



Rights of Way Committee

Minutes of the Rights of Way Committee Meeting held electronically on Thursday 11th February 2021 at 7.00pm.

Members Attending:

Cllr Denise Rosewell (DR), Cllr Chris Jeffes (CJ), Cllr Paul Moffatt (PM), Cllr Christopher Langford (CL) Kim Adams (KA) attending as a member of the public (left meeting at 8pm with prior approval)

20.001 Apologies

No apologies received.

20.002 Appoint non-Councillor member to Rights of Way Committee.

Cllr Rosewell proposed that Kim Adams be appointed as a non-Councillor member of the Committee. Cllr Jeffes seconded, and all agreed.

20.003 Current and planned projects

- Footpath 30

KA and CJ had obtained 4 contractor quotes to resurface a 150m section of the path between Martyr Worthy and Chilland. The quotes varied considerably, and specifications were discussed in detail. It was agreed that further quotes from two of the companies were needed to compare like with like.

Action: Cllr Jeffes to obtain detailed quotes.

Costs were discussed and it was acknowledged that there was not a specific budget available for this project. It was agreed that once full costs were known other sources of funding could be pursued including grant applications, support from other organisations & crowdfunding.

It was agreed that a letter should be sent to the owner of a property in Chilland Lane to ask that an overhanging hedge be cut back.

Action: DR to follow up with Clerk.

- Footpath 31

Issues discussed included the condition of the surface of the path, the width, obstructions



Itchen Valley Parish Council

Serving the Communities of Avington, Easton, Itchen Abbas & Martyr Worthy

(vegetation, trees and steps from neighbouring properties). It was noted that some conifer branches laid by a member of the public may have temporarily improved the footing, but also presented a trip hazard. It was suggested that a short-term improvement to the path surface could be made using bark chippings.

Action: Cllr Rosewell to obtain a price for bark chippings to cover 50-80m.

Action: Cllr Appleby to inform the landowner of the intention to make the path safe in the short-term and gain support for ongoing maintenance.

KA suggested that signage was needed to discourage cyclists from trying to access this footpath.

Action: Cllr Jeffes said he had some suitable 'no cycling' signage and would arrange this.

- Lone Farm Lane

DR confirmed that this path was just about accessible on foot but too overgrown for horse-riders or cyclists. It has been reported to HCC but unlikely to be prioritised for works to be carried out. DR suggested that if clearance work could be done soon before the Spring it could be made usable, but if not, it would quickly become impassable again.

Action: Cllr Rosewell to obtain quote from local contractor and seek necessary permission from HCC to carry out work.

20.004 Footpaths budget

There is £600 remaining in the Footpaths budget for the 2020/21 financial year. It was agreed that it would be preferable to use this on current projects as it would not be carried forward. It was agreed that bark chippings for Footpath 31 and contractor hours for Lone Farm Lane would be a good use of these funds.

There is £1000 Footpath budget for the 2021/22. It was acknowledged that this would not be enough to fully fund a large project (such as surface work to Footpath 30) and other sources of funding would have to be sought.

PA said that if the Committee felt that considerable expenditure would be needed on other paths in the future (possibly Footpath 31) it would need to plan for this early, and in September consider the budget provision required for the following year. The costing work



currently being done for similar work would be help establish potential future project costs.

20.005 Reporting and resolving problems (blocked paths, etc)

There was a discussion regarding effective mechanism for residents to report issues such as blocked paths. It was acknowledged that residents tended to use the Itchen List (community email that many residents subscribe to) and whilst useful it could not be promoted as proper process for reporting issues.

Action: Cllr Appleby to include guidance regarding reporting of blocked paths etc in next report for Itchen Valley News.

There was a discussion about a gate that had been damaged by a fallen tree on a footpath that crosses a Parish border. Whilst the path was no longer obstructed it was felt that the gate should be removed. For several reasons this had not been resolved previously.

Action: Cllr Jeffes to contact Ramblers Association to find out if it was their gate.

NB see note below.

20.006 Permitted paths/Watercress Way Conceptual Route

Cllr Roswell shared information collated with Kim Adams, on Watercress Way Conceptual route as applicable to the Parish and how recently negotiated 'permitted paths' aligned with this. There was support for further negotiation to try to achieve improved access along the disused railway line, and improved footpath access from Martyr Worthy and Easton to Footpath 44.

Cllr Langford said that an off-road path that linked Easton to Footpath 17 (Mud Farm) would be beneficial, and that planned changes to Government funding could help support landowners with public access schemes in the future, although details were not known yet.

Action: Cllr Roswell to draft letter to landowner with suggestions for future permitted paths.

It was noted that there was no signage as yet to indicate the new 'permissive path' near Footpath 39. CJ said the landowner would appreciate some help with suitable design.

Action: Cllr Rosewell to research and suggest something suitable.

20.007 Items for Consideration at next meeting

There were no further items put forward.



20.008 Date and Time of following meeting:

Date: Thursday 11th March at 7pm until 9.00 pm.

Location: Electronic – public welcome, contact clerk for entry.

The meeting was closed at 8.50pm¹

¹ NB Following the meeting, it was established that the gate had not been installed by The Ramblers Association. Cllr Rosewell arranged with the landowner that it would be removed. The landowner has no need for a replacement gate as there is no livestock on the land.