair) of Natural England on 23rd October. They will discuss the practicalities of the central role of AONBs in nature recovery, and how we work together with Natural England to further the recommendations of the Review. The next meeting of the NAAONB Board on 31st October will include a substantive discussion on the Review recommendations and the next steps the Association needs to take to progress delivery. Finally, Lord Gardiner has confirmed attendance at the NAAONB Chairmen's meeting on 28th November and will be speaking on the outcomes of the Review. This meeting will also include a presentation by Maxwell Ayamba on the challenges of people from black and minority ethnic communities using designated landscapes.

For the AONB Partnership, we need to engage actively with the national discussion, and input to any further formal response from the AONB Family to the Review report.

There are some aspects of the proposals which are likely to require primary legislation (e.g. new purposes, creation of a National Landscapes Service) or secondary legislation (e.g. making AONB organisations statutory consultees in planning). Some other proposals would need actioning by Defra but could happen any time (e.g. increased funding). Some aspects can be progressed by us now and would reinforce some existing as well as some newer directions (e.g. priority to nature recovery, outreach work with under-represented groups) though these are also resource dependent.

The governance implications for AONBs will probably take time to emerge. The Review report says nothing specifically about new Conservation Boards. It does acknowledge the higher status of the Cotswolds and Chilterns which have these, and mentions 'the challenges of the Conservation Board model' (apparently in the context of this not being strong enough). It seems highly unlikely that Defra will wish in the short term to progress our proposal to create a Conservation Board. Our proposal may be overtaken by changes arising from the Glover Review, or this may still be an appropriate mechanism – this is not yet clear. The report does acknowledge that different structures may be appropriate for larger AONBs. It does not however seem fully to recognise the fundamental difference between National Park Boards that govern independent legal organisations, and AONB Joint Advisory Committees and their sub-groups which are advisory only. There may be a spectrum of responsibility and roles for different structures, but as we know there are along this some binary differences of where the final accountability lies (i.e. with the local authorities or with an independent body). Unless a new model emerges, the same main options of structure for AONBs are likely to remain.

List of Background Papers

Glover Review final report at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/designated-landscapes-national-parks-and-aonbs-2018-review>.

Human Rights Act Appraisal

The information in this report is compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998.

Environmental Appraisal

The recommendation in this paper will contribute to the conservation of protected landscapes.

Risk Management Appraisal

Risk management has been appraised as part of the considerations of this report.

Community / Consultations Appraisal

The topics raised in this paper have been the subject of earlier consultations with Partnership members.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Landscapes review: final report - summary of findings

Appendix 1 Landscapes review: final report September 2019 - summary of findings

The underlying argument of our review, which covers England, is that our system of national landscapes should be a positive force for the nation's wellbeing. Big ambitions are made possible by these 44 areas working together in new ways to become more than the sum of their parts.

We want this to happen not as an end in itself but because more must be done for nature and natural beauty. More must be done for people who live in and visit our landscapes. And a lot more must be done to meet the needs of our many fellow citizens who do not know the countryside, or do not always feel welcome in it, but should be able to enjoy it. Our landscapes are open and free to all, but can seem exclusive.

We think this can only happen if we are honest about what doesn't work at the moment and put in place a system which can do better.

Today, we have a system which is fragmented, sometimes marginalised and often misunderstood. Indeed it is not really a system at all, but 10 National Parks, who do not always work together effectively, and an entirely separate network of 34 less powerful Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). They have different purposes from National Parks, vastly less money, but sometimes greater pressures. Yet they cover areas that are more visited, sometimes more biodiverse and are just as beautiful.

We believe this duplication wastes resources and diminishes ambition.

That is why our central proposal is to bring National Parks and AONBs together as part of one family of national landscapes, served by a shared National Landscapes Service (NLS). This will give them a bigger voice, bigger ambition and a new way of working to meet new challenges.

Within this family, of course not every member will be the same. Local identity matters. National Parks need to keep their titles, at least their current levels of funding, and local autonomy, especially over planning.

The current system of governance for National Parks (and, as we'll explore later, AONBs) should be reformed substantially. Time after time we have heard and seen that National Park boards are too big, do not do a good job in setting a strategic direction and are deeply unrepresentative of England's diverse communities.

Of the almost 1,000 people on National Park and AONB boards today, the great majority are male, many are of retirement age and a tiny fraction are of black, Asian or minority ethnicities. This is wrong for organisations which are funded by the nation to serve everyone.

We also think what are now AONBs should be strengthened, with increased funding, governance reform, new shared purposes with National Parks, and a greater voice on development.

We think the current cumbersome title 'AONB' should be replaced. Our suggestion is that they should be called National Landscapes.

We would also like to see the encouragement of a wider range of non-designated systems of landscape protection, which should be members of the national landscapes family and served by the NLS.

This ought to include new areas of forest, along the lines of the successful National Forest in the East Midlands. We give our strong support for proposals for new urban National Parks, such as the one proposed for the West Midlands and the one already underway in London. We also praise the impressive work being done to bring the South Pennines together as a regional park and to create a marine park in Plymouth.

Our overriding conclusion is that without structural reform and greater shared ambition and status, our national landscapes will always struggle to do more than make an incremental difference.

Summary findings

The review focused on 5 areas:

1. Landscapes alive for nature and beauty
2. Landscapes for everyone
3. Living in landscapes
4. More special places
5. New ways of working

They are not separate but part of one ambition: to strengthen the natural beauty of England's landscapes in order to serve the country better by improving their biodiversity, and the lives of people who work in them, live in them and enjoy them.

For clarity when reading this summary, we refer to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as AONBs, and use 'national landscapes' to refer to the two designations of National Parks and AONBs together.

Summary 1. Landscapes alive for nature and beauty

The 2010 Making Space for Nature review and the most recent 2016 State of Nature report are explicit about the crisis of nature and what needs to be done to bring about a recovery. There is no need, in this review, to restate the excellent and mostly chilling analysis they contain, except to say that we agree and we want to see national landscapes lead the response.

Proposals

Proposal 1: National landscapes should have a renewed mission to recover and enhance nature, and be supported and held to account for delivery by a new National Landscapes Service

Proposal 2: The state of nature and natural capital in our national landscapes should be regularly and robustly assessed, informing the priorities for action

Proposal 3: Strengthened Management Plans should set clear priorities and actions for nature recovery including, but not limited to, wilder areas and the response to climate change (notably tree planting and peatland restoration). Their implementation must be backed up by stronger status in law

Proposal 4: National landscapes should form the backbone of Nature Recovery Networks – joining things up within and beyond their boundaries

Proposal 5: A central place for national landscapes in new Environmental Land Management Schemes

Proposal 6: A strengthened place for national landscapes in the planning system with AONBs given statutory consultee status, encouragement to develop local plans and changes to the National Planning Policy Framework

Summary 2. Landscapes for everyone

National Parks were created in part to provide a healing space, both mentally and physically, for the many who had given so much to protect our country during the Second World War. They were meant for everybody. Much has changed in the 70 years since. Modern Britain is a very different place socially and demographically. Today we recognise diversity as the mark of a healthy and resilient society. However, many landscape bodies have not moved smartly enough to reflect this changing society, and in some cases show little desire to do so.

We want our nation's most cherished landscapes to fulfill their original mission for people, providing unrivalled opportunities for enjoyment, spiritual refreshment and in turn supporting the nation's health and wellbeing.

Proposals

Proposal 7: A stronger mission to connect all people with our national landscapes, supported and held to account by the new National Landscapes Service

Proposal 8: A night under the stars in a national landscape for every child

Proposal 9: New long-term programmes to increase the ethnic diversity of visitors

Proposal 10: Landscapes that cater for and improve the nation's health and wellbeing

Proposal 11: Expanding volunteering in our national landscapes

Proposal 12: Better information and signs to guide visitors

Proposal 13: A ranger service in all our national landscapes, part of a national family

Proposal 14: National landscapes supported to become leaders in sustainable tourism

Proposal 15: Joining up with others to make the most of what we have, and bringing National Trails into the national landscapes family

Proposal 16: Consider expanding open access rights in national landscapes

Summary 3. Living in landscapes

Our system of national landscapes works best when it works with people on its side. We can all agree that a village that is lived in, with an active school, people who work, and who are part of a living tradition, is better than a sterile place that is full of shuttered homes, empty pubs and derelict shops.

If we are serious about demonstrating the value of 'lived in' landscapes to the global family of national landscapes, then we need to be serious about the people who live in them, and show how it's possible to offer meaningful social and economic support for them.

Proposals

Proposal 17: National landscapes working for vibrant communities

Proposal 18: A new National Landscapes Housing Association to build affordable homes

Proposal 19: A new approach to coordinating public transport piloted in the Lake District, and new, more sustainable ways of accessing national landscapes

Summary 4. More special places

Almost a quarter – 24.5% – of England is already covered by national landscapes.

We think there is a case for several larger AONBs to take on National Park candidate status, as well as for a new AONB (or National Landscape as we propose they are called in future).

The success of the National Forest is also a model which should be replicated.

We also think that a changing nation needs new ways to come together to support natural beauty and access.

Proposals

Proposal 20: New designated landscapes and a new National Forest

Proposal 21: Welcoming new landscape approaches in cities and the coast, and a city park competition

Proposal 22: A better designations process

Summary 5. New ways of working

We want our landscapes to focus on enhancing natural beauty, supporting communities and visitors. But to do it better, we think they need to change and work together more.

Proposals

Proposal 23: Stronger purposes in law for our national landscapes

Proposal 24: AONBs strengthened with new purposes, powers and resources, renamed as National Landscapes

Proposal 25: A new National Landscapes Service bringing our 44 national landscapes together to achieve more than the sum of their parts

Proposal 26: Reformed governance to inspire and secure ambition in our national landscapes and better reflect society

Proposal 27: A new financial model – more money, more secure, more enterprising

This page is intentionally left blank

SHROPSHIRE RIDING AND CARRIAGE DRIVING FORUM (SRCDF)

Minutes of meeting held on Monday 4th February 2019, at 5.30pm, Shirehall, Shrewsbury.

1. Attendance:

Angela Williams, BHS CABO & Ellesmere, Chairman. Zia Robins, Shrewsbury & District RC A&BWO, Nesscliffe Hills & Dist. BWA P3 Group, Joint Secretary. Linda Russell, South West Shrewsbury BW P3 Group, Joint Secretary. Elaine Newton, Broseley BWA. Jan Mees Robinson, Telford Bridleways. Nino Binns, Long Mynd & Dist BWA. Sue Evans, Ryton, Badger & Beckbury BWs, Shona Butter, Shropshire Council.

Apologies:

Pam Yuille, Underton, Bridgnorth. Andrew Kelly, Vyrnwy & Dist. BWA. Gill Eyre, BHS South East Shropshire. Mark Weston, BHS. Ann Durnell, Bridgnorth BWA

2. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 15th October 2018 (paper A) were approved, and signed by the Chair.

3. Matters Arising

(a) Helicopters

Following our last meeting Zia asked Squadron Leader Kim Leach, the Corporate Engagement Relations Officer at RAF Shawbury, email address kim.leach347@mod.gov.uk if they had granted any new landing sites. Kim has reported that they have no new field and clearings approved, but have passed on Shona's name to the person who manages their Fields and Clearings Register with a reminder that they need to liaise should they take on new landing sites. They would like to invite Shona to their next Rider Awareness Day on Thursday 16th May. Kim attended the RAF Air Safety Conference in Oct 18, with a presentation by the BHS on their Dead Slow campaign. Mr. Des Payne, BHS Deputy Director of Safety, reported that there had been a reduction of horse rider incidents reported to the BHS in Shropshire compared to other Counties, which Kim felt reflects the benefits of the Be Seen, Be Safer campaign. To obtain information on their Safety campaigns put in www.raf.mod.uk/our-organisation/stations/raf-shawbury/ and go to Flying information, Safety campaigns. There are no order forms available at present as she does not have any kit left, and they have not yet had funding approval for future years. Sue Evans will let us know if she hears of any pleasure rides being held from RAF Shawbury.

(b) Cycling – Mountain Biking (MTB' s)

It is reported that there are still ongoing problems with mountain bikers in the Nesscliffe Countryside Heritage Park, with damage being done to the infrastructure due to the making of new trails. Strava, a mobile phone app, records routes used by MTB's there including over the Hillfort, on footpaths and down steep banks onto bridleways endangering the many horse riders, walkers, many with dogs, and families who use the Country Park. Being close to Baschurch, Ruyton XI Towns, as well as Nesscliffe, it is a popular destination for families, dog walkers, and horse riders, as it serves the local communities, as well as tourism. There is concern as it is reported that there are now electrically assisted mountain bikes, it is understood, with a 250 watt, and 15.5mph limit. There is still concern that bikers do not understand that they must give way to pedestrians and horse riders on bridleways, and that cycling sites do not make this clear. It was

asked why bikes did not have bells. It is understood that it is illegal to sell a bike without a fitted bell, but not illegal to remove it afterwards. Concern was also raised as to how to control cyclists crossing bridleways at speed. We have raised concerns in the past with cycle organisations. **It is agreed** that we should write again, and this could also be raised with the Forestry Commission.

(c) Shropshire's Great Outdoors Strategy 2018-2018

Noted – That the Strategy was adopted at the SC Cabinet meeting on 17th October and is available on the home page of the Shropshire's Great Outdoors website.

(d) Natural England Permissive Bridleway Routes

Noted – The list of the Permissive Bridleway Routes that are still open, with their expiry dates (attached to the Agenda). They all end in 2020. Any extensions to these schemes are unlikely with current monetary constraints. It is suggested that landowners could be approached to retain these. The gates etc are funded by DEFRA. Jan suggested a letter to Michael Gove. It is understood that there are some field edge Permissive riding routes near Loppington, but it is not known under what scheme.

(e) Any other matters arising not on the Agenda

Sue Evans raised concern over the solving of reported problems. Shona asked her to send her a list of ones she is concerned over.

4. Shropshire Council

(a) Shropshire Outdoor Partnerships

Shona reported that Emily will be going on maternity leave soon, but they cannot take on anyone to cover her absence until they know whether their budget will cover this. Emily covers a large area of Northern Shropshire, and also deals with any problems reported on Helen Foxhall's area as Helen only works on Mondays. Mark Blount will also be retiring and it is thought that Richard Knight will be taking over some of his responsibilities.

Noted – that the Rights of Way User Survey 2019 is now available on line on the link given in the Agenda and also via a link on www.shropshiresgreatoutdoors.co.uk, Members were asked to pass the link on, and encourage others to fill it in.

Noted - that the Shropshire Outdoor Partnerships and Volunteer Newsletters are available on www.shropshiresgreatoutdoors.co.uk website on the Home page under 'Useful Links' – 'News', and that the 'Access & Rights of Way' link gives access to lots of other useful information on DMMO's Claims, Landowner Declarations, etc. Members reported difficulty in reporting problems online via the site. They were reminded that they had been sent an email with details as to how problems etc. can also be reported direct to outdoor.recreation@shropshire.gov.uk.

Concern was raised over Shropshire Council's proposed cut of £50,000 from the Rights of Way budget. The Shropshire Council Consultation closes on 18th February. The BHS have put in a letter of concern over the proposed cuts. Members discussed the implications of these cuts. The BVPI (Best Value Performance Indicator) for Rights of Way, which shows routes ease of use, is already down from 85% to 67%. It is not being done this financial year. The cuts could also impact on jobs. Shona reported that they can only deal with some of the issues reported due to current staff constraints. Budget cuts could impact on the number of volunteers if there is not adequate support for them. **It is agreed** that a letter be sent from the Forum raising our concerns over the impact of the proposed ROW cuts.

The £100,000 Public Health cut will impact on the Wild Teams and Walking for Health.

(b) Public Inquiries and Definitive Map Issues

Shona reported on ongoing issues:

Frodesley Lodge BW4 – They have consulted on a diversion which would go from the side of the barns straight ahead up the bank alongside the fence line with a BW gate into Mr. William's field then straight across to the eastern hedge line. They have had good support on this line.

It is important that the ground is suitable. It may require some levelling work.

Bentley Ford Farm BW 7R outlet – They are still looking into a solution to the difficulties with regard to the opening up the definitive line of the connecting bridleway route by the farm, and the practicalities of opening up the line, due to the deep ditch, and 6ft revetment wall.

Hanwood Railway crossing – Shona is hoping to resolve the issue of the correct recording of the definitive status of the railway crossing. Lucy is working on railway crossings.

Old Coalport to Bridgnorth Railway Line and Link – Sweeney Bridge. Lucy is still dealing with this.

Stiperstones Higher Access Route – Shona reported that they have been looking at waymarking for another route in the area, and that they still have problems with Natural England in getting routes waymarked on The Stiperstones, including the now higher status of BW for the FP92 & 92A route off BW108 to the ridge BW 95, an easier route to ride than BW 108. Zia reported that she eventually got a BW waymark put on the Stiperstones ridge. She had asked for at least a stone with a blue arrow on it, and they eventually agreed to a waymark post in the middle of a stone cairn, to camouflage it, but people have since added stones to the pile which can obscure the wooden post with the bridleway marker on!

Oaks Wood BW claim – Shona reported that there was a possible line amendment at Hunters Lodge. She suggested a site visit attended by Linda who knows the used routes there.

Drumbles BW outlet to Platt Bridge claim – This Order is due to be done, but this depends on budget cuts and the staff available. Concern was raised that people who could give evidence are dying. 2/3rds of the route is now BW. It is important that this last section of the route gets done.

Weston Woods BW claims – There is now a new landowner, and the BW claim has been withdrawn, as permission had been given to use the route. The footpath use was not permissive. Zia raised again the outlet of RB 4 to the road, as the diverted end section to the road is only registered as a FP - FP4Y. It is road access to properties. The link to, and the outlet of, RB1 on the opposite side of the A49 road is also only registered as a footpath, UN1. This should be a Restricted Byway from the A49. **Agreed** this should be sent to Emily with a copy to Shona.

Sutton Mill – It is not too late to submit any new evidence for this order.

Hilton BW claim – No change. Unlikely to be dealt with for some time due to work pressures.

Bishops Castle, Banks Head, RB Addition – The Order was published, and they have received objections from both the TRF, and Alan Kind of LARA, that the route should be higher status than the claimed Restricted Byway. It will now have to go to the Inspectorate for determination.

Adderley BW addition – They have now received objections to both parts of the Order, but there is good evidence. They will now send the BW claim to the Inspectorate.

Taddymoor Lane, Hopesay nr Craven Arms – New evidence is still needed.

Linley Estate northern outlet for UCR URS U5999/10 – The outlet was discussed. A definitive footpath goes up to the gate and returns to the road. There needs to be a restricted byway outlet.

Colebatch – BOAT claim – There is no update on this Order which was made prior to CROW.

(c) Shropshire Outdoor Partnerships Implementation Team

Richard Knight reported to our last meeting that his team is now at full strength.

Richards Castle BW addition Mitnell Lane – RK reported that following some enforcement work by Shona's team to get some rails obstructing the route removed, his team had opened up the route with some new gates, and it should now be available for use.

BW10 Diversion Upton Magna – RK reported that following the confirmed Diversion Order to take the bridleway around the barn, which had been built over BW10, his team are now working on getting it sorted and improved, and just await the delivery of BW gates to fully open it up.

Sansaw BW 0210/31 There is no progress reported on the problems there.

Adcote Mill Bridge BW 0202/54 linking BW0202/UN3 & BW 0425/54 and opening up of adjoining Ford 0202/UN3. – Shona reported that they have the budget in place to do the work, and she has done the final report on works and legalities for replacing the bridge and reinstating the ford alongside. This awaits approval, then they will be writing to all concerned, but that no work can be started before May.

BW 0419/25B Nesscliffe – Shona reported that there is no progress to report in setting up a meeting date with the landowner, to try and resolve the dug away definitive line of BW25B. Zia reported that the landowner's unofficial diversion is dangerous, and that, until the line is resolved, it needs way mark posts to sign a safe route, as close to the original line as possible.

Melverley RB1 - drainage. This is still waiting to be dealt with when staff area available.

Hopton, Nesscliffe – Shrubbs Common BW 0419/UN14 to BW to Pine Car Park – The surface work on this and drainage work on the adjacent Shrubbs BW is still awaited.

Acton Round - Shirlett RB 0101/UN1 – Shona has not had a recent update on this, but was not aware of any further incidents since the Police had spoken to two people. It is understood that statements were to be taken by the Police. It is hoped that this will bring an end to this matter.

Shawbury RB 0225/1 – Shona reported that this route is now fully open and available for use.

Members are reminded that, if members have problems with the Interactive Map on the Shropshire's Great Outdoors website, which can be very slow, and can take several attempts to open it, the Outdoor Recreation Map on the home page of Shropshire Council's website can be used to look up Definitive routes, but that you cannot get the different layers of ROW on it.

(d) Shropshire Council Planning

Planning Applications - Members were asked to check and respond to any Planning Applications in their area on <http://planningpa.shropshire.gov.uk/online-applications> that might impact on off-road riding routes, promoted routes, and on the lanes used to connect routes.

Agricultural Buildings – Following concern raised by Zia that Permitted Development Right applications for Agricultural Buildings were not being consulted on, and that Parish Councils were not notified of them, Shona confirmed that they have now asked to be consulted on all applications for Agricultural buildings with permitted development rights, as these could impact on public Rights of Way.

Ebury Hill 18/04179/FUL impact on BW 0435/23/3 – Shona reported that a BW gate has now been put up next to the area obstructed by the boulder. The route is currently clear, and the BW line is now shown as unobstructed on plans. ROW will need to agree any surface changes.

It is important that a link from BW 23 to BW 19 is resolved. It is feasible, as Zia has ridden it. Walkers can use FP30Y & FP18, but currently horse riders have to use the road going north from Ebury Hill, and it is understood that they then use FP22 to get to BW19.

Oxon Link Road – There is no update on the lack of provision for horse riders along the road side path, or to cross this road.

Gypsy Lane, Gledrid - Planning Application 18/00056/FUL impact on the UCR and **BW0309/UN1/10 – Gypsy Lane** – No update on the impact of the proposed Caravan Park on this route, the underpass is the only safe way for some distance for equestrians to cross the A5.

Baschurch Railway Yard 17/02174/REM – There is no recent update on the new plans which now show a proposed bridleway route through the site, but with the last section north through the middle of a proposed car park. Shona is hoping to address the BW continuation to the south.

Valeswood Lane, Nesscliffe – The Planning Application 18/04176/FUL for 12 Holiday Chalets on this narrow access lane to Nesscliffe Countryside Heritage Park has now been reduced to 10,

but this will make little difference to the extra traffic which will impact on users of the Country Park, as the lane dissects it.

REPORTED – that Item 7 on SGO Strategy Board Agenda for Thursday 7th February is on ‘Ironbridge Power Station Site Development’ when Anne Suffolk (Telford & Wrekin LAF) is to lead a discussion about walking, cycling and riding aspirations for the Ironbridge Power Station redevelopment. Elaine went to a meeting today. It was reported that they said that they had not heard from horse riders. Neither Broseley nor Telford Groups had heard anything back following the previous 15th October 2018 meeting. You need to notify the Strategy Board two clear days before in order to speak at a Strategy Board Meeting. There is a network of dead ends in the area. Shona said that it needs well thought out plans now. There is a DMMO in for the Buildwas link. **Agreed** that Zia will write to the Strategy Board raising the Groups concerns.

NOTED – that the Shropshire Council’s ‘Local Plan Review’ ‘Preferred Sites Consultation’ has been extended to 8th February 2019, and that it is important that members check their areas for sites and any impact on riding routes or opportunities to improve or add routes within plans. Members should also note that Cross Subsidy Exception Sites can be put anywhere, including outside village boundaries. There was great concern over this and the possible impact on country lanes. Kate Nore has looked at all the Plan Reviews. Planning the open spaces etc. will be much better for all. **Agreed** – that a letter be written on behalf of the Forum.

NOTED - Kate Nore, kate.nore@shropshire.gov.uk deals with all the Searches and Planning Applications, so one person sees it all through. She consults with the area ROW Officers.

(e) Shropshire Council Highways

There is no change on the funding for UCR’s previously maintained by Richard Knight’s team. It is important that members look at lanes to check their status, and the need to claim them.

Petton – A green lane to the north of Petton off the Ellesmere road, an important route for local horse riders, which connects two public roads, was given to Zia on a list of public roads by Don Pearse former BHS County Representative. Lost Ways has it with good Public Road evidence, but it currently has no status and is not on current highway maps.

Local Transport Plan – It is important that we input to any new LTP as the last unapproved Plan was not consulted on, and consideration of horse rider’s needs were omitted. The previous adopted LTP was given an award by the BHS for inclusion of horse riders’ needs.

Flax Mill stopping up order on UCR outlet to BW 0443/UN52 – Zia has still not had a response from Mark Wootton of SC Highways on the recording of the UCR route to be stopped up as a Bridleway. It is currently only proposed as a cycle route and pedestrian path. Zia has raised this with a National Heritage representative.

North West Relief Road – There is no update on the funding for this. It is important that the provisions for horse riders, agreed at the Consultations held some years ago, which Zia attended, are still included. The link at Hencote needs claiming. It will link to the Oxon Relief Road (also addressed under 4 (d) Planning) where we are already encountering problems in provision of safe routes along and across the road for horse riders, including a bridge at Shepherds Lane.

Chapel Lane, Yorton. UCR U2527/10 – Still no change on the incorrect signing of this UCR.

Old Moors Lane UCR U1019/20 St. Martins – No update on progress in opening up this route.

6. Claiming Lost Ways

The way forward on claiming routes and funding was discussed. Zia read an email received this afternoon from Will Steel, 2026 Project Manager for the BHS, on the current position re the BHS Project 2026. They have logged over 100 DMMO applications across England. The grant

scheme to cover volunteers research expenses in submitting applications is up and running. He reported that there is more and more work happening in Shropshire and that they are supporting the digitisation of the Finance Act maps for the county at Kew for use by local researchers. They now have the ability to view and plot routes, and are continuously developing their Research Record facility which includes the ability to upload images of documents and incorporate them in a Summary of Evidence document.

Angela reported that she could help if people needed information on the Tithe Maps. Nino reported that she has not yet received any maps. Zia has photographed the old Shropshire Council Highway Maps.

Shona reported that, as her department holds all the information from the Lost Ways Project in northern Shropshire, it is not necessary to submit claims for any of the routes in that area with case studies, as the Council will be submitting these claims. We can just send any evidence of use or other information to support these routes to her department.

There is concern that there might be duplication of work on claims. It is important that we know who is working on which areas. Shona suggested that all those working on claims send details of which Parishes they are covering to her, and she will compile a map so we can see where the gaps are. We need to focus on routes that have a use, and will add to the network.

NOTED - Highways and Landowners Statements and Declarations, Formal Applications & Public Path Orders are available through 'Useful Links' on the right side of the home page of www.shropshiresgreatoutdoors.co.uk click on 'Access & Rights of Way' to access these.

6. Minutes and Feedback from SGOSB and other Forums

Noted – the Minutes of the Shropshire's Great Outdoors Strategy Board meetings held on 11th June and 25th October 2018, and that the next meeting is on Thursday 7th February 2019.

We have discussed several items from this Thursdays Agenda, including the Green Infrastructure Plan at our last meeting, and the Ironbridge Power Station Site Development, Local Transport Plan, and Local Plan Site Allocation Consultation at todays meeting.

For Strategy Board papers and list of the members so far appointed go to.
<http://shropshire.gov.uk/committee-services/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=727>

Previous LAF Meeting papers are available with ctrl+click on: - [Local Access Forum](#).

Noted – That there are no Walking Forum Minutes to circulate, as there is currently no one to run these Forums.

7. Any Other Business

Road Safety Debate – Parliament – 5th Nov 2018, Zia reported that she wrote to the local MP raising the omission of Horse riders from the Review of the Highway Code.

8. Dates of the Next Meetings

The date of the next meeting, to be held at the Shirehall at **5.00pm for a prompt start at 5.30-7.30pm**, is agreed for **Monday 10th June 2019**.

The 14th October 2019 is confirmed for the date of the following meeting.