

Bradford Local Access Forum
Minutes of meeting
Wednesday 5th November 2025 - 6:30 pm
By Teams

Meeting Organiser: David Campbell (DC)

Countryside and Rights of Way Manager

Notes: Linda Stafford (LS)

Area Rights of Way Officer (administrating the LAF)

Present:

Pam Allen (PA) (Chair):

Equestrian, Regional LAF representative

Emma Young (EY):

Bradford Council - Cycle and Active Travel Champion

Nick Dybeck (ND):

Walker, Ramblers Association representative, Friends of Ilkley Moor representative

Mark Corrigan (MC):

Regional British Horse Society representative

Marilyn Banister (MB):

Menston Parish Council representative

Andrew Beck (AB):

Trail Riders Fellowship representative

Mayor Chris Herd (CH):

Mayor of Keighley

Cllr Keith Binns (KB):

Keighley Town Council

Apologies:

Didy Metcalf (DM):

Equestrian, landowner, Regional LAF Secretary

Cllr Alex Ross-Shaw (ARS):

Bradford Council Executive Member, Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Planning & Transport – with responsibility for Countryside and Rights of Way Service and Transport Planning

Steve Parkes (SP):

Walking - access from those with limited walking ability to those who need wheelchairs

Item	Discussion	Action	Person(s) Responsible
1	Members present – introductions	Members present and introductions. Hello to Mayor Chris Herd (Mayor of Keighley) and Cllr Keith Binns	
2	Apologies	Apologies. PA requested that it was noted within the minutes that Cllr RS hasn't attended for some time.	
3	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	Minutes accepted from May meeting. Consultation with WYCA (West Yorkshire Combined Authority) Meeting notes of meeting 18.8.25 with LS and Chris Payne, Strategic Stakeholder Manager, WYCA Mass Transit (MT) Team circulated to LAF – LS contacted CP, no further update at this time. CP will attend LAF meeting once more information to share. EY: Email to WYCA - to include Local Access Forum as consultee on WYCA schemes in the future (to be included at an early enough stage of the scheme). Steeton/ Silsden bypass bridge Planning Application 25/02498/MAF for construction of the bridge as a walking/cycling bridge is currently being considered by Development Control.	

		<p>FP has checked Public Access on the planning portal – still showing as pending consideration A document has been uploaded which is a response to the BHS comments that bridge should be a bridleway. LS to circulate with these minutes.</p> <p>Wharfedale Greenway PA: results taken to RAF. The route crosses borders and involves NYCLAF and LLAFF. DM circulated feedback from the RAF (Regional Access Forum).</p> <p>Occupation Lane, Menston FP noted that the minutes from the May meeting contain some incorrect information, “<i>DJ confirmed application for a bridleway has been received from DM</i>”. FP notes that DM submitted a large volume of information in support of the upgrading of the route to a bridleway, but no formal application has been submitted. FP has discussed with DM; last email was that DM was looking to rewrite and simplify the applications. FP not received anything further. It is not being investigated at this time. FP: Enforcement action against the electric gates has not progressed due to lack of officer time to progress this.</p> <p>MC: Electric gates should be removed as unauthorised. A Sec 130a will be served if no action is taken by enforcement.</p> <p>Bradford South 80 Information from FP: Petition for closure of path was taken to Bradford South Area Committee in October by Bradford South Area Co-ordinator, no one from Rights of Way was able to attend as we were not given the date in good time. Committee asked to defer the report for further consideration in February with Rights of Way asked to present it. Asked for further information on processes for closing a path and evidence that consultation has been undertaken if the route was closed the alternative route could not be used. A consultation will be sent out shortly to LAF and usual consultees asking for views on whether they would support the closure of the footpath either under Highways Act Section 118B for purposes of crime prevention (assuming the criteria for such a closure were shown to be met) or Section 118 - not needed for public use and views on whether the alternative routes available to the public if the path were to be closed were considered to be adequate.</p>	<p>LS</p> <p>MC</p>
4	LAF	<p>Expenses Claims DC: discussion about process. Agreed that the opportunity to claim needs to be there. Anyone wanting to attend anything on behalf of the LAF should seek agreement in the LAF meeting before submitting a claim.</p> <p>Possible new member PA has advised of a possible new member, PM, a base member of Friends of Baildon Moor. LS to send application and information if contacted – no contact from PM as yet. PA to follow up. PA noted that we are looking to recruit people to represent all user groups.</p>	<p>LS/DC</p> <p>PA</p>

		<p>Cllr K Binns is a cyclist and would be interested in being a member. LS to send forms.</p> <p>DC: asked if there are any groups that we might target? Some suggestions given.</p> <p>PA: noted that someone from Education is needed. and suggested that we could take something out to shows.</p> <p>EY and JB: contacts in Scouts and Guides groups.</p>	LS
5	CROW Team update recruitment and structure	LS circulated CROW Update report and Consultations to LAF.	
6	BDMC ROWIP (2017) Update And LAF feedback and discussion on the approach to ROWIP	<p>JB provided an update on the review – included within CROW Update report – circulated to LAF.</p> <p>JB discussion on the progress made so far:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended professional body conference, useful to liaise with colleagues from different authorities. • Attended a Regional Development Day, funded by IPROW. ND attended along with NE representatives. <p>JB gave an overview of the meeting, will prepare some notes from the meeting to circulate with the LAF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RP has been looking at the data that we have on outstanding work and has cleaned it up and created an up-to-date list of outstanding work. <p>ND: gave feedback from his meeting with PA and DM. LS to circulate notes with the minutes.</p> <p>Key Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that it will take a long time to do – would be useful if we could have a timescale for the publication of the ROWIP, and the scope of input from LAF for the four stages – Consult, Assess, Plan and Action. Only at consultation stage now. Draft will need to be out by June, if it is to be completed by end 2026. Useful to have some framing of timescales to give an idea of when the LAF should input. <p>LAF should be involved at the fundamental level to produce a draft document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within each user group, walkers, cyclists, equestrians – there is a huge range of users with different wants and needs. Important to represent in the ROWIP and needs outside input. Disabilities, at the moment, are seen as a separate group, shouldn't be seen as separate, should be inclusive. JB: noted very good point. Need to reflect things like the equality act, more reflective of a modern society. • AB: TRF circulated a newsletter about health benefits of going around on motorcycles. Don't seem to get any representation on the LAF, not sure if the LAF is the right forum for representation or should I be consulting with Highways? <p>ND: opportunity to be included within the ROWIP</p> <p>Points within JB's report – individuals can get back to JB within the month.</p>	<p>LS</p> <p>JB</p> <p>LS</p> <p>JB</p> <p>JB</p> <p>ALL</p>
7	LAF response to WYCA Local Nature Recovery	<p>ND: has the LAF been notified of it and are the LAF going to respond to it?</p> <p>DC: involved with the strategy when it comes to consultation it can be adopted by Bradford.</p>	

	Strategy consultation	<p>As it deals with urban and rural spaces, thought it would be of interest to the LAF – broadly speaking it is a guide/strategy for investing into nature conservation.</p> <p>Potential conflict between nature conservation and public access, mutual benefits too.</p> <p>Is it something the LAF would be interested in commenting on?</p> <p>JB: touched on this dataset that NE are holding.</p> <p>ND: LAF support the measures that are being recommended.</p> <p>JB: some funds NE funded work PW – smaller amounts available for routes alongside national trails.</p> <p>Should I be included as an attendee?</p> <p>ND: The Local Access Forum (LAF) welcomes the opportunity to engage with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority's Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and agrees that it is important to formally respond to this consultation.</p> <p>We support the general aims and direction of the strategy, particularly its emphasis on restoring biodiversity, improving access to nature, and creating a more resilient natural environment across West Yorkshire.</p> <p>During our recent engagement, the Biodiversity Officer helpfully explained that the strategy operates at two levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 1: A broad, foundational strategy outlining general principles and priorities. • Level 2: A more detailed, higher-level strategy that will require further consultation and stakeholder input. <p>The LAF supports this two-tiered approach and recommends that WYCA proceed with wider consultation as the strategy develops. We believe this structure allows for both strategic clarity and meaningful public and stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>We look forward to contributing further as the LNRS evolves and ensuring that public access, connectivity, and inclusive use of natural spaces remain central to its implementation.</p> <p>The LNRS is a statutory initiative under the Environment Act 2021, aiming to reverse biodiversity loss and improve access to nature across West Yorkshire. The strategy includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed measures for habitat restoration, species protection, and nature-based solutions • A Local Habitat Map identifying priority areas. • Surveys for public and stakeholder feedback (summary and detailed formats) • Engagement reports from farmers, landowners, eNGOs, and community groups <p>You can explore the full strategy and participate in the consultation on WYCA's Your Voice platform.</p>	
8	Any other business	<p>KB: Connectivity is essential and must be inclusive. The current structure of access routes across West Yorkshire is fragmented, limiting safe and functional movement for many users. To support nature recovery and community wellbeing, we urge WYCA to prioritize:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe, functional routes that connect existing infrastructure - including footpaths, bridleways, and cycleways - into a coherent, accessible network. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive access for all users, including walkers, cyclists, horse riders, wheelchair users, and those with limited mobility. • Canal-side connectivity: The canal network offers a vital corridor for both leisure and commuting. Safe, well-lit, and maintained access to and along canals should be a priority. • Commuting routes: Nature recovery should not be limited to leisure. Many people rely on green routes to travel to work, school, and services. These routes must be safe, direct, and usable year-round. • Joined-up planning: The LNRS should align with Local Transport Plans, Rights of Way Improvement Plans, and Active Travel strategies to ensure integrated delivery. <p>We believe that nature recovery and public access go hand in hand. A well-connected, safe, and inclusive access network will support biodiversity, reduce car dependency, and improve health and wellbeing across West Yorkshire.</p> <p>MC: work closely with Trans Pennine Trail route, mapping system can advise you on appropriate routes for all users. Similar mapping could be used in Bradford.</p> <p>KB: There has been a change in direction with cleaner air and promoting Active Travel. Connecting the Northern Trail to our proposed route for the Worth Valley would create a useful link.</p> <p>PA: noted a lot of railways are not in public ownership and finance involved in buying land back is an issue.</p>	
10.	Dates of Next Meetings	<p>Agreed quarterly meetings, three online and one outside. These have been set until November 2025.</p> <p>Next meetings:</p> <p>2026 meeting dates to be agreed.</p> <p>LS proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th February 2026 – by Teams • 6th May 2026 – by Teams • 2nd September 2026 - Outside • 4th November 2026 – by Teams 	LS