



Minutes of meeting held on 25th May 2021 via Microsoft Teams commencing at 6:30pm

www.bedford.gov.uk

Members present:	Apologies received:
David Mitchel James Russell Nigel Jacobs – Chair of the meeting Ann Kennedy Barry Ingram	Bob Wallace Cllr Royden
In attendance/Observers:	
Andrew Prigmore - Bedford Borough Council Michael Gibbons - Bedford Borough Council April Quinn – Bedford Borough Council Yo Higton – Bedford Borough Council	
Clerk: Georgina McDade	

1.	<u>Welcome by Chairman</u> The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Previous minutes of the 20 April 2021 agreed and will be signed by Nigel Jacobs electronically.
2.	<u>Apologies</u> As above.
3.	<u>Cycling and Sustainability</u> <u>Presentation by Yo Higton</u> Presentation focused on Bedford cycling routes and the impact on the Greenwheel. It was suggested that the LAF could contact Peter Blakeman from Cycle Campaign and Cycling UK Bedfordshire Group in order to encourage membership for a cycling representative.

	<p>The forum suggested that it would be beneficial for cycle maps to be produced, which would provide better access for the public, which was noted by Yo as a potential recommendation for future projects and proposals.</p> <p>AK requested consideration be given to horses also as they can ride on tarmac as well grass.</p> <p>Cycle map link to be sent to Clerk to send to members. Completed.</p> <p>It was suggested that the A1 footbridge from Kempston to Wixams could be a cycle way and not just a Footpath.</p> <p>JR advised that E-Scooters need to be taken in to future consideration considering the exponential growth in the use of the scooters i.e will require tracks to have wider widths to accommodate them. They need to be taken in to consideration for future development and networks.</p> <p>YH confirmed that all Council should have in place a Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). Bedford Council are seeking ideas from advisory groups and as such the consideration of E-Scooters and widths etc is something that could potentially be added to the LCWIP.</p> <p>BI suggested that segregated areas should be implemented so that pedestrians are offered protection.</p> <p>YH confirmed that Central Government has provided guidance. Local Authorities have to consider the widths that are available when developments take place, but this would be something that could be considered during future planning.</p> <p>It was agreed that collaborate working between the BoBLAF and Cycling & Sustainability will bring positive outcomes for the Borough as a whole, especially considering the depth of local knowledge LAF members have regarding the Borough, network and Greenwheel.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><u>East West Rail</u></p> <p>AK suggested that Footpath 1 Kempston should be a cycleway and not just a Footpath. She advised that she met with an East West Rail representative who accepted that proposals for Section D-F were “vague.” Did confirm that they want to work closely with advisory groups so that updated plans and designs can take in to consideration comments and needs.</p> <p>NJ – Asked if rail users are actual users of the Rights of Way Network. We need to ensure that users groups are considered so any new Right of Way connections aren’t put just anywhere but in convenient and desirable places.</p> <p>AK – Agreed with NJ comments that some proposals offer no enhancements apart from perhaps the viaduct.</p> <p>NJ confirmed he would draft a final response for the consultation.</p> <p>AK asked what was likely to happen to Footpath 5.</p>

	<p>AP advised that the definitive map team had already flagged that Footpath 5 can't be closed as it will split new development in half.</p> <p>LAF members agreed that the Footpath should be a multi user path.</p> <p>BI asked if there was a potential for a station at Stewartby as this could be accessed by residents of Wootton, Wixams and Stewartby. Suggested that this should be suggested to East West Rail that this should be put down as the main stop and there should be one station instead of 2.</p> <p>AK – advised that the response should be specific about Marston Vale section and the rest should be generic.</p> <p>BI – Asked if a link to Clapham should be encouraged. It was noted that there would be an issue with this.</p> <p>AQ- Advised that the issue with deep cutting are water levels and the potential for flooding.</p> <p>AK- Severing the Right of Way should be avoided either by tunnelling or deep cutting and a bridge should be first point.</p> <p>JR – Raised the point that cycle links should be considered especially between stations. Ways should be upgraded to assist/link all residents between stations.</p> <p>AK – Should add in legacy funding. Advised would draft final response and send to Georgina to forward to East West Rail. Completed.</p>
5.	<p><u>A428 Consultation</u></p> <p>AK – The upgrade over Roxton Bridge to a Bridleway including raising the parapet had been ignored due to cost, but would send around the response that the LAF originally made to the consultation and will add some comments to the original response. Completed.</p> <p>Georgina to register LAF as an interested party so that the group can comment at the next stage of the consultation process. Completed.</p> <p>NJ- Will draft final response and covering letter for Neighbourhood Plans and send to Georgina to be distributed to Parish Councils. Completed.</p>
6.	<p><u>Volunteering</u></p> <p>AQ- Nothing has been decided yet with regards to training surveyors. Could show people how to use the CAMS devices, but there are only a limited number of devices. The issue with using the pen & paper system is that it's not beneficial or cost effective for the Council.</p> <p>AP confirmed only 4 devices available for use by volunteers.</p>

	<p>AK commented that a person would need manage who has a device, book it out, volunteer would then have to do a sufficient amount of surveying to make it beneficial before returning the device.</p> <p>AP agreed. Council would need to be sure of having a good number of volunteers. Could potentially look at funding for another 10 devices, but Council would need a definite number of volunteers.</p> <p>AQ Council currently has rolling 6 year surveying in place and it is done Parish to Parish. Advised pair surveying is useful because if a Footpath is blocked one can enter the details on the CAMS whilst the other clears that path for use so the job is finished there and then.</p> <p>AK – The problem with clearing is you can get in to issues with insurance and potential land owner permissions so perhaps it’s not feasible.</p> <p>NJ – Advised he tends to send a list to Ground Maintenance for Wilstead every 2 months.</p> <p>AP – Need people to come forward to volunteer. Could potentially train 3 people in one day whilst restrictions are in place. The Council would need a list of interested parties to ensure commitment.</p> <p>AQ- Reiterated that the Council would have to ensure social distancing measures are in place and strictly adhered to if training did take place.</p> <p>AP – Potential issue is that a “condition” report has to be submitted regarding structures, which is the main reason training is needed apart from how to use the CAMS devices. Council could put in bids for funding for more devices and for future training. A little bit of investment is likely to go a long way in the future.</p> <p>AK – Suggested members present at the meeting that wanted to volunteer could agree a date for training so that they can spread information amongst user groups and parishes and gather more volunteers that we could then train up.</p> <p>Members agreed to agree a date for training on how to use the CAMS devices and what information to look for. Completed. Two LAF members attended training on 15/06/21.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><u>Future Agenda Items</u></p> <p>ROWIP Green Space Badgers</p>

Close of Meeting

The meeting closed at 20.30

Next Meeting dates:

20th July 2021

26th October 2021

Signed:

Date: