

Amendments

[4] PRIORITISE IT DEVELOPMENT FOR SUPPORTING, ENCOURAGING AND RETAINING VOLUNTEERS

Amendment 1 proposed by the Motions Review Committee

Insert "Areas and" before both occurrences of the word "Groups".

Background notes to amendment

Practice differs between Areas as to the amount of communication with members undertaken at Area level and Group level. The amendment seeks to clarify that the appropriate degree of support should be available at whichever level is required.

Amendment 2 proposed by Richard May on behalf of the Board of Trustees

In the second sentence replace the words "prioritise those" with "consider"

In the third sentence replace the word "will" with "may"

Background notes to amendment

The original motion is over prescriptive on the board, and asks that the Group IT needs are prioritised, necessarily meaning that other IT needs are de-prioritised. These relative priorities should be the decision of the board, whilst considering Group needs as the motion would call for if it were amended.

Amendments

[5] APPROVAL OF NEW FOOTPATH APPLICATIONS BY LOCAL COMMITTEES

Amendment 1 proposed by Surrey Area

Delete the first two sentences.

In the third sentence delete “Council therefore” and insert in its place “This General Council”.

In the third sentence also delete “such applications” and insert in its place “applications for unrecorded rights of way, or amendments to existing rights of way, in England and Wales”.

Background notes

This amendment deletes the reference to the administrative costs to highway authorities of processing applications. Such costs are not our concern, and do not necessarily have the effect of reducing funding for path maintenance work. The amendment also replaces the word “new” with the correct terminology “unrecorded”.

Amendment 2 proposed by Surrey Area

Delete any reference to “footpath” and insert in its place “rights of way”

In the final sentence delete “will be” and insert in its place “are likely to be”

Background notes

The motion as originally drafted refers in places to “rights of way” and in others to “footpath”. The first part of this amendment seeks to clarify that the motion, irrespective of the fate of our Amendment 1, is intended to refer to all rights of way, not just footpaths. The original wording “there will be significant and sufficient benefits” imposes absolute certainty on Areas and Groups and could lead to missed opportunities to submit claims. The amended wording suggests instead that Area and Group decisions should be based on the balance of probabilities.

Amendments

[7] DAMAGE TO RESTRICTED BYWAYS

Amendment proposed by Avon area

Replace "and make recommendations for action"
with "and consider making recommendations for action".

Background notes to amendment

The Board should only be asked to "make recommendations" if the problem is found to be significant (after conducting the survey). This may be something that IPROW (the Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management) can deal with. IPROW is a forum for interchange of ideas between PROW Officers and some Local Authorities may have found ways of dealing with this. For instance, surfacing of some routes has deterred those drivers of motorised vehicles who have particularly sought out muddy paths. However, that can be expensive and may be seen as an excessive solution.