



# Minutes

Date: 27<sup>th</sup> January 2026  
 Time: 13:30 – 16:30  
 Location: NCH Grenville Room / Microsoft Teams  
 Chair: David Cooper (DC)  
 Vice Chair: Shelley Barratt (SB)  
 Attendees: Cllr Karen LaBorde (KL), Cllr Julian German (JG), Rob Knill (RK),  
 Jeremy Elvins (JE), Jim Hancock (JH), Paul Rabbeth (PR), Kay Driver  
 (KD), Jon Rowell (JR), Tim Passmore (TP), Charlotte Evans (CE),  
 Donald Martin (DM), Susan Parker (SP), Dave Wood (DW), Emma  
 Walker (EW)  
 Apologies: Steve Church, Phil Allen, Cllr Steve Webb, Carol Wilson, Martin  
 Howlett

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

DC opened the meeting and all attendees introduced themselves.

## 2. Introduction to CAMS - Emma Walker (Presentation copied to Members)

EW explained that she has taken on the responsibility for delivering the new Countryside Access Management System for Cornwall Council as the business representative for the PROW team. Historically, it hasn't been possible to capture management information for the network and there has been a lack of connectivity between the various systems used by the different teams.

CAMS will help to solve many of these issues and also has the ability to pull through legal records and a full history of each link in the network, to provide a full picture.

EW explained how the large number of reports that come in via email (approximately 6000 emails per year) were previously not being stored centrally and so the information was not easily accessible to officers, as it is only the high-level information of the defect that gets stored on the current WDM system.

By bringing all of the information together in a central system, CAMS will allow us to see everything that is relevant to every link on the network and also to report on everything, including the positives (solutions implemented) rather than just the negatives (defects reported).

EW gave a live demonstration of the system, showing how the information is recorded against each link, how issues are logged and how legal records are displayed. During the demo the following points were noted:

- CAMS is a web-based system using the OS base maps
- Jane Tomlinson is the Information Asset Owner for CAMS.
- Updates to the interactive mapping service are now being fed from CAMS.
- Power BI dashboard integrations will aid reporting and monitoring
- Permissions to the various features in CAMS are set by user role
- Layers can be switched on like in the interactive map, and colours used are the same
- Furniture and issues can be switched on/off
- The Task module is already being used to define monthly inspection routes for inspectors to inspect and then upload their condition reports
- Our CAMS is not public facing at present, but discussions are underway to understand if it is possible to release the public portal. If delivered to its full capacity, this will allow people to log issues and receive live updates as the issue resolution progresses.
- The roll-out of the public-facing portal requires buy-in from the Council Web Team to fit into the 'one-portal' vision, and the Customer Contact Team to support this route of logging issues raised via the call-centre. A meeting was held earlier in the month to engage the relevant teams on the public-facing portal rollout procedure.
- The various layers are optional, and we can choose how much data to make visible to the public.
- There is no intention to record Permissive Paths on CAMS, but the system does allow us to report on all routes recorded (including multi use trails, SWCP etc)
- We have given the developers feedback for improvements and are working with them to tailor the system to our needs.

Questions arising:

- RK raised concerns over whether the public facing portal might flood the system with bad data, but that volunteers and trusted users might improve the data input.
- JH said that GLASS have a similar issue-reporting system and that perhaps it would be possible to connect this into CAMS as well. EW noted that the FixMyStreet system does already integrate to CAMS so third-party integrations are possible.
- JE asked how the system records that some paths are managed by Parish Councils - EW showed the 'Maintained by' field on CAMS which can be used for that purpose.
- SB asked about public rollout timelines and EW explained that currently we are in phase 2, with phase 3 (public roll-out) coming soon although timelines for this are yet to be finalised.

- DC asked which other councils are furthest down the road with their use of CAMS. EW stated that Kent have led on many aspects of CAMS (although they don't use the legal module, which is what we have been focussed on developing). Warwickshire also use the same CAMS public-facing portal that we are planning to use.
- DC asked what the route forward is for CAMS in Cornwall. EW said that once we have clarity on what we can do in Cornwall Council, within the given constraints, EW and Adam Chell want to come back to CLAF for a consultation on how our trusted groups would like to proceed, as the first stage of the public roll out.
- DM added some comments from the CORMAC perspective, to say that CAMS is already proving to be a real game-changer for asset management of the public rights of way network, specifically in allowing inspectors to update details in real-time, whilst out on site, using the CAMS mobile platform on their tablets.
- KD raised the question of risk - what are the perceived risks of personal information being inadvertently released? What security is there for the legal cases? EW explained that two-factor authentication is required for all users who access to the legal module. The public would not have any access to personal information – just the basic info about the issue itself, and not about who reported the issue. No issues have been raised by Kent / Warwickshire in this regard.

DC thanked EW for an excellent presentation and she left the meeting.

### 3. RoWIP Update - Charlotte Evans (Presentation copied to Members)

CE explained that she is in the midst of the internal review phase at present so this will just be a quick update on progress.

A lot has been going on in the last 3 months with the ongoing analysis of survey data, meeting with relevant officers, the photo competition opened up to a public vote (closing this Friday 30<sup>th</sup> Jan), finalising the framework for the document and devising a plan for the consultation phase.

CE was delighted to receive the offer of promotional support from The Kernow King and will follow up on this offer to help produce some appropriate content with him.

There will most likely be a consultation period of 8 weeks in early summer (subject to management sign off), with the report then being published in autumn/winter.

Questions arising:

- SB asked about timing for the next RoWIP working group meeting – CE suggested that this be delayed until she has finished the write-up has which should be towards the end of March/April, and therefore before the next CLAF meeting (28th April).
- KD asked if would be helpful to look at each section in turn rather than waiting for full document to be finalised. CE was open to doing it that way however SB suggested a whole document might be better for context. On balance it was felt that it would be best to review the document as a whole, to avoid conflicting updates. DC agreed it will be best to see the 'finished article' to avoid back-and-forth reviews, ideally before the next CLAF meeting.

Related Action Points from the previous meeting:

PR – the Ramblers submission didn't happen. CE – a formal submission was received from GLASS and CE also wrote to all of the big landowners (Natural England, Duchy of Cornwall & National Trust all fed back) but she would still like to hear from the Ramblers too. **(AP26/1/1 – PR to follow up)**

Everyone thanked CE for the update.

#### **4. Capital Programme Update - Dave Wood (Presentation copied to Members)**

DW talked through the Capital Programme updates and during the presentation the following points were also noted:

- The storm impact from Goretti and Ingrid is huge for the PROW network and delays will happen to the scheduled plan because of this.
- April to Sept is the key period for work to happen on the ground.
- The new 4-year program allows for much better forward-planning
- 5 or 6 Parish and Town councils are already signed up for the next ELMP cycle

Questions arising:

- RK asked about timings for ELMP – last year it came out in August, which wasn't the best time to do work on the ground. Some of their work looked great on completion but it wasn't given enough time to settle before the rains came in winter. Earlier would be better if possible – DW agrees we need to try and get the work done in Apr-Sept if at all possible.
- JE asked about the funding for the footbridge at Par harbour– DW said it is being funded and that the planned design is already out for costings, with work planned to be done asap with the shortest closure possible.
- CE added that the budget for next year has been approved but it hasn't been allocated to individual teams yet. Work is ongoing within capital funding from this financial year. Hopefully the allocations will continue as planned and allow the current pace of capital projects to be maintained.
- DC queried the confidentiality of the capital programme lists that were distributed to members, asking what can user groups share? DW confirmed that he has sanitised all data so is happy for it to be shared as necessary and will plan to do regular quarterly updates to CLAF going forward. DC is therefore free to share the information with the other Ramblers ROW officers. DW also added that his aim is to publish this info on the council website soon.
- DM referenced the Multi User Trails works that are also happening and asked that Adam Chell include those updates in DW's data as well. Adam Chell will also be attending the next CLAF meeting.

DM then also gave a brief update from a CORMAC perspective:

The team is still under huge pressure from storm damage and staffing issues (they are 2 team members down due to absence).

The budget position is positive, and the team are now targeting drainage, surfacing and vegetation management (which are lower than the threshold for capital projects).

Multi User Trails are more pressured in terms of budget for reactive work and tree works and some other routine winter works have also been deferred due to fall out from the storms.

Cormac have also been heavily involved in the operational side of the CAMS delivery and refining our bespoke version of the system, inspection schedules etc. as well as supporting the IMS programme (Integrated asset Management System) looking to develop a single system.

Storm response updates:

- Goretti was an exceptional event and had a major impact on the entire environment network.
- Ahead of the storm, emergency protocols were enacted.

- Highways feel an immediate effect with reports coming in during and immediately after the storm, but the Environment Team sees a lag due to delayed use of the network during the storm. 150 individual storm-related cases have been logged on the network so far and this has put an immense strain on the team. They are currently just past the peak of issue referrals incoming as a result of storm damage.
- The team are seeing a real benefit from CAMS already in terms of logging and reporting on defects raised
- Proactive inspection plan going forward rather than reactive / triage of emergency safety issues
- Wider environment network will be subject to a proactive post storm inspection
- Arboriculture technical teams are supporting regular officers to remove residual risks – ongoing over next 2-3 weeks
- CC promoted a pragmatic approach to storm response which was beneficial in terms of opening strategic routes quickly
- Ground is really saturated and teams are under significant pressure to log and resolve ongoing issues.
- Camel Trail, Coast to Coast trail, and Mount Edgcumbe sea wall all had serious structural failures.

All members recorded their thanks for the efforts of the team in dealing with the storm response.

DC thanked DM and he left the meeting.

## 5. Minutes of previous meeting

Previous minutes – 28/10/25 adopted, and approved unopposed (RK approved and JH seconded)

Follow up on Action Points from previous meeting:

- Nothing received from PA on the CAP for Feock – follow-up required (**AP26/1/2 - PA**)
- SB confirmed expenses solution has been resolved
- Katherine Ennever was contacted regarding a connection with the Youth Council but hasn't responded - follow up required (**AP26/1/3 – TP**)
- No suggestions for constitution amendments so DC/JR to propose amendments prior to AGM in July (**AP26/1/4 – DC/JR**)

## 6. Changes to Membership / Appointment of New Members

- SP membership confirmed by Cornwall Council – formally welcomed by DC
- BM from National Trust has resigned from CLAF – Carly Cosh will take up that role later in the year. The group recorded their thanks to BM for his contributions to CLAF.

The question of whether members are sitting as individuals or as representatives of their various groups was also discussed. DC advised that DEFRA guidance is not clear on this, but it does say Cornwall Council, when appointing members, must be fair and transparent and that it should consult with relevant individuals and organisations. Which implies that members may sit either as individuals or as representatives from their groups, provided any affiliations are clear to all parties. (**AP26/1/5 – DC to further review the Guidance against CLAF/CC procedures.**)

## 7. PINS Decisions for DMMOs (Jon Rowell)

JR started by asking if the current format of speaking on specific topics is welcomed by the group, given our cases often take many years to resolve and therefore the overall stats don't change significantly from quarter to quarter. Members agreed that the current format was very interesting although DC caveated that for each AGM meeting it would be good to have a numerical summary of progress over the year.

There are two recent decisions from The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) which need to be discussed but before that JR gave an overview of the DMMO process for when cases are referred to the Secretary of State (SoS) via PINS.

- Cornwall Council make an order based on evidence and then serve notice.
- If this is subject to any objections, we seek the withdrawal of the objections through a resolution process. Sometimes that is successful, but it depends on the type of objection. Some objections can amount to hundreds of pages and can often take months to process, often without resolution. If all of the objections cannot be resolved, then the case is referred to the SoS via PINS.
- Of all DMMO orders made each year (target of 30 per year) approximately 2/3 of the orders made are subject to objections, and after seeking resolution, about 1/3 of those objections are withdrawn (allowing us to conclude the process), the other 2/3 of objections aren't withdrawn and the cases have to be submitted to the SoS via PINS.
- When a case goes to the SoS the Council will always ask for written representations in the first instance, as it is the cheapest and most effective route for the council. Invariably PINS will be happy to deal with cases relying on documentary evidence alone by written reps, but if any user evidence is involved then it will go to a Public Inquiry (PI), essentially so that the users can be cross-examined.
- When a case goes to PI, costs escalate massively. In one case an officer devoted 3 months of solid work to that inquiry, to ensure the chances of success were greater, leading to Council costs in excess of £50,000 for the single PI.
- Most cases that go to PI are for orders that the council are supporting, but sometimes we choose not to and go neutral, which means there is a significant saving. There are 10 DMMO applications currently with PINS, and for four of these the council is neutral and our only contribution is to facilitate the process.

Recently two decisions have ruled against us, i.e. to not confirm the order.

In the first example, a case based on use, the Council had 40 User Evidence Forms demonstrating proof of significant use. 5 of these witnesses took the stand to give evidence at the PI. The landowner's evidence essentially consisted of him saying there was a locked gate (even though the gate wasn't on his land, no evidence was produced to demonstrate it was ever locked and he hadn't lived there during the 20 years over which rights accrued) and yet the Inspector still decided not to confirm the order.

The second example was dealt with by written reps as it was a case relying purely on historical sources. That documentary evidence was perhaps the most compelling evidence of historic rights that the Council could ever produce. Despite this, the objector (landowner) said they considered the route to be a private accommodation track and the inspector decided in their favour, so the order was not confirmed.

Over 300 of the DMMO applications currently in the queue rely on similar evidence although probably not quite as strong. Given the amount of public money required to be invested to support the DMMO

process, the question needs to be asked: should the council just go neutral in every case and not support them against any objections raised? Or should we determine not make orders at all but rely on inviting the applicant to appeal that decision to have the Secretary of State direct the authority to make the order and then require the applicant to support it should it be subject to objection?

Questions arising:

- There was a general consensus amongst members that the latest decision is so flawed it should be subject to appeal. JR added that the inspector relied on outdated case law and looked at individual sources on their own (rather than as a whole) and said they were not compelling in themselves. This has left a cul-de-sac bridleway with no possible means of resolution to connect it with the highway.
- RK asked, given amount of money required, if nothing is done in the first instance then would the public be better off? JH said no, not in this case because the link to the bridleway wasn't useable.
- RK asked where do we draw the line about adding new routes? DC suggested that applicants need to decide how to prioritise all of the DMMOs logged in each area/Parish and decide what is the value in each one. Some clearly have high value (like stopping short of the highway) but many don't.
- DC asked if other authorities have the same experience. JR noted that there has been a complaint to PINS from a Somerset Bridleway association group – essentially it needs a collective appeal and the window for appeal is 3 months after the decision is made.
- JR added that the council could easily clear the current backlog of 300 cases in a year or two if we didn't support orders through PI, and we could then focus of PPO cases to actually improve the network.
- SP asked if there is a process to be informed about applications when they first appear, so that user groups can help support the process. JR advised that TRF are included in all consultations but that perhaps the communications are only going to the national representatives, not the local ones at county level. JR agreed to add SP to all consultations that are made going forward but also noted that the NERC act is considered in every report (which extinguished rights for MPV). **(AP26/1/6 – JR to add SP to consultations)**
- JH asked if BHS legal team could help. JR said we have drawn attention to it nationally as the council cannot afford to appeal this decision and take it to judicial review. User groups do need to group together and challenge it.
- DC is going to consult Phil Wadey and Sarah Buck to see if they are aware of this particular decision and what they think. Agreed that National organisations need to collectively raise concerns about these recent decisions. **(AP26/1/7 – DC/JR)**
- JR suggested that we might need to start making decisions to flush out what PINS actually consider to be worthwhile evidence. A large part of the problem is that we only have 11 Inclosure awards in the whole county, but it is the Inclosure awards that PINS seem to attribute most weight to.
- JG asked about PINS relationships. Louise Wood has had conversations with them and might be able to find out some further information. JR said we do have some discussions with PINS through the commons applications process, which might also allow us to ask some questions about the process for DMMO decisions.
- JR added that in letters of resolution we always include the details of the potential for costs claims to be raised (which some people see as a threat, even though they aren't) and sometimes this warns people off. Lots don't care though as money is often not an issue for wealthy landowners.

- EW is overseeing the Kenwyn case (WCA 633) which is due to go to PI this summer. Full details of this case, including the time and location of the PI, can be viewed on the council website: <https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment/countryside/definitive-map-and-statement/submissions-to-the-secretary-of-state-dmmo/>

## 8. Working Groups Feedback

- Major Schemes WG – DC is helping CW to get the issues resolved, as well as a Ramblers representative. It would be useful for the website to put up an article on CLAF involvement in the A30 works. **(AP26/1/8 – CW to provide suitable material.)**
- Multi User Trails WG – JE said that the group had met a couple of times, trying to understand the current network. It's confusing largely due to historical maps covering multiple trails, some are on road, some are off road. Hoping to present findings at next meeting. JE shared latest map of the routes discovered – copied to members. Still more to do. Flagging up missing links to Goss Moor (A391 project cycle track missing links) and missing signage. Working with Natural England on this to apply for funding. A SusTrans member has been invited to the next series of workshops. DC asked JE to send through a list of members for this WG. JE advised that there was no chair for the WG yet. Members recognised the great work done so far. JG added that there is a mile long route between Goran Haven and St Austell along the coast – which was built as part of the safer routes to school project. The build was funded through capital projects, but nobody took responsibility for maintenance and so it is not on the map.
- Parish & Town Council WG – DC and SB to join the group. **(AP26/1/9 - PA to provide an update when he returns to the UK next month)**
- Health and Wellbeing WG – JH/SW haven't met yet, but the intention is to bring some of the actions arising from the RoWIP report into this WG.
- China Clay Area WG – JE has planned two public meetings for March (lots of communications to go out in due course) and will present proposals on paths to designate. Good progress made. PR has met with the WG and discussed it. There will be objection to some of the losses but the net gain to the network is huge.

## 9. Correspondence to the Forum

- Third cycling and walking investment strategy (CWIS3) – a few individual responses from members were used to construct an average response for CLAF that DC submitted.
- A38 Liskeard to Trerulefoot safety improvement scheme WCHAR – this consultation was prematurely shared with CLAF and so we should wait until the wider announcement in March that we can contribute to then. This will go to the Major Schemes WG in due course.
- The Ramblers Path Accessibility Fund (for example taking out stiles, putting in alternative gaps etc.) - Members can apply as individuals, but the work does need to have prior landowner permission.
- SW asked about closing a footway in Truro but that is a highways issue and JR has already responded with the updated legislation.

## 10. Any Other Business

- Website updates
  - SB sent her report highlighting that lots of work is required. This will be difficult as no budget to employee anyone to do it. DC suggested that we need a small WG to look at options and decide how to proceed. Photos, bios, minutes, agendas etc. need to be published.
  - KB suggested that it may be better to use the council website as that has traffic already. DC said problem is that the council one was never kept up to date. IT wouldn't allow people to have appropriate access to website updates. DC said there are requirements to publish certain items. **(AP26/1/10 – TP to investigate using Council website again)**
- Skills Survey
  - JH organised it – 9 members responded. No others planning to respond. DC will review skills on offer and decide how best to proceed. **(AP26/1/11 – DC to review)**
- CC Interactive Mapping
  - RK is spreading the word on how good the interactive mapping for Cornwall is and encourages other members to do the same.
- MoD – Cardinham footpath diversion consultation
  - DC emails were forwarded. Very reasonable alternative and a PPO will be supported. **(AP26/1/12 - DC to formally respond)**

## 11. Time and Date of Next Meeting

- 28/04/26, 13:00 – 16:00, NCH Grenville Room (back up 2N:03)  
**(AP26/1/12: TP to confirm room bookings and send out invite to members.)**

Provisional dates for subsequent meetings:

- 28/07/26 (AGM)
- 27/10/26

## Action Point Tracking Table

| Action Point ID | Brief Description                       | Assigned To | Date Completed |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| AP26/1/1        | Ramblers' submission to RoWIP           | PR          |                |
| AP26/1/2        | CAP report for Feock                    | PA          |                |
| AP26/1/3        | Follow up contact for Youth Council     | TP          |                |
| AP26/1/4        | Constitution amendments before AGM      | DC/JR       |                |
| AP26/1/5        | Review DEFRA Guidance                   | DC          |                |
| AP26/1/6        | DMMO Consultations – add local TRF rep  | JR          |                |
| AP26/1/7        | Consult national reps on DMMO decisions | DC/JR       |                |

|           |                                          |    |          |
|-----------|------------------------------------------|----|----------|
| AP26/1/8  | Article on CLAF involvement in A30 works | CW |          |
| AP26/1/9  | Parish & Town Council WG update          | PA |          |
| AP26/1/10 | Publishing CLAF docs on the CC website   | TP |          |
| AP26/1/11 | Review of Skills Survey responses        | DC |          |
| AP26/1/12 | MoD Cardinham diversion response         | DC | 02/02/26 |

**Forum Membership (as at date of meeting):**

| <i>Landowner/ Manager Group (7)</i> | <i>User Group (7)</i>                                                                                          | <i>Others Group (3)</i>                   | <i>Cornwall Council (3)</i>                   |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Martin Howlett<br>Jeremy Elvins     | Carol Wilson<br>David Cooper<br>Paul Rabbeth<br>Philip Allen<br>Shelley Barratt<br>Stephen Church<br>Rob Knill | Jim Hancock<br>Kay Driver<br>Susan Parker | Karen LaBorde<br>Julian German<br>Steven Webb |

**Working Group Members (as at date of meeting):**

- Major Schemes WG: Carol Wilson
- Multi User Trails WG: Jeremy Elvins, Adam Chell
- Parish and Town Council WG: Phil Allen (Chair), Rob Knill, Shelley Barrett, David Cooper
- RoWIP WG: Shelley Barrett (Chair), Kay Driver, Rob Knill, Jim Hancock, David Cooper
- Health and Wellbeing WG: Jim Hancock, Steven Webb,
- China Clay Area WG: Jeremy Elvins, Ollie Howe, Hannah Rodger, Paul Rabbeth