

Meeting Minutes

Meeting: Dorset, Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole Joint Local Access Forum (DLAF)

Time: 10am – 1.45pm

Date: Friday 22nd July 2022

Venue: Hybrid meeting (Dorset Council Offices and Microsoft Teams)

Present:

DLAF Members:

Philip Hackett (PH) (chair)
Janet Davis (JD) (vice chair)
Fiona Bowles (FB)
Nathan McCormick (NM)
Chris Slade (CS)
Paul Tomlinson (PT)
Christopher Tucker (CT)
Jim de Bertrand (JdB)
Nicola Harper (NH)
Maddy Pfaff (MP)
Mandy Willis (MW)

Local Authority Officers:

Tara Hansford DC (TH) (DLAF coordinator)
Giles Nicholson DC (GN) (Service Manager for Coast and Greenspace)
Vanessa Penny DC (VP) (Definitive Map Manager)
Philip Elias BCP (PE) (PRoW officer)
Jemma Reddaway DC (JR) (Support officer)
Cllr. Simon Christopher DC (CSC) (Councillor, Marshwood Vale Ward)

Apologies:

Amanda Wallwork (AW)
Cllr Mike Greene (BCP) (CMG)
Cllr Sherry Jespersen (DC) (CSJ)

Public Presentation – Piddle Path Proposal:

The meeting began with a guest presentation concerning improvements to the Piddle Path bridleway linking the villages of Piddlehinton and Piddletrentide, particularly relating to surface quality, to allow users to reach local facilities all year round. Following the presentation the guest speaker received questions from PT, PH and NH regarding reasons why the bridleway link is so important in the context of the local area, if problem reports have been submitted to the ranger team, if the proposal has had offers of funding, and if there was a move to restore hedgerows. The guest speaker explained the bridleway provides a link to other PRoWs, shops, and sports facilities and that there have been offers of funding from the community and local businesses. In addition, there have been many maintenance problem reports submitted and these are recorded as under investigation. GN, the area ranger and TH have walked the route from which GN added areas of the route requiring improvement were identified and quotes were obtained; the route is suitable as a bridleway, but the objective is to get the bridleway to a higher standard than that. Now quotes are obtained these need to be compared to other worthy schemes and sources of funding evaluated to come to a conclusion. In relation to the hedges, the guest speaker explained in the areas that are not hedged conversations have been had with the two relevant landowners and one has been supportive so far.

1. Welcome and apologies

- 1.1 PH welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance, particularly Dorset Council (DC) Councillor representative CSC. Apologies were received from AW, CMG and CSJ.
- 1.2 CSC introduced themselves by explaining they are from a rural background and care deeply about the countryside.

2. Declaration of interests (DOIs)

2.1 PH asked all to please indicate DOIs at time of each agenda item.

3. Minutes of the last meeting, actions and matters arising (31.03.22)

3.1 PH asked members to indicate matters on inaccuracy via pages on the minutes from the last meeting.

3.2 JD proposed the previous minutes were a true record. Seconded by CSC. No objections or abstentions.

3.3 Matters arising from March 2022, with numbers below relating to action points found in the March meeting minutes:

- A5.1: no comments received so far, still open
- A9.5: ongoing
- A9.7: ongoing
- A10.2: still open
- A11.2: the Legal Record Team have not been made aware of any Parish boundary changes but would renumber paths as required and inform interested parties.
- A11.3: new member of staff in post.
- A11.4: still open
- A11.7: legislation states the Legal Record Team will have to determine each application within four months which is almost impossible to achieve therefore delays would be caused elsewhere but until it is implemented it will not be known how often the mechanism will be used.
- A12.3: provisionally booked for November DLAF meeting
- A15.7: ongoing
- A15.11: ongoing
- A16.2: awaiting feedback, reported to be circulated to DLAF members

All other actions from March 22 DLAF meeting minutes have been completed although some await further response.

4. Legal Record Team – Definitive map and statement

4.1 VP began by explaining the Definitive Map Team are in a difficult situation regarding reducing the backlog of Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs), which has increased due to the large effort organisations such as the British Horse Society (BHS) and the Ramblers are putting into submitting applications in response to the 2026 cut-off date. Although the government has indicated its intention to repeal the cut-off date, such organisations have carried out extensive work so continue to submit DMMOs. The Definitive Map Team are up to date in all other areas except DMMOs and are trying to refine processes where possible but are ultimately hampered by the legal process and resources.

4.2 PT referred to a letter written to VP's manager after a meeting several months ago regarding what will be done about the DMMO backlog and what resources are needed to comply with their duties. PT believed a response was never received and elaborated that if it is due to being unable to afford additional resources that is a separate issue, however the answer desired was what level of staffing is necessary to carry out an acceptable service. VP recalled that this was spoken about with managers and VP was under the impression a response had been sent but was not involved in any response. VP added that the managers are aware of the issues and are sympathetic but was concerned a response was not provided to PT and was happy to chase this.

4.3 PH asked what proportion of DMMO application evidence is documentary evidence as opposed to user evidence statements. VP responded that it is not recorded but they estimated that around 75% are based on documentary evidence alone rather than only user evidence or a combination of the two. PH further explained that user evidence cases may include evidence from elderly people who may pass away prior to the application being taken forward. VP

explained the Definitive Map Team have a statement of priorities but being prioritised does depend on the applicant asking, which some applicants may not be aware of or forget. The team are looking at revising the statement of priorities and prioritisation system. PT added that years ago a member of the Definitive Map Team came to a DLAF meeting to talk through the prioritisation process and the DLAF were happy with it. PT asked if this could be done again at some point to which VP agreed they would be happy to do this when a draft is ready, noting the DLAF were very supportive previously and on that occasion the statement of priorities got unanimous support from the committee.

Actions:

- **A4.2: VP to chase response to PT's letter regarding Definitive Map Team resourcing for DMMOs**
- **A4.3: Arrange VP to talk through the Definitive Map Team draft revised statement of priorities and prioritisation process once it is ready**

5. Public Right of Way (PRoW) Dorset Council management and maintenance

- 5.1** GN explained his role as Service Manager for Coast and Greenspace which involves teams such as the highway verges, PRoW teams, Arboriculture Team, Country Parks, Natural Environment Team. The service is very diverse with a focus on greenspace and the assets that DC manage including PRoWs. GN explained there are 5 ranger teams geographically spread over Dorset, each of which has a Senior Ranger who manages PRoWs, highway verges, land that DC own and Country Parks in that area as well as manage the teams who deliver that work. The public use a reporting system on the DC webpage which come through via Cside. The issues are prioritised, and the team deliver that work. GN showed members a graph of the jobs received and resolved between 2013 and December 2021, noting that the service is solving more issues than ever before although this does not show whether the network is improving or not.
- 5.2** CS queried reports he has submitted where he believes rangers have re-routed some PRoWs, signing them offline i.e., not the definitive line as shown on the Definitive map. GN answered paths not on the Definitive map should not be signed and in response to examples provided by CS that if these could be provided in an email GN would investigate them.
- 5.3** JD checked that 55,549 was not the number of outstanding problem reports and what the outstanding figure is, with PH asking if these reports get timed out. GN estimated that there would be less than 2000 outstanding without checking and that they would not time out. GN also explained when JD pointed out some of these are 5, 10 years old that some are legal problems that can take years and can involve the Definitive Map Team. JD highlighted that the way problems are labelled under the prioritisation system makes it hard to understand how it is prioritised and how quickly things will be looked at, particularly with the term 'under investigation'. GN clarified that 'awaiting works' relates to the teams going out and completing work on problems. GN explained that there has been some improvement to the system feedback previously but there are more improvements to make and would be happy to raise this at the next meeting with the Senior Rangers.
- 5.4** CS asked if the ranger teams cover Unclassified Roads (UCRs) as well and how to report issues with them. GN confirmed UCRs are with the Dorset Highways department, but they can be reported on the DC website similarly to PRoW problems and they will go to Dorset Highways. TH reminded members that UCRs were picked up in the public consultation in preparation for RoWIP II to prioritise those of benefit to the PRoW network.
- 5.5** JD queried how paths subject to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are shown on Dorset Explorer as the Ramblers have noted cases where paths are marked as closed but when the TRO expires they are not removed from the system. GN answered that their teams sometimes request TROs but do not control the processing of them and noted this.
- 5.6** PH enquired if the public could see a list of maintenance jobs (otherwise referred to as problem reports prior to being received by the Service) and whether if several people report the same issue multiple maintenance jobs are created. TH answered a breakdown of jobs in each

prioritised category is being provided by a Senior Ranger and GN responded that the multiple reports will come through separately to start with then are condensed into a 'duplicate'.

- 5.7** PH expressed concern over the PRow teams' capacity and time spent on verges and roundabouts as opposed to PRowS using an example of some bridleway issues reported around 20 years ago still exist. Relating to department capacity GN shared that a few years ago when PRowS were a separate entity there were 6 people working on them across the Dorset Council area whereas now each of the 5 teams has around that amount of people, plus apprentices and volunteers who are trained and equipped to work alongside permanent members of staff. It may be in summer season due to demand on other areas there are around 10 people working on PRowS however this is still a great improvement than previously and only the case for part of the year. PH asked if parish councils were informed when rangers are working in the area to provide support. GN answered that generally not, as although the rangers work with Right of Way Liaison Officers (RoWLOs) most jobs are 2-3 person jobs therefore additional support would not be of benefit in these cases.
- 5.8** NH enquired in relation to stiles whether the ranger teams also look to improve them when carrying out repairs noting that in her experience this did not happen. CS seconded this issue. GN answered they should be doing that, and that is what the Service aim to do and noted this issue before elaborating that the British Standard specification is used as a blueprint although this cannot always be followed exactly due to land conditions, and that stiles are a landowner responsibility however the ranger teams repair a lot. PT added that there is a Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra) guidance document about opening up the countryside to people with disabilities and where defective structures are being looked at, the default should be to make the structure more accessible. GN agreed that gates are more accessible than stiles, more gates replace stiles each year and the Service want to expand the number of gates however if this were done on mass there would be a funding issue. Gaps can be done and are low cost but can only be implemented in some places, and some landowners prefer stiles for stock proofing. Following this, NH queried whether there is also a Standard for ground surface conditions, particularly on bridleways, that would allow those with pushchairs, bicycles, or wheelchairs to use them in winter months when they can be very muddy i.e., beyond welly-proof. GN confirmed there is a minimum standard and agreed that paths should not be deep lengths of mud, however when carrying site visits what can be very muddy in winter can sometimes not be even in spring. GN elaborated that it is an issue and hard to balance between user groups as there has been previous feedback from equestrians that it is fine all year and overurbanisation is unwanted.
- 5.9** MW explained about a particular PRow around Longham Lakes, and that the well-used entrance to the path, including being used by the DC ranger team, is a permissive path rather than PRow. MW continued that according to a NE 'rulebook' the surveying authority has a duty to keep the Definitive map under review and should take action. It was interpreted from this that the local authority could make a DMMO to record a PRow on the Definitive map. GN and TH responded that in this example TH had responded to a planning application advocating dedication of this path as a definitive PRow with adequate provision for implementation and maintenance and GN believed the ranger team had passed on the methodology of how to get this permissive route designated. More generally, VP answered that it is correct an application does not have to be received however this usually relates to map drafting errors that already have support. VP sympathised and continued that the Definitive Map Team are tied by the legal process and although a modification or designation may make sense on the ground this is not enough in the eyes of the law; a substantial amount of evidence is needed over years to proceed, which the local authority does not have the capacity to gather.
- 5.10** PH enquired whether GN would consider going to parish councils about the ease of use of PRowS in their Parishes i.e., carrying out condition surveys. GN answered condition surveys are ideal and TH explained that during the pandemic they consulted existing RoWLOs, created an up-to-date list and plans to work with them in their 5 geographical areas, to carry out parish PRow surveys. Unfortunately, the pandemic put a halt on this, but they would now like to revisit the idea through implementation of the Right of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) II.
- 5.11** GN answered, when asked by PH if enforcement measure taken against landowners are effective, that they are unsure of figures but that most of the time they have been. Additionally,

they would be happy to answer this and other questions with figures at a future meeting if provided in advance. GN explained that having smaller geographical area means the Senior Rangers know lots of the landowners which helps form relationships. There are different strategies that are used in different scenarios, for example encouragement, letters, and legal action, and GN believed overall the Senior Rangers are good at choosing the appropriate tool combinations and that this approach works well in most situations. PH highlighted bridleway examples that have been reported but remained unusable for many years and GN requested the list of issues.

- 5.12** PH discussed the multi-use capacity of the Castleman Trailway (this discussion point has been moved to agenda item 6.3 for clarity).
- 5.13** GN concluded that managing PRoWs could have infinite resources and everyone would like to see them managed to higher standards however what they are content with is the teams are pushing the boundaries of what can be achieved, including harnessing external income, for example the Active Travel Fund. GN felt the Service are working to improve the asset they have, doing a good job and there is always more than be achieved but more resources would help.

Actions:

- **A5.2: CS to be provided with email for GN**
- **A5.11a PH to submit list of bridleway enforcement issues to GN**
- **A5.11b DLAF members to provide GN with any specific questions or further question so these can be answered at a future DLAF meeting**

6. Multi-user routes

- 6.1** PH noted that the Transport Planning Team Leader was invited to the meeting and had given their apologies therefore questions that would have been asked will be deferred to the next DLAF meeting.
- 6.2** PH asked if other officers were aware if DC have a policy on multi-user routes. TH responded that in the previous Dorset RoWIP, the aim when PRoWs are looked at is that routes would be enhanced for multiuse where possible without comprising the primary users. This aim is being carried on, with the policy looked at in light of the Active Travel Fund, as well as assessing how the green PRoW network and greyer urban network interact. GN highlighted that, with regards to Active Travel projects, it is difficult to have a blanket policy because there are specifics within each one that make them more or less safe for horse riders, for example being next to major roads. PH concluded it was best to note the report for now but that they would like to see a DC multi-use policy prior to the November DLAF meeting.
- 6.3** PH discussed the Castleman Trailway, explaining concerns regarding the emphasis being on cycling not equestrians; whilst it is suitable for equestrians, there are barriers on the trailway that inhibit equestrians and that horse riders should be able to use the trailway (DOI: PH is a member of the British Horse Society (BHS)). PH continued that when they previously wrote to the Active Travel Team clear responses were not received. NH also pointed out if the barrier inhibits equestrians, they may also inhibit those on mobility scooters. GN explained horses are allowed on all multi-use routes that are bridleways and that they are keen for this to happen, believing that large sections of the Castleman Trailway are available to horse riders. GN highlighted that a revamp has recently been completed between Verwood and Ringwood, including taking out all the barriers for the reasons raised by PH and NH. This has received some criticism that motorbikes may access them, but the Service have held the line that is more people can use them they will be better self-policed, and no issues had occurred since the barriers were removed.

Actions:

- **A6.3 PH and JD to discuss a multi-user route policy**

7. Access Land – research and conclusions

- 7.1** JdB ran through report 7a to explain the open access land site prioritising process that has taken place. This project involved identifying areas of open access land without PROWs links to them making them accessible, with the aim that a list of higher priority sites could be handed over to DC and supported in the new Dorset RoWIP. These were firstly identified, data was gathered on area, designations, and nearby PROWs to assess the value and feasibility of joining them up with the PROW network. A list of 9 priority sites were identified for review and approval by the DLAF prior to them being handed over to DC. JdB and their colleagues in the working group were congratulated on the project by PH, TH, JD and PT.
- 7.2** PT added that it would be a shame, considering the effort put into this work if the Council and Natural England (NE), as the relevant authorities, did not pick it up and take it on. TH responded that it will be pulled into the Dorset RoWIP and go into action and delivery plans and has been flagged up with the NE open access land team. NE's open access land team are still currently focusing their efforts on the England Coast Path (ECP) with the review of open access land being deferred, however discussions have taken place around the role NE can play in dedication or creation of routes to open access land. NE are aware of the work undertaken and are very interested in it.
- 7.3** PT proposed the approval of report 7a, seconded by JdB, all other DLAF members in favour. 1 abstention.

Actions:

- **A7.3: Report 7a titled DLAF Review of OAL Island Sites – Stage 3 Priority Sites Review approved**

8. Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review (WCHAR) Poundbury Monkey Jump

- 8.1** TH explained that they were asked to comment on plans to for the Poundbury Monkey jump roundabout with potential enhancements for walkers, riders, and cyclists. TH pointed out there is a footpath and bridleway already severed by the A35 near the roundabout where there are areas of strong bridleway network nearby. With that in mind TH has asked for a pegasus crossing but to help support this they would like to see evidence of its need, which is critical but difficult, particularly as lots of people will not use the bridleway network due to the existing severance, but if any members have any to please send it through. TH made the DLAF aware that they will be submitting a response and the DLAF can either make suggestions and endorse it or write a separate response, however there is a tight deadline.
- 8.2** JD commented that there is already a significant active diversion order for a footpath which crosses the A35 southeast of the roundabout and TH should take that into account in relation to wider improvement of this area.
- 8.3** PT added that currently the roundabout is a no-go area for non-motorised users and with the proposed works it would be made worse, therefore, to provide safe crossing for non-motorists will be expensive. PT questioned who is providing the budget for this project. TH confirmed it is a National Highways scheme who are working very closely with DC. TH elaborated that asking for a pegasus crossing is likely asking beyond what is possible with funding, but it would be the most suitable solution; it will be discussed but it is possible no enhancements will be provided therefore it is beneficial to show all the enhancements possible to make a stronger case for non-motorised user enhancement. On this point TH added another enhancement mentioned including using verges to take cyclists away from the roundabout and back onto the main road further along. If this is the case, it would be suggested the verge is extended to meet the bridleway.
- 8.4** PH added that the South West England has the highest reported incidence of horse-traffic incidents in the UK. Bridleway severance is a key issue, roads are getting busier, and the cost of the enhancements compared to the cost of the highway scheme is a very small proportion but necessary (DOI: PH is a member of the BHS).
- 8.5** PT raised that several years ago a list of bridleway severance cases was produced which raises the question of how this one should be prioritised. PH and NH agreed that opportunities

such as this should be taken when they arise. TH added that the list PT referred to is being fed into the Dorset RoWIP.

- 8.6** PH moved to endorse TH's response, NH seconded, unanimous endorsement by DLAF members with 1 abstention.

Actions:

- **A8.1: DLAF members to send through any evidence of need of a pegasus crossing or other enhancement for non-motorised users near Poundbury Monkey Jump roundabout to TH**
- **A8.6: DLAF endorse TH proposal response to WCHAR Poundbury Monkey Jump**

9. DLAF planning working group

9.1 JD explained that previously TH suggested that the DLAF may wish to set up a group to respond to planning applications that affect PRoWs. The Ramblers had worked hard to ensure they were consulted about planning application and now receive all those that TH and the Senior Rangers are consulted on. JD reflected that this is a lot of applications, many of which the DLAF would not need to comment on, and the DLAF would not have the capacity to comment on all of those but that it would be good to look at some, for example >10 dwellings and those that cover large areas of land e.g., solar farms and mineral extraction, although this may be difficult to achieve in practice as the DLAF meet infrequently. JD opened the topic to discussion, focusing on if the DLAF have capacity, who would like to be involved and what sort of protocol would be followed. TH added that it would be good to start by looking at wider general guidance and for the DLAF to develop a policy on advice notes and standard responses for enhancements then pick some applications to focus on.

9.2 JdB felt that planning was an interesting area and an important role the DLAF can have, the hardest thing would be reaching a consensus within the timescale. If enough members were interested JdB suggested a trial exercise between meetings to then tweak and review. CS also expressed an interest to take part.

9.3 FB and NH also agreed a planning group would be a good idea. FB raised that working with other groups such as the BHS and Ramblers to highlight relevant applications, as well as being able to filter the applications alongside a RoWIP map would be beneficial to target real gaps in access. NH added that they completed the response on the Bournemouth, Christchurch, and Poole (BCP) Local Plan and did not receive much feedback from other members when the response was shared for comments. CSC suggested that the DLAF may end up with majority decisions when submitting comments rather than a unanimous one and TH clarified that it can be recorded for DLAF records who supported and abstained when a response is submitted.

9.4 From looking at the Secretary of State's guidance PT explained forums can give guidance on planning applications but would most effectively give their time focusing on relevant policies and focusing on strategic level issues.

9.5 CSC answered that ward members are notified of planning applications with respect to their ward and TH explained majors are classed as over 10 dwellings when asked by PH,

9.6 PT, PH, JD and TH discussed the nature of how applications are picked up for consultees for example, Dorset Highways, TH and Senior Rangers, and if there are gaps in the process. JD pointed out that Senior Rangers tend to comment from a legal perspective which has a limit whereas input from the DLAF would be on a more strategic level and suggest enhancements echoing TH's broader Strategic Outdoor Access Development Coordinator role. TH explained their wider role when commenting on planning applications with a strategic focus and that all comments are considered by the planning officer when formulating their response.

9.7 PH asked the members how they wished to conclude this agenda item. NH, JD, JdB, and CS had expressed interest. JD suggested those members form a preliminary group for major applications and those including greenspace, hold a follow-up meeting and report back to the DLAF next meeting. PH seconded this suggestion, unanimous support, 1 abstention.

Actions:

- **A9.7: JD, NH, JdB and CS form a preliminary planning group and hold a follow up meeting to feed back at the November DLAF meeting**

10. Access at Wild Woodbury

- 10.1** JD explained that Wild Woodbury is a rewilding project on land acquired by the Dorset Wildlife Trust (DWT) and there is the intention to have public access elements to the new site. JD has contacted the DWT officer for the site, explained what the DLAF do, and the officer said they would be happy to take JD and a few others on a site visit if other members would like to join.
- 10.2** FB added they have also been on a site visit to Wild Woodbury in another capacity and footpaths were discussed therefore it would be good to include people of other user groups for those perspectives. NH expressed interest. PH asked all others interested to email JD.

Actions:

- **A10.2: DLAF members interested in an upcoming site visit to Wild Woodbury to email JD**

11. Dorset RoWIP

- 11.1** TH gave a presentation to the group providing an update on the Dorset RoWIP progress and highlighted key results from the public consultation. Key results discussed were favoured greenspaces to visit, and key limitations when using PRoWs (overgrown vegetation and signage). When asked by PT to elaborate on the new RoWIP timetable TH answered the aim is the end of the year for the draft RoWIP but no specific dates are defined yet because of the success of the consultation and scale of information to process.
- 11.2** MW commented relating to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANG)s that some residents are not aware of what they are and that SANG is more of a planning term.
- 11.3** NH, MW, PT, PH, CS, TH and GN discussed the finding that signage was a key limitation. MW and NH explained that previously signage included what the PRoW was, a destination and a distance that aids navigation whereas many newer ones do not. MW added that perhaps a lack of signage exacerbates the overgrown vegetation issue as those paths are less walked and the vegetation is therefore not trodden down. PH added it was concerning that 4 out of 5 people could not follow a PRoW but NH pointed out if signage is poor and people struggle to read maps then this is unsurprising. PT noted in the original RoWIP it was stated signs would be renewed every x-years and it would be interesting to find out if that was followed. GN noted that most people have a sat nav or map of the road network therefore questioned whether it is an aspiration that people can walk and not need a map. TH reflected if it is a barrier to use then it should be addressed, however there is a difference between what is within duty and what is optional and thorough signage will require innovative and creative solutions to resource. NH suggested it would be good to focus on where people live to allow short walks for daily exercise. TH explained that this was endorsed in RoWIP I, including easy to find, follow and use routes in and around communities as well as those linking communities. TH elaborated that various independent projects with DC had adopted this approach, providing examples across Dorset. CS provided examples of a few parishes that produce leaflets of paths in their area, some of which are done separately and some in conjunction with the DC. GN added that Sturminster Newton is a great example of these things where the town council were proactive in their approach. GN explained the DC have previously got in touch with town councils about projects such as this but, in the case of Sturminster Newton, that came from previous communications which started the relationship. However, if other areas are keen DC would be very keen to work with them. NH concluded that perhaps the RoWIP can show examples like Sturminster Newton as best practice. CSC highlighted the additional importance of information boards, pointing out that these could also promote access by encouraging the use of particular routes and interest points that are less obvious without clear signage.

12. Consultations

- 12.1 Forestry Commission** – TH established that the recent received consultation was not relevant to the DLAF

13. Ratifications

- 13.1 12a Review of Statutory Directions Portland** - ratified
13.2 12b Glover Government Response - ratified

14. Member feedback from associated groups/meetings

- 14.1 Dorset AONB Partnership board meeting May 26th, 2022**

This agenda item was postponed until the November DLAF meeting

15. DLAF work programme

- 15.1** To be updated from minutes and actions from this meeting

Actions:

- **A15.1: DLAF work programme to be updated from the minutes and actions resulting from the July DLAF meeting**

16. Any other business (AOB)

- 16.1** FB recently attended the Local Nature Partnership (LNP) who are open to have better join up on access and drafted a paper. FB asked if the group would be happy for them to circulate the paper to other DLAF members. Unanimous support.
- 16.2** TH asked that in future can all members please provide a response when asked even if they wish to abstain.

Actions:

- **A16.1: FB to circulate LNP paper to DLAF members**

17. Date of next meeting

- 17.1** Thursday 24th November 2022