

**MINUTES of the meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Monday 28 February 2011 at 9.30 am**

**Present:** Councillor RI Matthews (Chairman)  
Councillor PJ Watts (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: WU Attfield, CM Bartrum, GFM Dawe, DW Greenow, JW Hope MBE, TW Hunt, PM Morgan, A Seldon and NL Vaughan

**In attendance:** Councillors PA Andrews, WLS Bowen, PJ Edwards, KG Grumbley, MAF Hubbard, MD Lloyd-Hayes and DB Wilcox (Cabinet Member – Highways and Transportation)

**58. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor JG Jarvis (Cabinet Member – Environment and Strategic Housing).

**59. NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

There were no named substitutes.

**60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes, Personal, as a Member of the Greenway Steering Group.

**61. MINUTES**

In relation to Minute No 49 – Environmental Performance 2009 (GEM) it was requested that the following final bullet point be added:

- The Committee noted that in relation to NI175 (GEM TR1) there appeared to be a discrepancy between the National Indicator target of 91%, which a member claimed was undeliverable, and the LTP target to maintain buses to local centres.

**RESOLVED:** That subject to including the above additional wording the minutes of the meeting held 26 November 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**62. SUGGESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY**

No suggested areas for scrutiny were received from the public.

**63. UPDATE ON PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY (Pages 1 - 2)**

The Committee received an update on progress and issues, set out in the Public Rights of Way (PROW) report considered by the Committee on 13 July 2010.

At its July 2010 meeting the Committee received a report on the PROW Service including an indication of the responsibilities of Amey and the Council following the transfer of the Service

to Amey, and performance in relation to various aspects of its work, following which the Committee requested a further update.

The Chairman reported that questions had been received from Mr Everitt and Mr Lee relating to this agenda item and that copies had been circulated to members prior to the meeting. The full questions have been appended to these minutes and a written response would be given.

Responding to questions on the Service's apparent lack of progress the Chairman agreed but appreciated the restricted level of resources available. The Cabinet Member (Highways and Transportation) shared the concerns but pointed out that systems had been streamlined and needed time to show improved results. He emphasised that the Council had to prioritise its limited resources.

The Countryside and Leisure Development Manager presented the agenda report which set out a number of current issues and performance around Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMO), Public Path Orders and network maintenance. The report also provided an update on a list of issues previously suggested for scrutiny. He highlighted that since the July report the PROW Team were undertaking two new areas of work. The first related to the researching of applications for amendments to the Council's statutory List of Streets. The second involved implementing a solution to the Ordinance Survey's Positional Accuracy Improvement (PIA) programme. Both areas impacted on the work load of the DMMO team. This impact and consequent change to outputs had been agreed by Amey and Herefordshire Council and set out in the report.

During the course of scrutinising the report the Committee noted the following principal points:

- In the timescale of PROW work six months didn't provide sufficient time to show significant improvement.
- The Countryside Commission used to provide funding for bridge installations. That funding had ceased and the County had a backlog of bridge maintenance works. The PROW team were exploring whether alternative maintenance options were feasible e.g. working through the Ramblers Association or the Parish Councils.
- The Committee noted the position concerning the issues previously submitted by Mr P McKay as set out at appendix 1 to the report. These had been considered and mostly fell into three categories of: dealt with; an operational matter or for Herefordshire Local Access Forum (LAF) to consider.
- In response to the Committee's recommendation in July 2010 a meeting had been held with members of the local National Farmers Union. The NFU had acknowledged their PROW responsibilities and were keen to work with the PROW team, particularly recognising the importance of tourism to the county.
- Herefordshire Local Access Forum had sought a meeting with the Minister and MP's to discuss PROW issues. Current indications were that this may occur in July 2011 and officers would ask the HLAF to consider inviting various representatives of the Council to attend.
- Clarifying issues around bridge maintenance the Committee were informed that small scale bridge works were usually undertaken in-house with larger structures put out to tender.
- Due to the resources required to process applications to go to the Secretary of State for decision, nine months to one year being a typical time scale, only one was awaiting decision, however other applications were awaiting processing.
- Good progress had been made in tackling the backlog in Highways Act orders and therefore the new procedure, indicated in the July report of applicants appointing their own consultant, would not now be implemented but the existing procedure was being revised to minimise the burden on the Council.

- The Committee requested that any future report should indicate the percentage of the network open to the public – particularly in relation to the important category 1 & 2 routes. Information also needed to clearly indicate performance against targets (the service direction of travel).
- A number of outstanding service issues related to hazards or obstructions across rights of way. Some were such that the public could go around the obstruction others related to buildings having been built across the right of way and these would be more resource intensive to sort out. Following a query relating to prioritisation, it was reported that in line with PROW Standards, Amey had met the necessary targets that 100% of hazards had been made safe within 48 hours and 77 out of 78 (98.7%) of defects on a Category 1 route had been cleared, or programmed for works, within 3 months.
- The Committee supported the intention to further develop the closer working between the Parish Paths Partnership (P3) scheme, the Parish Lengthsman scheme and other partners e.g. the Ramblers Association. Efforts to focus the work undertaken by volunteers was also welcomed. The Cabinet Member (H&T) commented that while no further finance was available there was a need to ensure that greater value for money was achieved. Questioned whether this linked to the Localism Bill he thought this was a typical example of how communities can get involved to make a local difference.

The Chairman thanked Mr Everitt and Mr Lee for their questions, responses to which would be sent in writing in due course.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- a) that the position set out in the report be noted;**
- b) the Committee supports the closer working arrangements with partners particularly concerning the Parish Paths Partnership (P3) scheme and the Parish Lengthsman scheme;**
- c) future performance reports should indicate the percentage of the main network that was open to the public; and**
- d) written responses be given to the public questions.**

#### **64. ROAD OVER RAIL BRIDGES**

The Committee were informed of the number and condition of road over rail bridges, the responsibilities for maintenance, and the means of determining that maintenance.

The Technical Director, Consulting Highways, Amey, presented the agenda report and highlighted the bridge number, type and responsibility indicated in the report. He emphasised that all bridges for which the Council were responsible were managed in accordance with national standards to determine their condition, to identify maintenance works and that they are safe for traffic. Network Rail and British Rail Residuary Board state that their bridges were managed in accordance with their national standards.

He reported that four bridges were assessed as below full highway loading and these were further detailed in the report.

During the course of debate the following principal points were noted:

- The Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services, reminded Members that the report had been requested to ensure that the problems encountered with the Colwall railway bridge were not repeated and that potential issues were identified at an early stage.
- Noting that the report stated that there were no ongoing issues with Network Rail associated with land/fences at bridges ..., concerns were raised regarding the state of the fences (public safety, site security and visual untidiness) at Newtown

Road, Burcott Road College Road area of the City which the Committee wished to see addressed. On a similar point a member of the Bartestree & Lugwardine Group Parish Council (Mr M Wilson) requested that the fencing at the Whitestone Lane Bridge also be attended to.

- It was clarified that Woodleigh Road Bridge was at Ledbury and went over the Town Trail.
- Noting that the Huntington Court, Hereford, bridge was being considered for safety improvements, a local Ward Member (Councillor PA Andrews) requested that attention be given to designing out any opportunity to fly tip, which was currently the case.
- Following the recent fatal accident at the former rail bridge at Belmont Road, Hereford, the Highway Network Manager assured the Committee that all necessary bridge height restrictions were in place.

**RESOLVED: That**

- a) the position set out in the report be noted ; and**
- b) in view of the public safety, site security and visual untidiness the Committee recommend that the Executive, through the officers, investigate the various boundary ownership responsibilities in the Newtown Road, Burcott Road, College Road area of Hereford with a view to encouraging the owners to repair their fences and that the Chairman and V-Chairman be kept informed of progress and supplied with copies of the letters to the appropriate land owners within 21 days**

**65. PRELIMINARY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT**

The Committee were informed of the requirements of the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 and the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in regard to the development of a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for Herefordshire; and in particular the requirement for Herefordshire Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority to prepare a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA). The Committee's views were sought on the modification of the indicative national assessment of flood risk in Herefordshire; and the Committee's guidance was sought on the local significance of the criteria used in the preparation of the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment Report, and in the subsequent development of Herefordshire's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.

The Highway Network Manager reported that the deadline for the submission of the PFRA to the Environment Agency (EA) was 22 June 2011 following which the Agency would review the PFRA and publish it by 22 December 2011. A consistent approach was required nationally for the assessment of flood risk and this was supported by detailed guidance. The Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) will identify if from local knowledge there were Flood Risk Areas within Herefordshire. The identification will be based on the identification of significant harmful consequences on human health, economic activity and the environment as defined by the guidance. The indicative national flood risk map prepared by the Environment Agency provided a consistent assessment of flood risk across England and Wales. The indicative flood risk map identified nationally significant flood risk areas. Drawing on local knowledge of flood risk it had been determined that there were no nationally significant flood risk areas in Herefordshire. The indicators and threshold values used to determine the indicative Flood Risk Areas were included in Appendix 1 to the report.

During consideration of the report the following principal points were noted:

- The Assessment arose out of significant national /international flood events and while areas of Herefordshire were subject to flooding they were not of the scale covered by the guidance. Significant resources would be needed to provide the

evidence should the Authority wish to amend the indicative assessment of flood risk for Herefordshire.

- While the methodology adopted by the EA was to inspect 1 km grid squares for local flood risk and to seek clusters of flood risk in order to identify nationally significant flood risk areas, outside of the Assessment process the EA had agreed to subdivide the grid squares for Hereford to give a more accurate assessment of those areas likely to flood.
- Over the years a large volume of local knowledge had been amassed and this would be used to inform subsequent flood risk management and make substantiated financial bids for future flood alleviation schemes.
- Questioned why the Council's 'County Wide Flood Alleviation Strategy Preliminary Assessment' report by Brian Faulkner (April 2010) had still not been made publicly available the Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services confirmed that the report would be made available via the Council's Website.
- Responding to a question regarding the Council's representation on the Environment Agency Midland Flood Defence Committee the Cabinet Member (H&T) confirmed that Gloucestershire held the local seat on the Committee and that he was the substitute member. He had questioned the representation rights and this was being investigated.
- The local Member for Hampton Court Ward raised a number of issues and suggested that a further report be brought to Committee prior to the election period. The Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services reported that as Lead Local Flood Authority, the Council has a local Multi-Agency Partner Group set up to consider and co-ordinate just such issues and suggested that the Group was the best place to direct these issues. The next meeting of the Group would be in April 2011.
- The Cabinet Member (H&T) reminded the Committee that major investment had already been made in the County namely: the schemes at Ross-on-Wye, the King George/Bishops Meadow, Hereford, and the local scheme at Cross Keys. The Yazor Brook alleviation scheme was about to start. Management and funding bids needed to be looked at holistically.
- Concerns were raised regarding the accuracy of the Flood Risk map produced by the Environment Agency. The Mapping & Data Team Leader, Environment Agency, was in attendance at the meeting and he agreed to discuss the concerns outside the Committee.
- Clarifying paragraph 7 of the report the Highway Network Manager reported that flooding from blocked sewers or burst water mains were classed as a system failure rather than a lack of capacity in the drainage system.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee**

- a) agreed that the indicative assessment of flood risk in Herefordshire is not amended;**
- b) supported the preparation of the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment Report in accordance with the Guidance provided to all Lead Local Authorities by DEFRA;**
- c) agreed that the local issues concerning the accuracy of the Flood Risk Mapping be taken up with the Environment Agency; and**
- d) the following specific issues raised be referred to the Multi-Agency Partner Group:**
  - I) confirm that the 20 sites considered do not leave others worthy of consideration out of the process**
  - II) produce a prioritised set of flood risk sites with rough order costs**
  - III) confirm that the Benefit/Cost rationale is sound**

- IV) set in place actions to seek funding for various alleviation measures
- V) make recommendations on deployment of the (ring fenced) area grant funding for 2011/12 and 2012/13 and;
- VI) that Herefordshire submits a bid against the latest round of DEFRA individual protection grants.

At 11.15am the Committee adjourned and resumed at 11.25am

## **66. INTRODUCTION TO EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PLANNING FOR FLOODING IN HEREFORDSHIRE**

The Committee were informed of the Herefordshire Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) and the development of a Generic Reservoir Inundation Off-site Plan and the ongoing work programme that would enhance and develop the County's emergency preparedness for flooding.

The Assistant Director Public Health presented the agenda report and informed the Committee that the Pitt Review (December 2007) highlighted the need to improve reservoir emergency preparedness, recommending that reservoir flood inundation maps be prepared allowing local resilience forums to prepare generic emergency off-site plans and meet their duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004. The Herefordshire MAFP had been drawn up by the Joint Emergency Planning Unit in compliance with DEFRA guidance and had been peer reviewed by West Mercia Local Resilience Forum partner agencies (e.g. Police, Ambulance, Fire, EA) and considered "very satisfactory" when scored against the DEFRA MAFP Checklist. The Reservoir Inundation Off-Site Plan provided a framework to facilitate a co-ordinated multi-agency response to the off-site consequence of a potential or actual dam breach at a reservoir. Although a generic response plan, it contained specific hazard mapping relating to Herefordshire.

The Committee noted that the MAFP had been validated at 'Exercise UNITE', in November 2010. It will be further evaluated as a tactical tool during the national exercise 'Watermark' on 8 March 2011. Responding to whether key Councillors had been informed of the exercises the Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services reported that UNITE had been a 'table-top' senior officer level meeting of the Herefordshire multi-agency flood group, but acknowledged that Members may wish to be informed that such exercises were taking place.

In relation to the reservoir flood inundation maps and the possibility of flooding from a major dam burst at the Elan Valley, Rhayader, the Committee were informed by the Mapping & Data Team Leader, Environment Agency, who was in attendance at the meeting, that flooding from such an event was unlikely to reach Herefordshire.

**RESOLVED: That the Committee supported the work undertaken in the development of the Herefordshire Multi-Agency Flood Plan (MAFP) and the Generic Reservoir Inundation Off-Site Plan.**

## **67. UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED HEREFORD TRANSPORT HUB**

The Committee received an update on progress in respect of the Transport Hub concept being explored by Hereford Futures in association with the redevelopment within the Edgar Street Grid area of Hereford.

The Transportation Manager reported that the Transport Hub is a concept for integrating access at Hereford Railway Station which formed part of a wider set of proposals for the Edgar Street Grid area. The Transport Hub concept was being led by the Hereford

Futures team and progress had been made in terms of discussions with Network Rail and Arriva Trains who own and manage the railway station and key areas of land to the front of the station forming the existing forecourt area. Delivery of the Transport Hub concept was contingent on progress being made in re-developing the Edgar Street Grid and implementation of the link road. A Regional Growth Fund bid had been submitted to government to secure funding to deliver the link road with the result anticipated by the end of April 2011. Appendix 1 from the ESG Masterplan had been appended to the agenda report to indicate the relationship between the proposed hub and the alignment of the new link road.

During the course of debate the following principal points were noted:

- It was confirmed that progress with the transport Hub was dependent on the success of the Regional Growth Fund bid for the link road from Aylestone Hill to Edgar Street.
- Based on the assumption that the funding bid had been submitted to meet economic deprivation, the Committee requested a Member briefing note outlining to the background the bid, particularly in relation to the financial and job creation aspects and the level of business support.
- The Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services reported that the funding bid had received support at a sub-regional level as being a sound technical bid.
- Mr Pickles, Project Engineer, Hereford Futures, commented that Hereford Futures were working with the Chamber of Commerce to improve job creation and skills levels in Hereford.
- Noting the close geographical relationship between the railway station and the sorting office car park and the proposed link road and transport hub, concern was expressed that should Royal Mail Group (RMG) decide to relocate the sorting office as a result then, it was suggested, this could have a detrimental effect on postal deliveries in the County. The Project Engineer, Hereford Futures commented that any re-location of the RMG operation from its current site was a matter for the RMG alone.
- The Member for Central Ward (in attendance) commented that as there were no plans or stated principals for how the Transport Hub would interact with other modes of transport in the City, then it would be difficult for the Committee to scrutinise the proposal. In response the Committee noted that plans on the proposal had been available for some time and consultation had been undertaken. The Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services pointed out that the Transport Hub was still at a concept stage, however as it developed its interrelationship to other modes of transport would need to be picked up in the Local Transport Plan.

**RESOLVED: That the update on the proposed Hereford Transport Hub be noted and the Committee be provided with a Member briefing note on the background to the Regional Growth Fund bid, particularly in relation to the financial and job creation aspects.**

## **68. CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING**

Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes (in attendance) declared a personal interest as a member of the Greenway Steering Group.

The Committee considered progress of the 2010/2011 Environment Capital Programme within the overall context of the Council's Capital Programme.

The Director of Resources representative presented the agenda report and highlighted that the total programme had increased to £18,749m from the figure of £17.998m

previously reported and this, together with other variances, were set out in more detail in the report and Appendix 1.

The Committee noted that the final position on the Ross Flood Alleviation Scheme had been agreed and that full settlement was expected imminently from the Environment Agency.

The Cabinet Member (Highways and Transportation) reported that the government had announced that finance would be available for the repair of potholes arising from the winter weather and he anticipated that a £1m bid would be made towards the £2m worth of damage incurred in the County.

Responding to questions on the Sustrans Connect 2 Greenway scheme the Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services reported that following the options appraisal stage a further (third) option had been identified and was being consulted on. A report was available on the Council website. He confirmed that the three options could still be delivered by spring 2013 which was a requirement of the Sustrans funding for this project.

**RESOLVED: That the position set out in the Capital Budget report be noted.**

#### **69. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING**

The Committee considered the financial position for the Environment revenue budgets for the six months to 31 December 2010.

The Director of Resources representative presented the agenda report and highlighted that the total environment revenue budget for 2010/2011 had increased to £25,571k from the figure of £24,922k previously reported and this, together with other variances, were set out in more detail in the agenda report and appendix. She reported that the current position projected an overspend of £1.096 million, mainly due to an overspend in highway winter maintenance (£1.582 million) reflecting the impact of the weather so far this winter.

The Committee noted that the reduction of £117k in revenue budgets for 2010/11 reflected the accounting adjustment required to contribute Growth Bid Revenue grant to the Outer Distributor Road Capital Scheme.

**RESOLVED: That the position set out in the Revenue Budget report be noted.**

#### **70. ENVIRONMENT PERFORMANCE UP TO DECEMBER 2010**

The Committee considered the current outturns and progress against the actions for key national performance indicator targets for the period to 31 December 2010 as they relate to the Environment Scrutiny Committee.

The Assistant Director, Highways, Transport and Community Services, reported that in overall terms performance was on target. Those areas indicated as amber had action plans in place.

The Committee appreciated the improved position in relation to NI 195 (Improved Street cleanliness and environmental cleanliness) and NI196 (Improved Street cleanliness and environmental cleanliness – Fly tipping).

The Committee noted that NI 182 was at 76% being 10% above target, and therefore indicated as green however a Member commented that the 66% satisfaction target didn't seem a very challenging target to aim for.



**RESOLVED: That the position set out in the performance report be noted.**

**71. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered its work programme.

**RESOLVED: That the work programme be noted and it be recommended to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

The meeting ended at 12.22 pm

**CHAIRMAN**



## Environment Scrutiny Committee 28 February 2011

Public Questions received relating to Agenda Item 6 – Update on Public Rights of Way – together with written response.

### From Mr Everitt

**Question.** I would like the Committee to consider whether or not the continuing service given to Definitive Map Modification Order applicants is so poor that it should be referred to the Cabinet and Full Council.

### Background to the Question

Definitive Map Modification Orders are commonly referred to as DMMOs. The background to my request is:

The DMMO topic was discussed by the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in December 2008 and again in June 2009. It was also discussed by this Committee in July 2010 and is part of the Public Rights of Way Report you are looking at today.

Paragraph 6 of the Report before you states that there are 83 DMMOs awaiting determination. Last year it was 85, in June 2009 it was 82 and December 2008 it was 97. More historically, a Price Waterhouse audit report in July 1995 stated that there were only 106 DMMO applications awaiting determination or in work in the whole of Herefordshire and Worcestershire combined. Today there are 105 in Herefordshire alone!

Last July you were told that there was a legal requirement to determine DMMO applications within 12 months of receipt. What neither that Report nor today's Report tells you is that some of these applications date back to the early 1990s, ie 20 years ago, and that a significant number of them pre date 2000, ie they are more than 10 years old.

Today's Report also does not mention the anomalies situation which was briefed to you last July. You were told then that there was a backlog of more than 300 anomalies which were likely to require extensive research and in many instances a legal order to correct them. This is work which requires the same skills and expertise as the DMMO work.

However, in spite of this huge and longstanding backlog of work, today's Report advises you in paragraph 7 that two more tasks have been placed on the DMMO team. Thus it is necessary to reduce the forecast DMMO output this year. Moreover, today's Report also notes that the proposal made to you last July to free up staff from the Highways Act task for the DMMO task is now not necessary. In this context I suggest it is pertinent that the Council has discretion about undertaking the Highways Act task but a 'duty' to undertake the DMMO task.

In conclusion, I suggest that these various figures show that the Council is doing no more than maintaining the status quo of a DMMO situation that has been unacceptable for many years.

Today the officers are asking you to note their Report. This is the same recommendation that has been made and accepted by three Scrutiny meetings since 2008. However such past endorsements do not seem to have improved the service to

DMMO applicants and this is why I am suggesting consideration at Cabinet and Council level should be recommended.

**Response.** *Comment by the Chairman and the Cabinet Member – Highways and Transportation, are noted in the minutes. The Cabinet Member is fully aware of the issues and in this context there would seem to be no merit in referring the issues to Cabinet or Council at this time.*

**From Mr. Lee**

**Question 1.** Bridges! The poor condition and the ever growing number of “Temporary” closures (which are 6 month or longer – hardly temporary) are of very great concern. As stated in the July 2010 and February 2011 reports, Public Rights of Way provides considerable income to Walking Tourism bringing much needed income into the local economy, What positive actions are being put in place to resolve the grave bridges issues?

**Response.** *The condition of the bridge stock is recognised as an issue of concern. The Council’s Public Rights of Way Team has developed a programme of replacements and repairs that identifies the priority works for next financial year although this is always subject to change if we are made aware of works that may be required to other structures. However, it is unavoidable that some larger structures on less used paths will remain closed for the foreseeable future unless another way can be found of funding the required works. We are exploring working with the Ramblers and other volunteers to enable them to install ditch crossings and smaller structures on our behalf which will also go a small way to mitigating this problem.*

**Question 2.** In the Review report of 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 there was mention in Para 17, of 300 Definitive Map anomalies. Some past anomalies have been resolved during digitisation of the Definitive Map leaving this 300 figure. I see no mention in the February 2011 report of how these 300 will be resolved. How will the remaining 300 items be resolved?

**Response.** *With regards to anomalies, we will continue to address these as and when the opportunity arises as part of our other work, e.g. PPOs - Humber Court bridleway HU4 is an example of this. We are also happy to work with the HLAf and others to develop solutions that can assist with this but we do not have the staff resources to proactively tackle all the anomalies in the short term.*

**Question 3,** In the Review report of 13<sup>th</sup> July 2010 Appendix C - PPI05 – PROW Standards. It was stated that a set of PROW Standards would be agreed between Amey and Herefordshire Council by 30<sup>th</sup> July 2010. Despite asking the question as to what these Standards are, at the Herefordshire Local Access Forum, these Standards have not yet been set. These Standards will apply and be measured from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010. What are these Standards?

**Response.** *The standards are that all reported hazards should be made safe with within 48 hours and that all reported defects of category 1 routes should be cleared or on a work programme within 3 months. Both standards have been met for the relevant period.*

End