

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**DATE: 29 SEPTEMBER 2021****LEAD OFFICER: DANIEL WILLIAMS, COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS OFFICER****SUBJECT: BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC (BOAT) No. 526 (CAPEL & WOTTON) (D287) WOLVENS LANE****DIVISION: DORKING HILLS****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Extensive repairs to the surface of Wolvens Lane were carried out in Autumn 2020. Prior to the works, the surface of the BOAT, its boundary banks and neighbouring land and property had suffered significant misuse from motorised vehicles, including motorbikes. In addition to some irresponsible vehicle drivers damaging the surface, some also cause a danger to other users including walkers, cyclists and horse riders by driving at speed through sections with limited visibility. Wolvens Lane has a legal width of 10 – 15 feet and several blind bends, which can make it difficult for other users to pass vehicles safely.

An extensive consultation was carried out the results of which are contained within this report and its accompanying annexes.

Officers now consider that in order to improve the safety of non-motorised users and protect the repaired surface from damage, that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict all motorised vehicles with 4 or more wheels and all horse drawn carriages exceeding a width of 1500mm (4'11") should be made between A and D as shown on drawing 3/1/41/H52a (annex A) in line with option 2 detailed in the report (see para. 1.4). Existing structures enforce this closure are already in place at points B and C, and appropriate signage at points A, B, C and D.

This report seeks approval to publish a Notice of Intention to make a Traffic Regulation Order for Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) No. 526 Capel (D287) Wolvens Lane.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree that:

- i. The grounds for making a TRO as outlined are met. A Notice of Intention to make that Order, to restrict all motorised vehicles with 4 or more wheels and all horse drawn carriages exceeding a width of 1500mm (4'11"), to help prevent danger to persons or other traffic using the routes and to prevent damage to the repaired surface, boundary banks and surrounding associated land as shown A-D in pink on Drawing Number 3/1/41/H52a (Annex A) should be published for BOAT No. 526 Capel (D287) Wolvens Lane,
- ii. Where significant (and relevant) objections are received to an advertised proposal to make an Order, the Area Highways Manager will decide in

ITEM 7

consultation with the divisional member, and the Mole Valley Committee Chairman/Vice Chairman whether the Traffic Regulation Order may be made.

- iii. The Area Highways Manager may in consultation with the Divisional member and the Mole Valley Committee Chairman/Vice Chairman decide whether to accede to any unresolved objections and decide whether the TRO may be made either with or without modifications, with due regard to the provisions of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) Regulations 1996.
- iv. Where substantial (and relevant) objections are received, or significant modifications proposed, the Officer with delegated authority in consultation with the Divisional member and the Mole Valley Committee Chairman/Vice Chairman, may refer the decision on whether the TRO be made back to the Mole Valley Committee. A public inquiry might be convened to inform any final decision.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

For reasons of public safety, members are asked to agree that a TRO be made, to avoid danger to persons or other users of the route and to prevent damage to the repaired surface, boundary banks and adjacent surrounding land. On balance it is deemed reasonable and proportionate to make an order as proposed which maintains the safety and amenity of the way for the majority of users whilst withdrawing access from small numbers of users who cause the most danger and damage along the route and whose use cannot be accommodated without detriment to the majority of users.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Wolvens Lane (BOAT 526 Capel & Wotton) (hereafter to also be referred to as 'the Lane' or 'Wolvens Lane') is also a D Road, classified as D287. It runs from its junction with the Abinger Road and BOAT 527 in the centre of Coldharbour for a distance of 4.15km to meet Sheephouse Lane south of the A25 at Wotton.
- 1.2 Wolvens Lane is situated in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). AONBs are on par with the UK's National Parks. Each AONB is an outstanding landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty is so precious that it is safeguarded in the national interest. The land over which it passes is also designated as Greenbelt and an Area of Great Landscape Value. Sections of Wolvens Lane also pass through or run alongside areas classed as Ancient Woodland. For the most part, Wolvens Lane is a narrow single-track land between ancient boundary banks with very few places where wider vehicles can pass each other. It also contains several blind bends and rises with poor visibility.
- 1.3 Wolvens Lane has suffered from misuse by some irresponsible motorised users for a number of years with a certain criminal element. This has led to a significant deterioration of the surface with the creation of large wallows, which fill with water when wet, together with the degradation of parts of the boundary banks. The route and associated surrounding land was resurfaced with stone for most of its length last Autumn. Works were also carried out to restore and protect the boundary banks, to improve drainage and to restore adjacent affected lands. Since 26 October 2020 the route has remained temporarily

closed, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA), to motorised vehicles with 4 or more wheels, and all vehicles wider than 4'11". This was initially enforced by concrete blocks, later replaced on site with metal gates (at B and C) and appropriate traffic signs (at points A, B, C and D). The temporary closure is to allow the boundary banks and the surface to consolidate and settle down following the surfacing works. The total cost of works so far has been £226,000. Further works to the central 'sandy' section of the route are proposed in Autumn 2021.

- 1.4 Following the repairs to the surface, Officers carried out an extensive public consultation exercise between 2 March and 19 April 2021 on some options for managing the BOAT in the future. The consultation included placing notices on site as well as writing to all of the interested parties including user groups, Mole Valley District Council, Capel and Wotton Parish Councils, landowners and adjoining landowners, the Police, the Surrey Countryside Access Forum and Surrey Hills Byways Group. The consultation letter asked for views on 4 possible options, all of which would apply along the entire length of Wolvens Lane:
- (i) To promote a permanent TRO to restrict all motorised vehicles with 2 or more wheels and all horse drawn carriages exceeding a width of 1500mm (4'11").
 - (ii) To promote a permanent TRO as above for horse drawn carriages but only restrict those motorised vehicles with 4 or more wheels.
 - (iii) To promote an Experimental TRO, which would ban all motorised vehicles, except those who have been issued with a permit to use the BOAT. Alternatively, this could be reduced to just those with 4 or more wheels who would need a permit. The numbers of permits would be restricted. Horse drawn carriages would also be restricted as in option (1).
 - (iv) The BOAT has no restrictions
- 1.5 Greenway - proposals for the provision of a high-quality walking, cycling and horse-riding network, spanning Surrey were put forward in June 2020 by the Surrey Hills AONB and Cycling UK. It has identified routes to run parallel to existing road corridors and integrate with rights of way. The Leith Hill Greenway running from Westhumble to Leith Hill includes the route of Wolvens Lane. The formation of Greenways seeks to upgrade existing routes to create a significant benefit to local networks and ensure traffic free connections between significant local landmarks.
- 1.6 The committee decision is a non-executive function.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The making of a TRO is a power that may be exercised by the Council. Council Policy outlined below at s. 2.2 operates as an initial gateway to the more detailed legislative considerations (s. 2.3 onwards) which state what the Council may or may not do and what aspects need to be taken into consideration and balanced against each other.

ITEM 7

2.2 Council Policy (See annex B):

- a) That Traffic Regulation Orders be used proactively where a countywide assessment indicates a Byway Open to All Traffic is in poor condition, in need of significant repair and it is considered necessary to restrict traffic, coupled with programmes of repair as resources permit.
- b) That where a countywide assessment indicates a Byway Open to All Traffic is in reasonable condition a Traffic Regulation Order be only made on grounds of significant danger to users of the route, or to prevent significant damage to the route.

2.3 The County Council as the Traffic Authority has the power to make a Traffic Regulation Order, subject to Parts I to III of schedule 9 of the RTRA where it considers it expedient: -

- a) 'for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
- d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs'
- g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality)

2.4 Section 22 of the RTRA states that in the case of AONBs, the Council should also consider the purpose of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty of the area, or of affording better opportunities for the public to enjoy the amenities of the area, or recreation or the study of nature in the area.

2.5 The Council must also consider s. 3 (1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which states:

- 1) a traffic regulation order shall not be made with respect to any road which would have the effect—
 - a) of preventing at any time access for pedestrians, or
 - b) of preventing for more than 8 hours in any period of 24 hours access for vehicles of any class, to any premises situated on or adjacent to the road, or to any other premises accessible for pedestrians, or (as the case may be) for vehicles of that class, from, and only from, the road.

This requires that we cannot interfere with vehicular access to properties, which can only be exercised along the road in question. The Act does however continue in s. 3 (2) to state:

- 2) Subsection (1) above, so far as it relates to vehicles, shall not have effect in so far as the authority making the order are satisfied, and it is stated in the order that they are satisfied, that—
- a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road to which the order relates or any other road, or
 - b) for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
 - c) for preventing damage to the road or buildings on or near it, or
 - d) for facilitating the passage of vehicular traffic on the road, or
 - e) for preserving or improving the amenities of an area by prohibiting or restricting the use on a road or roads in that area of heavy commercial vehicles, it is requisite that subsection (1) above should not apply to the order.
- 2.6 The Council has a duty under Section 122 of the RTRA, to conduct an adequate balancing exercise to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).
- 1) It shall be the duty of every local authority upon whom functions are conferred by or under this Act, so to exercise the functions conferred on them by this Act as (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified in subsection (2) below) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway or, in Scotland the road.
 - 2) The matters referred to in subsection (1) above as being specified in this subsection are—
 - (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
 - (b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;
 - (bb) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy);
 - (c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
 - (d) any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.
 - 3) The duty imposed by subsection (1) above is subject to the provisions of Part II of the Road Traffic Act 1991.

The Courts have determined that the decision-maker must aim to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic so far as practicable whilst having regard to factors which may point in favour of imposing a restriction on that movement. Such factors will include the effect of such movement on the amenities of locality and any other matters appearing to

ITEM 7

be relevant, including factors mentioned in section 1 of the Act (See para 2.1) as being expedient in deciding whether a TRO should be made. The decision maker should balance the consideration and come to an appropriate decision.

- 2.7 An Experimental Traffic Order may be made under Sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. This order can only stay in force for a maximum of 18 months while the effects are monitored and assessed. Changes can be made during the first six months of the experimental period to any of the restrictions (except charges) if necessary, before the Council decides whether or not to continue with the changes brought in by the experimental order on a permanent basis. Any such order must have a clearly defined question which is being addressed.
- 2.8 Surrey has not operated a permit scheme before. No statutory guidance exists so a system would have to be devised and facilitated by Council Officers. An experimental order would allow time for the development of the scheme, its implementation, modification and refinement by officers. Advice on operation and implementation could be sought from other Counties (such as Kent) who have already put permits into effect.
- 2.9 The 'Surrey Priority Statement and Targets for Public Rights of Way' states that the County will process TROs in accordance with County Policy as the need arises. Processing TROs is number 4 of 8 in the Priority Statement. See Annex C.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 Section 1.4 of this report notes that 4 possible options were consulted upon:
 - i. To promote a permanent TRO to restrict all motorised vehicles with 2 or more wheels and all horse drawn carriages exceeding a width of 1500mm (4'11").
 - ii. To promote a permanent TRO as above for horse drawn carriages but only restrict those motorised vehicles with 4 or more wheels.
 - iii. To promote an Experimental TRO, which would ban all motorised vehicles, except those who have been issued with a permit to use the BOAT. Alternatively, this could be reduced to just those with 4 or more wheels who would need a permit. The numbers of permits would be restricted. Horse drawn carriages would also be restricted as in option (1).
 - iv. The BOAT has no restrictions.
- 3.2 Whilst these options remain a starting point for the consultation and the committee, they do not prevent the committee considering or proposing alternative options based upon the responses and the officer's recommendations.
- 3.3 Options 1 and 2 and 3 would not require any modification to structures currently in place. Option 1 would require changes to signage at each end of Wolvens Lane and at relevant structures. Option 3 would require significant administrative input indefinitely. Option 4 would require the removal of all existing regulation structures and signage.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Notices were placed on-site and all statutory and other interested parties were written to, including user groups, Mole Valley District Council, Capel and Wotton Parish Councils, landowners and adjoining landowners, the Police, the Surrey Countryside Access Forum and Surrey Hills Byways Group. Legal Services has approved this report. Substantial evidence was received from consultees. A detailed summary of the responses can be found at Annex D.
- 4.2 491 responses were received to the consultation. The varied and qualitative nature of them means that whilst it is difficult to report exact numbers it is possible to infer general trends of support for each option. Some care must be taken in the interpretation. Some respondents expressed their preferences in general terms, or by supporting one or more options. Sometimes an option was expressed as a supporting preference and sometimes as an objecting preference, sometimes with caveats or variations from the option. It may be possible to make some assumptions when looking at the numbers. For example, those supporting option 1, most likely would object to option 4 even if this was not explicitly stated. Estimated percentages are drawn from those responses that clearly drew attention to support or objection- many fell outside this rigid categorisation.
- 4.3 Approximately 63% of responses were in support of some sort of restriction to motorised vehicles, whilst approximately 35% objected to any type of restriction. Option 1 gained the most support (45%) but also the most objections (32%). There was only a small amount of explicit support for an experimental order and permit scheme (9%).

Other relevant statistics:

21 responses suggested imposing a speed limit
 2 people said they used the Byway in motor vehicles because they needed disabled access
 2 people suggested proper signage was needed
 6 people suggested imposing a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)
 79 people mentioned danger/safety concerns, of those 13 mentioned near misses
 1 person suggested a weight or width limit might be applied
 10 noted that access was required for carriage drivers.
 140 respondents are motorcyclists
 12 respondents had used it in a 4x4 or similar vehicle.

- 4.4 The Council cannot restrict such private rights or the wayleaves of those organisations requiring utilities access.
- 4.5 Positive responses were received from BT, SES Water, SGN Gas Distribution and UK Power Networks that they had plant either on or adjacent to Wolvens Lane. No objections were received to the works which have been already undertaken.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 If a Notice of Intention to make a TRO is published this would incur administrative and advertising costs of approximately £3,000. No additional costs on structures or signage are likely to arise.

ITEM 7

- 5.2 If a public inquiry is convened the costs of this would be in the region of £10-15,000. This would include Surrey's administration costs, legal costs, venue hire and the cost of an Inspector provided by the Department of Transport.
- 5.3 S. 54(7) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 does not:
"...oblige a highway authority to provide, on a way shown in a definitive map and statement as a BOAT, a metalled carriage-way or a carriage-way which is by any other means provided with a surface suitable for the passage of vehicles". A BOAT is defined by s. 66(1) of the above Act as a "highway over which the public have a right of way for vehicular and all other kinds of traffic, but which is used by the public mainly for the purpose for which footpaths and bridleways are so used".
- 5.4 The Countryside Access team has undertaken substantial repairs along this route. It is clear, even given this extensive maintenance work, that this would not solve all the issues of safety to the public, nor prevent all future damage to the surface and adjoining land.
- 5.5 The costs of options 1 and 2 have already largely been met in terms of works.
- 5.6 The costs of option 3 would be significantly greater. Any experimental order would need to be made and advertised and then monitored. Additional staff administration costs and any permit scheme costs would be ongoing. Should any experimental order be made permanent then this 'conversion' would also require advertising. It is estimated the costs of this would initially be around £4,000 but would rise over the order period and continue indefinitely.
- 5.7 The immediate costs of option 4 pertain to the immediate removal of structures and signs on site. In the longer term it is likely that use of the route by 4x4 vehicles will ultimately lead to damage to the surface and resultant costs of repair.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is the objective of Surrey County Council to have due regard to all public users of the highway.
- 6.2 A TRO limiting use by all motorised vehicles and some carriages of greater width than 1500mm will prevent further damage to the surface and safeguard other users. This will limit access to small numbers of those for whom this is the only possible means of accessing this area of Countryside. Just two of those who responded to the consultation mentioned that they 'required' a motorised vehicle to be able to use the route.
- 6.3 The introduction of a permit system would allow some use to continue in a controlled manner for those who can demonstrate a defined need.
- 6.4 TROs will only be considered to the extent necessary to address the issues whilst drawing on principles of least restrictive access where possible. In this instance vehicle nuisance, the risk of danger to the public and damage to the BOAT and surrounding lands is at such levels that a TRO is considered required.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 This report addresses the concerns of Capel and Wotton Parish Councils, local landowner owners, local users and Surrey Police who have made representation as referred to in section 4.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	Set out below.

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

The closure of Wolvens Lane to motorised vehicles will increase road safety and prevent conflict between users. It will also assist in the prevention of criminal damage to adjacent land and property and the dumping of vehicles and other waste. Please see the comments from Surrey Police in Annex D.

8.2 Sustainability implications

The proposed restrictions will retain reduced use of the route by motorised vehicles, reducing environmental impacts in the local area.

8.3 Public Health

A permanent TRO would encourage the public to use Wolvens Lane on foot, bicycle and horseback which would make a contribution to health and wellbeing by facilitating safer exercise and activity.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 Officers do not have delegated powers to make or advertise proposals to make TROs.
- 9.2 The committee's decision must seek to balance:
- The factual issues outlined in section 1.
 - The legal considerations outlined in section 2.
 - The representations received to consultations and detailed at section 4 and annex D.
- 9.3 The type of TRO, its extent and how it is enforced will need careful consideration. The key issues identified are:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 7

- i. The narrowness, preventing some classes of user from passing safely.
 - ii. The poor lines of sight along the route.
 - iii. The protection of amenity for as many all classes of user.
 - iv. The damage caused to the BOAT and adjacent land by continued use of MPVs
 - v. The protection of improvements already undertaken.
 - vi. The protection of all existing rights and the expeditious movement of vehicles
 - vii. The purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty and amenity of the area where it falls within an AONB.
- 9.4 Surrey Policy directs that TROs may be considered for two key reasons, to facilitate (a) repair or (b) safety and to prevent damage. Wolvens Lane has recently been repaired to a high standard, with additional works due during autumn 2021. These works have been protected from the impacts of 4x4 vehicles by temporary closure (Para. 1.3). The route is therefore in a good state of repair so (a) cannot apply.
- 9.5 Surrey Safety Engineering Team Leader (see annex E) has carried out a safety audit of Wolvens Lane noting that there are very few safe passing places, there is restricted visibility and the risk of conflict between users, with pedestrians being particularly vulnerable. This position is strongly supported by Surrey Highways who note the removal of structures would create safety concerns for walkers, cyclists, equestrians and 2 wheeled motor vehicles, and by the Countryside Access Team Manager. These are the professional and expert opinions of Surrey County Council officers.
- 9.6 Road safety was also highlighted by Surrey Police, as was the fact that it is not always possible to prevent some users without impacting upon others. Part (b) of Surrey's policy is therefore engaged.
- 9.7 Having established this, members might consider that it is expedient to make an order under sections a, c, d or f to a greater or lesser degree (See para. 2.3). Much of Wolvens Lane also falls within the Surrey Hills AONB so members should consider whether a TRO would serve to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the area (see para. 2.4).
- 9.8 Motorised vehicles and carriages are legitimate users of any BOAT open without restriction and they have a right to be there. This applies both to 4x4 vehicles and to motorbikes. Preventing or restricting those rights cannot then be lightly undertaken. The Council's duty at section 122 (see para. 2.7) to conduct an adequate balancing exercise must consider those rights and whether, on balance, their curtailment or restriction can be justified given other factors.
- 9.9 It is accepted that the introduction of a TRO will make less of the BOAT network available for use by certain user groups, perhaps displacing some use and that this will remove legal rights from some parties. Consultations suggest that the majority of use by motorised vehicles is by motorbikes, whilst the most

damage previously caused was by 4x4 vehicles. Similarly, the greatest risk (perceived or otherwise) to other users, on the basis of restricted width and visibility was also caused by 4x4 vehicles. This seems to be supported by the lack of damage to the new surface since the temporary closure was put in the place for motorised 4-wheel vehicles and carriages only and the diminishment of reports to the police, especially since February 2021. Many users also say they are now able to use the route again. It seems then, expeditious to continue to restrict access to 4x4 vehicles and wider carriages in line with the successful restrictions already in place, whilst allowing use to continue for the larger body of user on motorbikes, carriages less than 1500mm in width, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.

- 9.10 The temporary closure which has been in place for almost 1 year has allowed the Council to consider the effect of the above restriction in line with option 2, in effect, operating as an informal 'experiment'. That it seems so far successful suggests that there is no need to make an experimental order to explore a permit system, which would in any case place a significant burden upon resources. It is then appropriate, proportionate and balanced, given the issues along Wolvens Lane and the breakdown of affected users, to proceed to consult on making an TRO in line with option 2.
- 9.11 It is the Officer's recommendation that a Notice of Intention to make a TRO, for BOAT No. 526 Capel (D287) Wolvens Lane, in line with option 2, prohibiting all vehicles over 1500mm (4ft 11ins) width, be published. A width restriction of 1500mm (4ft 11ins) will effectively exclude all motor vehicles, except quad- and motorbikes, whilst permitting use by many horse-drawn carriages. We recommend that this TRO should apply between A-B-C-D shown on plan 3/1/41/H52a.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Should Members decide to proceed with the TRO, a Notice of Intention to make a Traffic Regulation Order will be published in a local newspaper, on site, on the Surrey webpages and all interested parties and user groups will be notified in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) Regulations 1996.
- 10.2 Where significant (and relevant) objections are received to an advertised proposal to make an Order, the decision to proceed will be decided by the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the divisional member, and the Local Committee Chairman/Vice Chairman. Together they may decide whether to accede to any unresolved objections. The TRO may be made either with or without modifications, with due regard to the provisions of the 1996 Regulations referred to above.
- 10.3 Where substantial (and relevant) objections are received, or significant modifications proposed, the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman/Vice Chairman, may refer the decision on whether the TRO be made back to the Local Committee. Alternatively, they could decide that a public inquiry be held by an independent inspector to decide the matter. Guidance regarding how such an inquiry would be held can be found in the 1996 regulations already referred to.

ITEM 7

Contact Officer: Daniel Williams (Countryside Access Officer)

Telephone: 07929 849518 or 0208 541 9245

Consulted:

See section 4 of report and annex D

Annexes:

A Plan 3/1/41/H52a

B Policy for TROs

C Priority statement

D Summary of consultation responses

Sources/background papers:

- Available to view at Countryside Access offices, Mellow Depot, Guildford by appointment
-