****

**City and County of Swansea**

## **Minutes of the Swansea Local Access Forum**

##### Committee Room 3A, Guildhall

Wednesday, 24th January 2024 at 7:00 pm remotely via Teams

**Present**: Councillor PR Hood-Williams (Chair) presided

**Forum Members:**

 R Beale A Evans D Naylor P Lanfear

C Scott B Parry A Morgan B Stein

R Church S Samuel J Nellist G Ferguson

B Rowlands A Probert C Jones A Stevens

**Observers:**

H Grey (NRW)

**Officer(s):**

Chris Dale Countryside Access Team Leader (Secretary)

Hayley Chappell Commons Registration Officer (minutes)

**Apologies:**

R Church S Samuel A Stephens D Naylor B Rowlands

<AI1>

</AI1>

<AI2>

1. **Declarations of Interest**

In accordance with the Code of Conduct adopted by the City and County of

Swansea, no interests were declared.

1. **Approve</AI2>**

**<AI3>**

 **& sign the Minutes of the previous meeting(s) as a correct record**

CD - Forgot to include notes from J Nellist that were readout at the meeting, which should be included in the minutes.

**Resolved** that the Minutes of the Swansea Local Access Forum Meeting held

on 11 January 2024 be approved and signed as a correct record.</AI3><AI4>

1. **Access on Kilvey Hill dedicating PROW on Council owned land**

CD read out the comments from R Church and R Rowlands. Comments were also received about the noise pollution policy in the LDP from Paul Meller.

R Church would broadly support A Morgan’s views that the proposal represents an opportunity to create better access to Kilvey. There is a lack of clarity from the Developers as to how they will preserve existing access rights for horses and cycling.  If possible the LAF should ask for further information and suggest addressing developers directly on the access issues that that are now apparent to the LAF.

B Rowlands – Local opinion and questions must be taken into account, often these fears and concerns can be overcome with discussion and compromise by all parties involved. Open Access is what this forum is to comment on, the access of the public will be impeded by this application and the area will be changed forever by this application getting approval. Will the forum be doing its job correctly if we don’t make these observations?

CD shared comments from meeting in December. One or two points have been clarified. There will be no fencing around the luge – which raised other issues about health and safety.

Points 1 to 3 - Lack of accommodation for horse riders. PHW referred to point 3 and it looks like riders in area have been ignored. J Nellist –these comments still stand.

Point 4 Potential bridleways and footpaths. C Dale shared maps showing the council’s proposed bridleways and other routes. C Dale asked for any ideas of further routes. The Ramblers have surveyed routes and also local resident Richard Williams has set out routes used by riders.

Council has powers to dedicate PROW on their own land, but on other peoples land there is a different process needed. J Nellist supports the bridleways on the Council owned land. A Morgan identified the path to the west of the Hill as an ideal walking path, but CD stated that it may not suitable as a bridleway and needs checking. J Nellist will try to have a look at the route to check its suitability for horses. CD If the proposal does go ahead, there would be opportunities to gain better access through the use of a planning section 106 agreement.

B Parry suggested that, in addition to the path, a ranger is employed to oversee the access of Kilvey Hill financed by the owners as long as the project continues.

CD not familiar with planning procedures but suggested that the LAF include everything that they would think would assist access and promote access.

C Jones stated that if the project doesn’t go through could we still ask for these things to be done, as it needs to be like a country park and to be improved. B Parry - the Clyne Valley country park has a group of very active volunteers. C Dale stated that are volunteers on Kilvey already, managed by Sean Hathaway.

Only way the bridleway could go ahead is with s106 money or by paying for it with grants. PHW seems that LAF is happy with the proposed bridleways and other opportunities could be included in the response. A Morgan – path to Crymlyn Fen needs to be improved. CD may be possible under section 106, as cannot designate a path, but can pay to improve and can ask for funding for the signage to be improved.

Established that middle paths goes over the luge not under it, but bridges are not going to be suitable for horses so comments still relevant. C Jones - electric wheelchairs can be heavy and capable of going off road.

J Nellist – point 10 about noise pollution will be an issue to the surrounding vicinity and frighten horses within the area – so these comments are still relevant and also there will be a lot of human generated noise. At the moment it is a quiet place, and the development will change the areas atmosphere.

J Nellist advised of noise alongside bridleways which affect where you would like to go for your air and exercise. Needs serious consideration. The routes are not registered bridleways but would like to register them and they are in use.

C Jones attended a transport for all meeting which included neuro-diverse people and those that are affected by the noise, noise is an element in the LDP and the site will always be noisy. J Nellist referred to the Discrimination Act and how the noise could affect neuro-divergent people.

R Beale stated access crossover and noise is covered by P Meller’s note and LAFs role is to do with access and the need for quiet areas. Comments should be included in one form or another stated PHW.

CD luge on access land won’t be fenced which raises issues – B Rowlands made the comment about the heathland, which is not a direct access issue, but can be something that could be commented on in the response. There won’t be access to the access land as the owners of the site would intend to stop the access land being used.

Access land can be closed temporarily like a public footpath and an owner can apply to NRW to close access land, so it can be effectively closed off if not fenced off. Could consider to object or comment on these grounds as access land will be lost if goes ahead. C Dale cannot object as an officer and will record LAFs comments or objections.

C Scott - loss of vast amount of access land to build the luge by very nature of LAF it should object. P Lanfear stated in any development you will suffer a loss whatever you do, C Scott agrees.

P Lanfear – if this access land was common land you would have to have exchange land. Welsh Government should be lobbied to make it the same for the access land.

PHW stated a loss of access land and all the noise generation. C Jones - can’t fence off the luge and problems associated with public damaging it etc.

H Grey agreed the summarised points and raised points about supporting access to links and areas to outdoor space. Policies and strategies can be pulled in and can be provided to build the case around the objection.

H Grey asked if we know if other parties are making reps and if not worth mentioning the Local Nature Recovery Action Plan. PHW asked if the Environment officers were objecting, but they cannot object and only can make observations.

CD asked for confirmation on objections or observations, and PHW confirmed that there are two objections loss of access land and also noise.

C Scott very clearly and definitely object to the access land being lost by the luge. Clear message needed from the LAF with other recommendations followed on from there.

J Nellist objection on reasons of noise and loss of access land and failure to provide access to horse riders, who are being excluded by not being recognised and not considering riders when they have been informed about them.

C Jones - was consultation carried out correctly as there was no meeting but PHW didn’t think this was something they were required to do.

C Scott – be specific, whole thing will be noise and would go for a more specific approach including everything. J Nellist agreed that we need to be clear and precise about what we are objecting to. PHW queried with CD if he had enough information. CD confirmed he had a good selection of responses to be made. CD shared the map of the artist’s impression with regard to the amount of the land being taken up by the luge.

A Morgan – the picture makes it looks like there is a bigger green space area but there is the big solar farm in the fields to the right, and there is a lot of commercial development coming from the east, so the luge will be adding to a totally different environment on the Hill. PHW advised the solar panels are on private land, but A Morgan stated that the area appears to be greener than it actually is now.

R Beale – LAF can propose things being provided under section 106 if the proposal goes ahead.

A Morgan mentioned signage and wheelchair access and asked about how specific we need to be to about details. CD – it can be left open ended to include other possible routes later on when there is a clearer idea about what routes can be included.

CD advised there won’t be much difference in cost of dedicating one new path compared to a number of paths at one time. Probably best to overestimate the funds needed for dedicating and improving paths on Kilvey Hill – put in a sum of money for generally improving and dedicating paths on the Hill as this is more flexible. J Nellist reminded the meeting about B Parry’s idea for an employed ranger. CD confirmed one ranger may be suitable for such an area, but B Parry said ask for two. P Lanfear basically need to do a broad form of requests. A Morgan agreed a broad brush approach is needed.

**Resolved that: -**

1. C Dale will put together a letter containing the agreed points above to the Planning Dept. and will circulate before sending.
2. </AI4>

<AI5>

1. </AI5>

<AI6>

1. </AI6>

<AI7>

1. **Any Other Business**

Countryside Access Plan Meeting before the end of February.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm
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