

## **RIGHTS OF WAY SUB-COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 1 September 2010

### **Present:**

Councillor Stephen Wells (Chairman)  
Councillor Russell Mellor (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Julian Grainger, Gordon Norrie,  
Richard Scoates, Harry Stranger and Michael Turner

### **1 APPPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

**RESOLVED that Councillor Wells be appointed Chairman and Councillor Mellor be appointed Vice-Chairman for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.**

(Councillor Wells in the Chair)

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS**

Apologies had been received from Councillor Bosshard as a Ward Member for Chislehurst in relation to Item 6: Public Footpath 41, Camden Park Road, Chislehurst.

### **3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5TH JANUARY 2010**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2010 were considered. In relation to Minute 4 (Minutes) the Chairman highlighted that in consideration of Minute 11 of the Sub Committee's meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2005 (Public Footpath 41: Camden Park Road, Chislehurst) it had been noted that the Order which had been made following the Sub-Committee's meeting in April 2005 had been based on Drawing No. ETP/9808/1, whilst the Sub-Committee's decision had been based on Drawing No. EHP/9808/1. This had been highlighted at the meeting of General Purposes and Licensing Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2010, and maps relating to Footpath 41, Camden Park Road, Chislehurst had been re-circulated to all members of Rights of Way Sub Committee prior to the meeting of 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010. In response to a query from a Member, the Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services' representative noted that correspondence with the solicitors acting for Camden Park Estate Ltd had ended in January 2008.

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2010 be confirmed.**

Note: It was subsequently confirmed that solicitors acting for Camden Park Estate Limited had written to the Council on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2008, and that the Council had acknowledged receipt of this on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2008 in a letter from Mr Tony Tompkins in which he said that he was taking further instructions. Two further letters had been sent by the solicitors on 19<sup>th</sup> March and 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2008, but no replies had been sent.

## **5           QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

No questions had been received from members of the public.

## **6           PUBLIC FOOTPATH 41, CAMDEN PARK ROAD, CHISLEHURST Report LDCS10154**

At its meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2005, the Rights of Way Sub-Committee resolved that an Order should be made under S.53 (3)(b) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add a public footpath to the Definitive Map and Statement along the south side of Camden Park Road to link up with the existing FP 41 where it joined Camden Park Road. The rationale at that time for the proposed Order was that Camden Park Estate Limited had blocked public vehicular access by means of electronically controlled gates across the carriageway but had left a manually operated side gate for pedestrian access. The then Director of Legal and Democratic Services considered that to protect future pedestrian access, a footpath as described should be added to the Definitive Map and Statement.

Members were advised at the last meeting of the Sub-Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2010 (the first time the Sub-Committee had met since the meeting in April 2005) that although the Order had been made in October 2005, it had not progressed to formal confirmation because of various objections to it which had not been withdrawn. As one of the objections challenged the validity of the Order itself, because of an error on the Order plan and description in the body of the Order of the length of the proposed footpath, the Order was defective and if it was to proceed further would have to be re-made. However a six month time limit applied to the making of orders under the Act and the authority to re-make the Order had expired.

Since the meeting in April 2005, the Council had not received any complaint or other indication that pedestrian access had been denied or challenged in any way as had been originally feared. Subsequently the Council had recorded Camden Park Road on its non-statutory list of unadopted highways as a highway restricted to pedestrian rights over the distance between the gates. In legal terms as a highway with that restriction there was no practical necessity or legal requirement to separately record the footpath on the Definitive Map and Statement.

The Chairman highlighted that a statement within the Commentary of the report LDCS10154 was incorrect and put forward a proposal that the entry for Camden Park Road in the Council's non-statutory list of unadopted highways should

reflect the decision of the Rights of Way Sub-Committee on 27 April 2005 as follows:

*"a highway restricted to footway rights running along the south side of Camden Park Road between the kerb line and street boundary and crossing Camden Park Road to join Footpath 41 on the other side, as shown along the route A to B in drawing EHP/9808/01 as circulated to the Rights of Way Sub-Committee for its meeting on 27 April 2005."*

The Sub-Committee supported this and agreed that, in future, rights of way issues relating to Camden Park Road should have reference to Map EHP/9808/01.

Having considered the report of the Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services and the advice of the officers, the Sub-Committee was satisfied that no new Order needed to be authorised.

**RESOLVED that**

- (1) no new Order be authorised; and**
- (2) the proposal to amend the entry for Camden Park Road in the Council's non-statutory list of unadopted highways as set out above be agreed.**

**7 FOOTPATH 279 - AVENUE ROAD (TATSFIELD) TO MAIN ROAD,  
BIGGIN HILL, INCLUDING CLARENCE ROAD & PART OF  
BELVEDERE ROAD - APPLICATION FOR DEFINITIVE MAP  
MODIFICATION ORDER TO UPGRADE TO/RECORD AS  
BRIDLEWAY  
Report ESD10125**

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 required the Council, as the surveying authority for public rights of way, to keep the Definitive Map and Statement under continuous review. The Director of Environmental Services' representative reported that, under the above Act, an application had been received for a Definitive Map Modification Order to upgrade Footpath 279 to bridleway status based on use by horse riders over a number of years. Following the receipt of the application, a consultant, Sue Rumfitt Associates, had been appointed to carry out investigations into and analysis of the claims. The consultant's report containing conclusions and a recommendation, attached to the report of the Director of Environmental Services, was considered by the Sub-Committee.

The application for a Definitive Map Modification Order, submitted on behalf of the Tatsfield Bridleways Association, claimed that the route of Footpath 279, together with other routes shown on Plan 1a which were not at present shown on the Definitive Map and Statement, should be upgraded to/recorded as bridleways. The consultant had subsequently interviewed the applicant and witnesses who had submitted evidence and had considered all the map

evidence available. The consultant had recommended that in respect of route A-B-C-D on Plan 1b there was a case for making a Definitive Map Modification Order to record the route as a bridleway, but an Order be refused for section V-X and W-X-Y on Plan 1a. It was noted that a small part of the claimed route (between B-C on Plan 1b) was in Surrey, and should an Order need to be made a formal agreement would have to be entered into to delegate to the London Borough of Bromley the legal authority to make an Order that would modify the Definitive Map for the County Council of Surrey. The consultant's fees had been met by Transportation Planning's consultant's fees budget from the previous financial year and the advertising costs of £60 would be met from Transportation Planning's advertising budget of £3300.

In considering the implications of the proposal, in conjunction with the consultant's conclusions and recommendation, various questions were asked by Members. The Director of Environmental Services confirmed that the definition of a bridleway differed from a footpath in that users were also permitted to ride or lead a horse and ride bicycles.

Having regard to all the available evidence and to the consultant's findings, the Sub-Committee was of the opinion that, on the balance of probabilities, there was sufficient evidence in support of the claims to enable the Council to accede to the request to make the requisite Definitive Map Modification Order.

**RESOLVED** that

- (1) the Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services, in consultation with the Director of Environmental Services, be authorised to make an Order under section 53(3)(c)(i) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add a bridleway to the Definitive Map and Statement for the route shown from A-B-C-D on Plan 1b (ESD/10623/1c) and refuse to make an Order for the sections W-X-Y and V-X on Plan 1a (ESD/10693/1/1a), and**
- (2) the applicant be advised that the Council takes the view that on the balance of probability, the case in favour of some of the application has not been demonstrated and that the application has been refused in part and the applicant be advised of the right to appeal to the Secretary of State, and**
- (3) the Director of Environmental Services seek delegated authority from Surrey County Council to include the section of the claimed route that lies within Surrey in the Order.**

**8 FOOTPATH 280 (PART) GRAYS ROAD TO BOROUGH  
BOUNDARY - APPLICATION FOR DEFINITIVE MAP  
MODIFICATION ORDER TO UPGRADE TO BRIDLEWAY  
Report ES10124**

Applications had been received on behalf of Tatsfield Bridleways Association under Section 53 (2) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 by London

Borough of Bromley and Kent County Council to modify the Definitive Map and Statement to upgrade Footpath 280 that runs in a southerly direction from Grays Road through Grays Farm for a distance of approximately 280m to the Borough boundary and its continuation into Kent through routes SR332 and SR331(part), to bridleway status, based on use by horse riders along this route over a number of years. This was effectively one claim for a complete route that crossed the boundary between the two Authorities, with the majority of the claimed route lying in Kent. Following discussion between the two Authorities it was agreed that Kent would carry out the investigation and analysis of the claims in respect of the whole of the claimed route.

Following a period of investigation and analysis of the claims in respect of the route along SR332 and SR331(part) to its junction with Footpath 280, Kent County Council produced a report containing conclusions and a recommendation, attached to the report of the Director of Environmental Services, which was considered by the Sub Committee.

The application for a Definitive Map Modification Order, submitted on behalf of the Tatsfield Bridleways Association, claimed that the route should be defined as a bridleway. The applicant and witnesses who had submitted evidence were subsequently interviewed and all the map evidence available had been considered. Kent County Council had concluded that as there was little mapping or documentary evidence in support of the application, the application rested solely on user evidence. In considering user evidence with regard to the provisions contained within Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980, it was determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the upgrading of these routes to bridleway status. Kent County Council subsequently contacted London Borough of Bromley to further clarify consultation issues and to note that the claimant had advised Kent that it was her intention to appeal to the Government Office for the North East (GONE) against the decision of the County Council.

The appeal was duly made and Kent had provided GONE with their comments on the appeal case set out by the Tatsfield Bridleways Association, after having contacted affected landowners both in Kent and Bromley for comments. Kent County Council's statement in response asserted that there was no documentary evidence to support the upgrading of the proposed routes and, on the basis of the evidence provided, there was not enough user evidence to substantiate either test.

In considering the implications of the proposal, in conjunction with the findings of Kent County Council, various questions were asked by Members, in particular in relation to the locked gate along the route. In response, the Director of Environmental Services' representative confirmed that should the application be successful, the gate would need to be adjusted to accommodate horse riders.

Having regard to all the available evidence and to the findings of Kent County Council, the Sub-Committee was of the opinion that, on the balance of probabilities, there was insufficient evidence in support of the claims to enable

*Rights of Way Sub-Committee*  
1 September 2010

the Council to accede to the request to make the requisite Definitive Map Modification Order.

**RESOLVED that the applicant be advised that the Council takes the view that on the balance of probability, the case in favour of the application has not been demonstrated and that their application has been refused and the applicant be advised of their right to appeal to the Secretary of State.**

The Meeting ended at 8.12 pm

Chairman