

BERKHAMSTED CITIZENS ASSOCIATION
TOWN AMENITIES SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the BCA Town Amenities Sub-Committee held on **Monday 14 October 2013** at 8 pm at 13 Doctors Commons Road, Berkhamsted.

Present: Paul Crosland (PC) in the Chair, Gordon Bluck (GB), Beryl Edwards (BE), Jenny Habib (JH), Susan Johnson (SJ), Christopher Talbot-Ponsonby (CTP), Tony Statham (TS)

Apologies: None

1. **Minutes** of the meeting of 16 September were agreed.

2. Matters arising

2.1 20 Aug. Minutes, item 3.2; 16 Sept. Minutes, item 2.1 – retaining wall at Lincoln Court. Several courses of brickwork were removed, a new brick coping was laid and the footpath re-opened during September. SJ has confirmed with the Lincoln Court Management Company that this work is a temporary stop-gap until the wall can be taken down and re-built, probably in +/- 5 years **Note**

2.2 16 Sept. Minutes, item 3.2 - CIL. PC had been unable to attend the follow-up meeting for the BCA (similarly GB for BCP), however it was clear that the quantum of monies generated locally through CIL is quite small. **Note**

3. Planning and Environment

3.1 PC had requested a copy of the s.106 Agreement for the New Lodge development. **Note**

3.3 Planning Applications for weeks of 18/25 Sept, 2/9 and up to 11 October were reviewed. **Note**

3.3.1 4/01757/13/FUL – 249 High Street (Ask); All to take a look at the plans and consider if comment was required. Post meeting note: several members had checked this and commented that the proposals were not out of place compared with the existing situation.

3.3.2 4/01791/13/FUL - Oakhill Court, 38 Cross Oak Road: SJ to object on behalf of TASC to the proposed use of upvc in soffits and fascias (property is within Conservation Area).

3.4 SJ has discussed the sign for 'Here' on Lower Kings Road with planning enforcement (see Minute 3.6 of September meeting). The sign was found not to be internally illuminated, however, the type of light fitting used was incorrect. **Note**

4. Transport (including Parking)

4.1 (brought forward from previous Minutes) BE reported that she had had a look at the new style of bus stop timetable panels and agreed with PC's view that the displays are too small, and confusing. PC to write to Public Transport Unit at Herts CC to complain on BCA's behalf. Post meeting note: reply received from Public Transport Unit at HCC – see attachment to Minutes **PC**

4.2 TS commented on some missing signage on the By-Pass (A41). This comment brought forward other comments on road signage. All to review by next meeting; TS said he would collate comments following the November meeting and prepare a letter to the Highways authority. **All**

5. Canal (including Canal & Riverside Partnership – CARP)

5.1 GB reported on a recent CARP meeting where the condition of the Castle Street Bridge retaining wall, mooring rings and extension of the towpath upgrade were discussed, however, no significant progress on these had been achieved. **Note**

6. Footpaths/ Footways

6.1 Concerning the footpath between Kings Road and Doctors Commons Road, PC believes this is currently not shown on the County Definitive Rights of Way map..PC has contacted Clayton Rae, Countryside & Rights of Way Officer at Dacorum BC to ascertain the status of this path, and also 1) a path linking Bridgewater Road to Meadow Road and FP20, and 2) paths through the New Lodge development. Reply awaited. Post meeting note: PC has corresponded with Clayton Rae at DBC – see attachment to Minutes. **Note**

7. Trees

7.1 Nothing to report. **Note**

8. Sparrows Herne Trust Waymark

8.1 Grant of £400 obtained from Berkhamsted Town Council to complement the grant of £250 from Berkhamsted Community Partnership (BCP). TS to obtain quotation for stripping the cast iron waymark from the contractor recommended by DBC; SJ to obtain the same from the contractor recommended by a contact in Tring. Works to be done in Spring 2014. **SJ**

9. Environment Award

9.1 Long list was circulated by CTP prior to the meeting.

Note

10. AOB

10.1 None

11. Dates of next meetings

Thursday 14 November (8 p.m.) at Gordon's house (**NOTE : DATE CHANGE !**)

Tuesday 10 December (8 p.m.) at Gordon's house (Apologies: Jenny)

Dear Mr Crosland,

Thank you very much for your comments, though sorry to hear that you find the new style of timetable less usable than it could be.

Since we introduced this style in different parts of the county in January 2012 we have received a lot of feedback, generally good, as many passengers seem to prefer one integrated display to a mass of individual service timetables at busy stops. However we have had some constructive comments on how they could be improved and we are taking these into account as we continue to develop the system.

Regards,

Geoff Williamson

Research & Service Improvement Team Leader
Transport, Access & Safety Team
Hertfordshire County Council

From: intalink@pindarc creativemail.co.uk [mailto:intalink@pindarc creativemail.co.uk]
Sent: 13 October 2013 12:29
To: Feedback PTU
Subject: Intalink website feedback

A user has filled in the Contact Form form on your website at 13/10/2013 12:29:16

Name:	Paul Crosland
e-mail:	peejaycee@yahoo.com
Comment/Feedback:	Much as I applaud Intalink's efforts to make travel by bus easier, I find the bus stop specific timetables to be too small and quite confusing, with many symbols. I am a regular bus user so for the occasional user, they must be even more confusing. There is a marked contrast with stops in Buckinghamshire which use a larger and much clearer display. I wonder what feedback you have had from other bus users on this subject. The content on the Intalink website is, I have to say, excellent. Regards Paul Crosland

Initial e-mail from PC to Clayton Rae

From: Paul Crosland [mailto:peejaycee@yahoo.com]
Sent: 09 October 2013 18:37
To: Clayton Rae
Subject: Berkhamsted Footpaths and the Definitive Rights of Way Map

Dear Mr. Rae

I am writing to you in connection with two footpaths within the civil parish of Berkhamsted, and in particular, the absence of these from the definitive rights-of-way map. I attach a location map to show these two paths.

The first path runs between Kings Road - next to no. 35 - and running uphill to Doctors Commons Road.

The second path runs north from Bridgewater Rd (between nos.100 and 102). Notwithstanding that there is a footpath sign on Bridgewater Road, the definitive right of way does not begin until the section which runs alongside the Bridgewater School field.

I am the chairman of the Town Amenities Sub-committee of the Berkhamsted Citizens Association, and in that capacity, I am concerned at the possible future loss of 'amenity' which might be occasioned by the loss of these thoroughfares as a result of their omission from the definitive rights of way map.

Would you please look into these for me, and see what can be done to include these paths on the map.

I note also that new footpaths are being created as a result of the New Lodge development in Bank Mill Lane (BML), running between London Road and BML. Is it the intention that these paths should be included on the definitive rights-of-way map ?

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Regards

Paul Crosland

First Reply from Clayton Rae

Dear Paul,

The first path, Kings Road to Doctors Commons Road, is listed as a Hertfordshire Highways footpath, ref 2F54/10. This means that it is recorded as a public highway that has been adopted by the highway authority but will not appear on the definitive map.

The second path from Bridgewater Road to Meadow Road And then on to link with Footpath 20 has been noted by Herts CC as an anomaly and should, eventually, be added to the definitive map. The current definitive statement, and the first definitive map (produced in the 1950's) record the path as starting at Bridgewater Road but somewhere along the line part of it appears to have been overlooked, probably at the 'Special Review' in the 1980's and left off the current version of the map.

There is no intention to add the path and cycleway at Bank Mill Lane to the definitive map. I've discussed the issue with the planning officer and the public rights are secure although Highways do not appear to have adopted the routes. Who will maintain them may become an issue in years to come but in the current climate nobody is looking to add to their financial burden.

*Regards
Clayton*

PC's Follow-up e-mail in response to Clayton Rae's reply

From: Paul Crosland [mailto:peejaycee@yahoo.com]

Sent: 17 October 2013 21:13

To: Clayton Rae

Subject: Re: Berkhamsted Footpaths and the Definitive Rights of Way Map

Dear Clayton

Thank you for your information concerning the Berkhamsted footpaths. Referring the first one, what is the difference between a "public highway that has been adopted by the highway authority" and one which appears on the definitive rights of way map ? I suppose the difference is academic as long as the right of way is protected, but I would appreciate your advice.

I assume the Bridgewater Road path is listed for incorporation on the next update of the definitive map, whenever that may be.

It is a pity that the Bank Mill paths won't become definitive rights of way, though the reasons why this won't happen are (regretfully) understood.

Regards

Paul Crosland

2nd Response from Clayton Rae

Hello Paul,

An adopted path is one that Highways have undertaken to maintain as a sealed surface, i.e. tarmac. In the past some public rights of way have been adopted as the demand for an improved surface becomes apparent. However, they would have been on the definitive map long before the adoption took place. If a route that is not on the map is adopted there is no need for it to be added because, as you say, public rights are already protected and it would take a legal order to change them.

Bridgewater Road is on a very long list at County Hall. Unfortunately each anomaly needs investigation and, at best, a legal event modification order which all take resources. The list is prioritised but, in all likelihood, Bridgewater Road is unlikely to be on the map next time but there is no danger of the rights being lost. There is a clear case for their existence.

*Regards
Clayton*