

Meeting: MOD – Local Access Forums Liaison Group

Date: 11 April 2019

Location: [REDACTED]

Attendees

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	(Bylaw Review Team)
[REDACTED]	(Military Police)
[REDACTED]	(DIO)
[REDACTED]	(BHS)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	representing walkers)
[REDACTED]	representing cyclists)
[REDACTED]	representing equestrians
[REDACTED]	representing cyclists

1. Apologies

There were no apologies

[REDACTED], the new chair of [REDACTED] was attending his first meeting. His email would be added to the circulation list - [REDACTED]

2. Actions from previous meeting on 05.12.2018

- **DIO to forward completed Byelaws Advisory Document to HCAF Chair** Completed
- **Possibility of access on Greatham side of Woolmer Forest**
[REDACTED] thought that existing gate was open and the issue had not been raised by anyone else.
- **Crossing of A325**
[REDACTED] to contact Hampshire Highways **Action:** [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to also contact Hampshire Highways about crossing **Action:** [REDACTED]
- **Oxney Farm upgrade of [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]** [REDACTED] advised that no formal documentation was required as MOD could dedicate existing [REDACTED] as [REDACTED]. MOD could erect permissive [REDACTED] in the interim. **Action:** [REDACTED]
- **Repair of bridge.**
[REDACTED] advised that the defective bridge, which is on MOD land, was not on a ROW. The full route is partly on MOD land and partly on English Heritage land. The bridge has been declared unsafe. It was currently roped off and would be demolished as the cost of repair would be prohibitive.
[REDACTED] would investigate possibility of access for equestrians on north side of RDA. **Action:** [REDACTED]

This completed the actions from the previous meeting.

3. Long Valley and B4 fencing

Reference was made to the DIO Access Restriction Review recently published by the Trail Action Group (Appendix 1 attached).

█████ reported that from the military and DIO perspective, the fencing at Long Valley had been successful. He summarised the current situation and disputed several assertions in the TAG report. In particular he stated that the signs were only flipped when the area was in use by the military.

TAG asserted that the gates were often locked when there was no military activity.

█████ said that TAG believed there was a disconnect between when the area is booked for training and when the signs are flipped although MOD/DIO did not believe that was the case.

The issue generated significant discussion and several suggestions were made: e.g. a 6-month monitoring period in which bookings were compared with actual usage

█████ also asked for DIO's view on whether local volunteers acting under authority and guidance of DIO could be empowered to secure and unlock warning signs and gate to reduce workload on DIO. █████ responded that this was a safety-critical issue and could not, therefore, be delegated.

DIO said that it would be difficult to subdivide the area and only close parts of it.

█████ referred to the criminal damage to MOD property, particularly the fencing. The cutting of fencing posed a risk not only to the cutter but anyone who came along subsequently. The perpetrators, if identified, would be prosecuted.

█████ stated that the report contained some good points, e.g. on signage.

█████ advised he had not been aware that signs had been flipped for civilian events and said that in most cases, this should not happen.

In response to the comments in the report on the Farnborough Air Show, █████ stated that a ground safety zone had been introduced as a general requirement following the disaster at the Shoreham Air Show.

4. Bylaw Review

██████████ explained process for issuing the revised bylaws as Statutory Instruments. He reported that the Aldershot and District Military Lands Bylaws were now top of the list. It had been decided to split the area into two:

- a) North (Aldershot, Long Valley, Minley and Camberley, Pirbright and Ash)
- b) South (Elstead, Woolmer, Longmoor).

The North would be reviewed first.

The revised bylaws would have two categories of land:

- a) Protected – no public access
- b) Controlled – subject to managed access.

A draft of the revised bylaws for the northern area would be published in about July 2019 and there would be a consultation period of 35 days. It was envisaged that the new bylaws would come into force by the end of 2019. No significant changes were likely in the new bylaws. However, cycling had been raised as a "critical issue" and it

was likely that there would be a slight change in the wording regarding cycle access. Equestrian access would remain permit only.

■ referred to a letter that she had written to the Bylaw Review team several years ago and ■ asked her to send the team another copy **Action:** ■

■ asked whether there could be an informal consultation between members of this group and the Bylaw Review team prior to the publication of the draft bylaws. It was considered that, in view of the statutory remit of the local access forums, such informal consultation might be feasible, provided that it did not disadvantage other consultees. ■ expressed the view that this informal consultation could be useful.

Action: ■

5. Letter from ■ to HCAF

The contents of this letter were noted and the letter is appended to these minutes as Appendix 2.

6. Ash Ranges

It was confirmed that Ash Ranges will come within the new bylaws and the area will be controlled rather than protected. Only the camp itself will be protected land. DIO and ■ reported that there had been an increase in vandalism in this area, particularly to target furniture. It had been decided that some fencing would be required but it was likely that a corridor approach would be adopted so that legitimate access could continue most of the time.

■ welcomed this statement and said it was a good example of achieving a reasonable balance between users and MOD requirements.

7. Multi-user routes

■ updated members on the multi-user routes:

a) Pirbright –1918 link

Improvements were to be made in this financial year, including waymarking, minor diversions and upgrade where necessary to bridleway. No equestrian use would be allowed on the canal section as the Canal Trust had indicated that access rights existed for walkers and cyclists only.

■ expressed the view that HCAF and SLAF might be able to exert some influence as HCC and SCC were joint owners of the Canal. It was agreed that the two LAFs would raise the issue at their next meeting **Action:** ■

■ raised the issue of how the route would be dedicated in Surrey. This would be investigated: **Action:** ■

Although the 1918 route would not extend to Long Valley, there were other possible access opportunities that will be considered as part of the wider local Safe Ways Strategy.

b) Caesar's Camp route

Route would be permissive bridleway. Funding had now been obtained. There was a discussion on the type of gate and it was agreed that the gates would not be self-closing.

c) Hawley and Bramshott/Minley area

These routes were in an earlier stage of development and final alignment had yet to be agreed. Provisional routes across Hawley have been considered and a strategic link running north/south has been recognised as the most appropriate. [REDACTED] would follow up this during 2019 with a view to implementation during 2010. No routes are considered across Bramshott. For clarity and consistency, some of the public footpaths across Minley will be dedicated as bridleways to match the other routes across the area.

d) Links to routes

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] will continue to consider other routes and links across the estate that adhere to the Safe Ways Strategy. This will be discussed further at the next meeting:

Action: Whoever drafts Agenda

8. SAMM (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Wardens)

The wardens are administered by Natural England. MOD had provided an induction course for the wardens who in this year would be paid, with funding coming from Section 106 monies.

9. AOB

- a) Kingsley Common:** [REDACTED] asked for better signage to deter motorised use. [REDACTED] said DIO aware of the problem and also that motorised users were blocking access to residents' properties.

The next meeting would be held in July, if possible, at [REDACTED] - not now possible. It will be in [REDACTED].