

**Minutes of the Northern Snowdonia Local Access Forum Meeting  
held on Monday 4th December 2023 at 5.45p.m  
at Plas Tan y Bwlch, Maentwrog**

<b>Present - Members:</b>	Mr Edwin Noble Mr Richard Williams Mr Mark Jones Mr Dafydd Gwyndaf Mr Tim Jones Mrs Maggi Barry	Mr David Firth Mr John Gladston Mr Dafydd Jones Mr Arthur Davies Mr Paul Williams
<b>Officers / Speakers:</b>	Peter Rutherford (SNPA) Gwyn LI Evans	Simon LI Roberts

*EN welcomed all to this evening's meeting.*

<b>1. Apologies:</b>	Mr Robin Parry Mr Connor A Watt	Cllr Beca Roberts Mr Callum Muskett
----------------------	------------------------------------	--

**PR took the opportunity to respectfully remind members that apologies if were required if absent and that if members missed more than 2 meetings without apologies then they could forfeit their LAF membership as laid down in the LAF Regulations.**

**2. Previous Minutes**

*AD mentioned that the spelling for Ffynnon Lloer was incorrect.  
PR would note this in the minutes.*

**Approved**

**3. Matters Arising**

**i) Events on CRoW access land**

PR stated that EN had raised an interesting point relating to landowners' liability if they applied a charge for use of their access land for events.

He had discussed this NRW Access Officers, and they had consulted their legal team and they had advised that if charges were applied then landowners, could not rely on the CRoW Act for protection and the reduced liability afforded for natural natural features. Applying charges meant that their liability then would fall to their usual Occupiers Liability.

He thought it important to flag this up with members. He had also mentioned this to one landowner who had applied a charge. Ideally people should discuss this with their insurers.

*DJ added that as event organisers charged for participation, and surely they should take responsibility.*

PR stated that they were to a degree, but it was any substantial claims that may be prove problematic if monies were exchanged.

*DJ mentioned that there had been issues of late with a mass event in Ogwen which resulted in damaged walls and fences due to poor organisation. In his view this had been caused by insufficient supervision. Significant numbers can cause damage to land, and he thought that there may have been up to 2000 in this. It was also apparent that some landowners had no prior knowledge of this taking place which made matters worse.*

PR acknowledged this and it had caused some concern for landowners. They had agreed to meet with the organiser, the FUW and the NT to discuss this as soon as possible. 6 months previously they had met with the organiser to discuss their arrangements and outlined clearly what the NP and NT expected. He was disappointed that these issues had occurred. If no guarantees can be provided for their event organisation then there would be no support for this on the next occasion. They would also discuss its location with the NT.

He stressed that apart from this there had been only one other problem reported in the north this year which involved some spectator/supporter parking blocking an entrance and he had discussed this aspect with that organiser to avoid this and one in the south concerning left signage.

It was also important to consider that the number of people taking part in events is far lower than those accessing the area generally for walking/climbing including Ogwen – but they are by default more obvious wearing numbers/names and high viz.

He added that there had been another very large walking event (Bangor to Nant Ffrancon - Betws Y Coed via Ogwen which had been requested recently by a major charity, but both the NT and the NP had asked for this to be modified.

Although the NP has no powers to stop people legitimately accessing the countryside we do pose ethical questions to those charities who are now considering very large events in places such as Ogwen where clearly it is not suitable and where there may be issues. Yr Wyddfa – Llanberis regularly see large events and is manageable but in some areas we need to discuss our concerns with organisers. Poorly run events reflects badly on those that pass off without incident. It is interesting that it is not commercial operators but charities who are attempting to maximise their activities of late.

*EN asked if the NP gave guidance on the access rights available to organisers.*

PR stated that they did this frequently in discussions with organisers, so they fully understood that within access land (and not Public Rights of Way) consent was required and was not a right.

*TJ added that it was important that those messages were made clear to organisers.*

#### **4. Correspondence**

**None**

## 5. Traws Eryri – Update

**EN introduced Keiran Foster as Cycling UK's representative Keiran Foster and would update us on Traws Eryri route.**

KF thanked EN for the opportunity to update the members on this project.

He explained that this was a partnership initiative between UK and the NRW. They were keen to reinstate a culture of adventure rather than any adrenaline type of cycling activity. Cycling was one of the original open air recreational activities mentioned in the original Hobhouse Report<sup>1</sup> – which set the scene for all National Parks in the UK.

Many long-distance routes revolve around the ethos of adventure and exploring these areas by cycle and are recognised as being important for the Health & Well Being of the nation as mentioned in a speech by Robert Silken MP who introduced the National Parks Bill to Parliament in 1945 described them as -

*“This is not just a Bill. It is a people’s charter – a people’s charter for the open air.”*

This was indeed far sighted when by today there is so much emphasis on Health and Well-being.

The 1968 Countryside Act allowed the use of cycles on bridleways and became a legal right.

Working on similar projects they have encouraged routes to touch communities that can provide facilities and to allow some to take some economic benefit – typically the accommodation sector. Data does show that horse riding and cycling have a broader season. The Glover report 2019 (although specifically targeted to the English National parks) did mention that there was potential to allow and expand recreational access within the countryside for cycling and horse riding.

In terms of Traws Eryri they, as Cycling UK, have worked in partnership with Natural Resources Wales (NRW) who have links to other potential partners to further develop this route. Certainly Covid was a catalyst and an opportunity to consider a link between the trail hub centres.

The lack of progress on access reform following the Access Reform Groups (ARAG) discussions has proved to be a real challenge where simple changes could be made to legislation would enable creations and/or additions to the network bringing significant longer-term benefits for users on what are existing Rights of Way or in some cases CRoW access land.

They have some signed some permissive access agreements along its route but appreciated that there is a great deal more work to undertake to make further improvements. Several Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMO's) have been

---

<sup>1</sup> **The Hobhouse Report** by Sir Arthur Hobhouse, published in July 1947 to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, proposed 52 conservation areas in England and Wales which included all proposed National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This was followed by the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 which provided the framework for the establishment of all NP and AONB's in the UK. *An original copy of the report and map is available for viewing in the National Park offices.*

submitted to Gwynedd Council which are based on historical evidence. The process of assessing the route potential was focused on an extensive analysis of detailed maps and included existing RoW, NRW land, National Trust land and existing networks.

The route is 122 miles running start or finish from Conwy in the north to Machynlleth in the south touching base with places such as Betws Y Coed and other mountain biking trail centres such as Penmachno and Coed Y Brenin along the way.

Most of the route uses surfaced using byways, bridleways and restricted byways and forest tracks.

Another important factor was its element of sustainability – cycling by default is `car less` and meets all the criteria for notions of sustainable tourism and economy.

They have also looked at wider issues such as heritage, history and culture along its route and a guidebook will encompass these important elements. There is also a Welsh version of the route guide.

*JG asked if there were any specific disabled elements included in this route.*

KF stated that there were sections of the route that would lend themselves to off road disabled vehicles such as Trampers or self-propelled incumbent wheelchairs. It was designed as a blue mountain route<sup>2</sup> rather than an all-ability route. The Guidebook does outline the grades and certainly people could make those choices if they felt they could use some sections.

*JG thanked KF for his explanation and stated that he as a wheelchair user himself always looked for least restrictive options when considering routes in the countryside and made the point that gates were frequently the main issue.*

KF they were restricted in some way to using existing RoW and agreed that sometimes the network was not always ideal in terms of its furniture.

PR mentioned that the NP was concerned that whilst they were broadly supportive of this initiative he had already indicated to CUK and the NRW that give that some sections did not have rights then this was problematic for landowners and that it was the NP who would then shoulder complaints when user expectations were higher following its launch and there were differing interpretations of legality on the ground. Some legal issues cannot be solved quickly and the legislation for modifications acknowledged to be slow and complex. Upgrades required considerable landowner dialogue and agreement.

KF replied that they recognised that many issues may take long periods to resolve but it should not stop the vision of the route in its entirety.

---

<sup>2</sup> **Cycling UK** have a route grading system for off road cycling routes

**Green** – Easy and also suitable for novices.

**Blue** - Moderate for intermediate cyclist/mountain bikers with basic off-road riding skills.

**Red** – Difficult for proficient mountain bikers with good off-road riding skills

**Black** – Expert mountain bike users using physically demanding routes

*EN commented that it was his understanding that although the route had been launched officially there were still sections where rights were not available but there are alternatives.*

KF stated that there were alternatives, and some road cycling would be required for short sections until issues can be resolved. Typically Blaenau Ffestiniog to Penmachno as an old mountain track was unusable as it is.

*DF asked where those supporting documents used as evidence had come from and where could the public download route information.*

KF stated that this was derived from old maps. The TEW route maps and the guide can be downloaded from the Cycling UK website. They were working with the NRW to create interpretive signage that will be erected at some key locations.

*PW expressed concern that it did seem that the project partners were quite committed in getting those access issues resolved. If a landowner contests any claim how would they deal with this.*

KF stated that most claims thus far had been on larger landowners including the NT and Crown Estates. He appreciated that this would require considerable dialogue over a period of time to accomplish this.

*PW added that in terms of NT land there were a significant number of tenants which would complicate this process particularly those proposals that would interfere with land management and agreement may be difficult.*

KF acknowledged that there were sections within agricultural landscapes where historical claims have been made – many were deliberately chosen so as to avoid these types of problems (including any that ran through yards or property), but he remained confident that issues could be overcome to make this a success.

*DG mentioned Cwm Teigl – Cwm Penmachno – Rhiw Bach. This was not a historic route as outlined but it was his understanding that the NT have refused consent as they considered it dangerous albeit it used by a lot of walkers.*

KF replied that after their extensive research he was happy about the historic evidence they had submitted, but it would then be up to an Inspector to decide on whether the claim was legitimate or not. But there was also considerable evidence in recent years of cyclists using that route.

*DG stated that he did not agree with this view and that in his experience (and living in that location) cyclists had only started recently appearing.*

KF relied that there was Strava<sup>3</sup> based evidence of this activity and he would be happy to share that data if required.

*EN thanked KF for his presentation*

---

<sup>3</sup> **Strava** – is a fitness and social media App designed for runners and cyclists to record their journeys

**6. All Wales Coastal Path (AWCP) – Update  
Rhys Roberts - Coastal Path Officer GC**

RR thanked the members for the opportunity to update them on this project and he was not able to attend the last meeting.

He informed the members that he was responsible for the All-Wales Coastal section within the Gwynedd area which amounted to 185 miles of pathway. From Llanfairfechan (the Gwynedd – Cowny boundary) in the north to Machynlleth in the south.

This is grant funded on an annual basis by Welsh Government via the Natural Resources Wales (NRW) – he acknowledged that annual grants were difficult to plan for.

Last year they had been working on the proposed route through the Penrhyn estate on the outskirts of Bangor which had only just come to fruition and had taken several years to achieve. This is 2.3km along the coast within the estate property. This also required subsequent surface works which were ongoing.

Additional maintenance works and replacements are now required along some of the original route including some of the first gates and bridges installed – this was time consuming and costly.

Some 20 miles of new paths have been created over the last 12 years after many discussions with a variety of landowners and tenants to create new Public Rights of Way.

They acknowledged that in some areas the path was sometimes not near the coast and they were looking at various options to improve this and they would be discussing their priorities with the NRW in the near future.

Some coastal sections had suffered from natural coastal erosion which means in some locations they must consider moving some routes further back inland. Seven sites are currently being monitored on a monthly basis where problems can appear overnight. They were obliged to discuss this with landowners when moving a line was under consideration. This issue was problematic as they must adhere to the usual legislative process which can be cumbersome. Pembroke NP have a roll back agreement system which makes the process easier, and they were looking at this model.

They also have a counter system, and they were more than happy to share any data with the LAF members.

PR thanked RR for all his efforts particularly in his recent achievements in Penrhyn.

He asked if there had been any updates or changes to the AWCP following the review by Huw Iranca Davies AM in 2022 (on its 10-year anniversary). During that consultation both the NP LAF's and the Arfon Dwyfor LAF – jointly, had recommended that a roll back system be adopted across Wales to make this process easier.

In the light of lack of progress in access reforms they were obliged to use the current legislation which was widely acknowledge by all to be time consuming,

expensive, and bureaucratic and did not lend itself to making this roll back process easy.

*JG thanked RR and asked if it was possible to use the new section in Penrhyn with a Trumper type vehicle which he could borrow from the NP.*

RR stated that once all contractor works were completed he thought this may be possible. He would liaise with JG once this was completed and go from there.

*TJ asked if there was any link between the New Agricultural Bill and the All-Wales Coastal Path i.e. was there any financial incentives available.*

RR stated that unfortunately there was none other than what had been allocated under the Living Paths initiative where grants had been made available for the Ein Llwybrau Byw pilot for the creation of wildlife corridors on some sections. It was disappointing that this could not be rolled out under the new agricultural arrangements proposed by WG as it had been most successful.

*PW asked what his budget was and what was the split between capital and revenue.*

RR replied that the grant was in the region of £170k per annum which encompassed his role and the maintenance required for the Gwynedd section of the route. This is matched by GC with a coastal Wardens post.

Maintenance is expensive and includes strimming and veg clearing amounts to some £40 k per annum. Here is a separate pot of monies to enable new sections to be developed. However when new sections are added to the RoW network this then adds to the overall maintenance budget. There was also an issue in that much of the original furniture (such as gate and way markers) that was installed in 2013 now required replacement which would incur further costs.

*EN thanked RR for his interesting update and for his time in attending.*

## **7. Latest information on the Animal Welfare Act - Rob Taylor**

PR reported that unfortunately RT was not available for tis evenings meeting and sent apologies. PR would try to reschedule this when convenient.

## **8. Draft Recreation Strategy ENP – Peter Rutherford**

PR reported that this had now gone out for consultation, and he had received some interesting comments from bodies such as the BMC, NRW and others. And had also received some interesting observation from the Authority and some individual LAF members. This was certainly a more modern and up to date document which was aligned closely with the published Eryri Management Plan and the latter part of the document contained the Activity Statements which outlined our stance on various activities that took place in the NP.

The Authority had also recommended that we included Campervans & Motorhomes as this was a form of `passive recreation` and should be recognised as such. Following a discussion with the Authority they had recommended that

wild camping be included. The previous information relating to this activity on the NP website which had been removed during Covid had now been reinstated.

He had circulated this to LAF members and invited them to send in any comments they wished to make. This consultation was due to third week in December, but he would consider any further observations from LAF members for a short period beyond that.

Certainly, activities had changed since the inception of the NP in 1951 and it was important to include these. It was also important (and as previously mentioned by JG) that we should always aspire to least restrictive options where possible. All NP's in the UK had signed up to this and the Miles Without Stiles philosophy. Examples include changing stiles for gates when possible – although given some of our NP terrain this was not always possible but at lower elevations on flat ground it should be considered. The Warden Service in Llyn Tegid and the Bala area had seen many stiles removed and replaced by gates by working in partnership in GC and landowners and this was commendable.

The issue of events was mentioned and categorically the stance is that the NP would only support specific events if organisers could guarantee that their *modus operandi* is sound and sustainable. They would not lend their support to events when successive issues have arisen. He stressed that most professional organisers knew what was expected of them and would not risk reputational damage – in his experience there are more issues with smaller charitable events, but all principles must be the same.

*EN asked if the NP knew of some misdemeanours such as events on access land could the NP stop them occurring.*

PR stated that the NP did not have those powers. The NP always referred organisers to landowners in such instances and it was up to them to come to agreement with landowners. If this occurred on access land without consent the NP would react accordingly and make our views known and that any support may not be forthcoming in the future. The way to a successful event was to ensure that there was adequate dialogue between parties well in advance and to everyone's satisfaction. This is what the NP encourages.

*EN was still not sure what the NP could do in such instances.*

PR stated that if a landowner required people such as events to leave that access land then they (the landowner) could exclude them for a period of 24 hours and as a commercial activity they had no right to be there without prior consent. The NP had in the past discussed such instances with organisers to ensure good practice but fortunately such difficulties had been rare.

*TJ added that managing these issues was made more difficult when the NP was not the landowner, and it was far easier for others such as the NRW or NT as landowners. The NP does not exert control or licence such activities.*

*PW asked that if he were an event's organiser would he be needed to obtain any sort of permit. He also asked what information was made available to the NP beforehand.*



PR replied that no permit was necessary however, if they were on someone else's land such as a landowner or the NRW (forestry generally) or the National Trust then consent will be required. No consent was required for using Public Rights of Way. All large events are discussed by the Gwynedd Safety Advisory Group (SAG) which is comprised of the NW Police, Fire and Ambulance services, Highways, and other sectors of GC such as Licencing when required. Licencing is only normally required for static stands where there are safety concerns such as gas or there are fresh food outlets. If there are any that are planned within the NP then the NP will attend.

*TJ added that access to water was becoming problematic as there was a lack of legislation and the demand from the public was increasing. Even environmentally important sites such as Cwm Idwal were being used and managing this important site which has many designations (SAC, Ramsar, SSSI, SAC and NNR) then becomes problematic. It also flags up other issues such as health and safety and bio security and additional work for staff.*

*PW commented that certainly these activities were on the increase and that the public wrongly assumed this as a right.*

*EN asked how that could be controlled and does the NP have powers.*

*TJ commented that enforcement would be difficult as those powers do not lie with the NP they would lie with other bodies such as the NRW. In terms of inland water the new inflatable boards, which were highly mobile, only exacerbated this problem.*

*DJ mentioned that the bio security was an issue and how did the NP address this with the limited access that they had typically on the upper Conwy.*

PR stated that the DJ has raised an important issue, and the NP needs to make the bio security information easily accessible on the website. There was information on site in places such as Llyn Tegid, but this was not enough. He would report back to the LAF members on this in the summer.

*JG mentioned that there was wheelchair access on Llyn Padarn, but it was difficult to get in and out of the pontoon.*

PR suggested that someone discuss this with Parc Padarn team to look at this.

*MJ mentioned that it was important to remember that many people accessing inland water users did not belong to any organised groups such as Canoe Wales or other governing bodies where this information was readily found. The challenge was to get those messages such as water safety, bio security out to the wider user community.*

*TJ added that potentially people could paddle in English Waters in the morning and be in Wales in the afternoon without recourse to bio security and moving from place to place was problematic in terms of protection especially from potentially many types of invasive species.*

*MJ commented that inflatable paddle boards were so portable and packable that it only added to this issue.*

PR added that access to water was mentioned in the strategy, but it was important to note that currently there was no statutory right of access to inland water in Wales or England. The NP had assisted in facilitating access on the upper Conwy for paddlers and had worked in conjunction on suitable water level signage with the National Trust on the middle Glaslyn both of which worked comparatively well. The lack of legislation was problematic, but he had written in the strategy that the NP should be prepared if we were overtaken by legislative changes. It was hoped that their upper Conwy model could be adapted by the Welsh Government as a potential way forward for paddling.

They had also added educational centres, and many had closed but the ones still operating were become much more commercially orientated but it was important for the NP to maintain links with this sector. The off roading sector had also been added.

*JG asked if caving was included in this document.*

PR stated that it was not included as this activity was undertaken via private access arrangements. Some estimated that the number of participants was in the region of 5000 - 6000 people annually. This was not mainstream recreational activity and was not publicly accessible – most use was through Educational Centres or organised private groups. But if there was an alternative view then PR would consider them.

Once the final version of the Strategy was concluded then he would bring this back to the LAFs.

*MJ asked if the consultation list included all the stake holders in this field.*

PR stated that that there was a comprehensive list which included organisations such as the NRW, Snowdonia Society, local Community Councils, the British Horse Society, the BMC, and the local authorities, the LAF`s and others.

## **9. The role of the access forum– Peter Rutherford**

PR circulated the LAF Guidance Notes<sup>4</sup> 2- the Role, duties, and functions of LAF`s. explained that the LAF`s were statutory bodies and their fundamental role was to advise the Authority and its officers on any particular access issues under discussion.

The Countryside & Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000 (Wales) and subsequent regulations issued by the then National Assembly for Wales place a statutory duty on local authorities, National Parks, the then Countryside Council for Wales and the Forestry Commission Wales (both now under the auspices of the Natural Resources Wales) to refer certain (access) matters to the LAF`s.

Business may include bylaws relating to access land, Wardening of access land, long term restrictions and exclusions<sup>5</sup>, Rights of Way Improvement Plans (as

---

These original guidance notes were produced by the then Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) in 2002 on behalf of Welsh Assembly Government. The NRW have not to date revised this. Any application for Restrictions & Exclusions within CRoW access land over 6 months must come to the relevant LAF for approval.

produced by local authorities), access land mapping, and involvement for strategic priorities for Public Rights of Way and cycle networks.

The NP has two LAFs – for both the north and south area of the NP.

So their role was important to the Authority, and they had advised PR and other Officers on difficult access issues on several occasions.

For information PR explained that the NP was not the statutory highways authority in terms of Public Rights of Way within the NP. These duties lie with both Conwy and Gwynedd Councils. However, the NP has a formal Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Conwy Council to carry out basic maintenance on those PRoW that lie within the NP Conwy area totalling some 560km. The NP has no such agreement with Gwynedd but there is a considerable amount of cooperation, and the NP assumes responsibility for all its promoted and upland routes and a great deal of the network in and around Llyn Tegid. However, they were working to arrive at some sort of Memorandum of Understanding with GC to formalise this. This also required the goodwill and cooperation of landowners many of whom had been most helpful.

*TJ mentioned that the CRoW access maps were subject to review. And asked if this was still an ongoing process.*

PR stated that there had been a review in 2013 and that the next should have been this year - 2023 but the WG had decided to extend this period to 2029. This made the situation difficult if changes occurred through voluntary dedications which should be added to the maps. It was likely that some form of (primary) legislation may emerge in the interim. They had also questioned the need for any further mapping reviews as major changes were unlikely. Applications for small additions or deductions should ideally be made via the LAF`s on a case-by-case basis.

*PW mentioned that according to the guidance notes the LAF`s could discuss proposed bylaws if necessary.*

*EN made the point that it actually stated that the LAF`s are statutory consultees for such matters. He added that other agencies should consult with the LAF`s regarding cycle ways and there has been no prior information or presentations until recently typically about Traws Eryri when there should have been a great deal more information given well beforehand. There had been no information particularly from the NRW about this route only what PR had arranged from Cycling UK.*

*TJ added that although we were all broadly supportive of this initiative this should have been done differently and his first knowledge of this was from the NRW Newsletter and not from any consultation.*

*PW added that this had not been a consultation but simply an update on their progress.*

PR agreed with this, and the route launch did seem a form of `fait accompli` and where there were a number of anomalies which required attention as previously discussed.

*EN recommended that members absorb the contents of the paper and if they had any queries then they could return to the LAF for further discussion.*

**Agreed.**

#### **10. Proposed changes to two Public Rights of Way– Peter Rutherford**

PR explained that this concerned proposed changes to two Public Rights of Way. He showed maps of the areas concerned.

i ) Footpath 5b Beddgelert – this path led from Lon Gwyrfaï and onward towards Moel Hebog. It ended near a crag with no onward and safe passage to the summit. It was thought that this should be moved to the used line on the ground, which is safer. This would require landowner consultation, but he was confident that agreement could be reached.

PR mentioned it was up to GC what legal process they used for this.

GLE confirmed that his initial thoughts tended to be that this could be achieved by a diversion.

*PW asked that if the path was diverted then what would be the status of the original line.*

GLE replied that the line would no longer exist and would be transferred to the new line.

Members agreed that as this was primarily a Health & Safety issue then it should be moved.

ii) Footpath Beddgelert 21n – This was close to the Nant Gwynant/Cwm Dylî power Hydro power station. A simple realignment was required to match the ground line. The landowner had also requested this.

PR had discussed these issues with GC, and they were minded helping us with these changes. However they did have a substantial backlog, but he was hopeful that they could be dealt with in the not-too-distant future.

GLE added that one of their RoW Officers had been out to see these routes.

#### **11. Warden Section North Update – Simon Roberts**

SR reported the following:

The Wardens in the north of the NP (AP & ID) had used their allocations of funds on work undertaken various works under the Conwy Service Level Agreement in that area. Works included drainage, fencing and the installation of new furniture on various routes. They had also been assisting with some works on the Carneddau HLF project.

Following the recent storms works are also planned for redial maintenance in the Capel Curig area.

Other works included:

Alan Prichard

- North Wales Path - new signage and survey done to assess any maintenance works.
- Carneddau - looking into the possibility of installing a cattle grid in Cwm Eigiau. This requires discussion with Conwy Highways.
- Bwlch y Ddeufaen – various drainage works are required on some sections by contractors
- Capel Curig – teams to carry out repairs following the recent storms
- Conwy Mountain – new 8` bespoke metal gate installed
- Moel Berfedd – new fencing erected and will be followed by corresponding stiles.

Ioan Davies

- Footpaths works in the Bro Garmon area including veg clearance.
- Trefriw Trails – new gate installed near cemetery at the request of the Community  
Looking into the possibility of assisting them and erecting new way markers on their promoted routes.
- Some surface works required on Llwybr Cowlyd /Eigiau link path – preparation under way.
- Llyn Geirionydd – reports from the joint (Crafnant/Geirionydd) working group indicate that issues have quietened down over the last season.
- Ty Newydd, Penmachno new gate installed in that area on a previously closed path.
- Benar, Penmachno - new stile installed on NRW boundary.
- Forestry works ongoing to deal with ash die back in particular and windblows.

Alun Gethin Jones

- Lon Gwyrfaï – 7 new gates are due to be installed along its length
- Cwm Dyli - new gate installed neat the power station and new stile in Pen Y Gwryd.
- Assistance given to the Beddgelert Garden project for path works and arranging an ecological survey.
- Cwm Marchnad – Rhyd Ddu. Some 400m drainage and surface improvements to this bridle route linking Rhyd Ddu to Cwm Pennant via Llyn Llywelyn.
- Llwybr Cwellyn – Snowdon Ranger – drainage works, and clapper bridge repairs carried out by team.
- New gating planned for Cwm Pennant side this bridleway.
- Bwlch Y Moch, Wyddfa – new overlap wall planned (as previously agreed) but specification being looked currently.

Ffion Warner

- Various gating improvement works in the Nantmor area ongoing.
- Stile removal and replacement gate installed in Planwedd – Rhyd Ddu area

General works

- Maintenance works undertaken on PRoW 09 & 10 Maentwrog, and improvements to furniture in the Craig y Gesail area and PRoW 46 Dolbenmaen.
- Contractor works in Cwm Pennant for various furniture improvements
- Amodau Dan Draed – Ground Conditions reporting. Contactor has been appointed to carry out this work to enable this information to be carried on the website - YrWyddfa.Live
- Improved signage installed between Pen Y Pass and Pen Y Gwryd to reduce further the number of people using the road.

Other issues.

- Landowner letters regarding ownership of furniture on PRoW had been approved by GC and is still awaiting comments from CCBC.
- Works on NO 3 Abergwyngregyn under consideration for surface improvements and new gating to assist GC.

Voluntary Wardens – season ended on November 23

- 35 volunteers in total attended over weekends which amounted to 308 `person days` and 16 days manning the interpretation/information van and a total of 94 in season days on site.
- 2000 hours of volunteering on Yr Wyddfa (commendable)
- Proffered advice to over 4000 people
- Collected 600 bags of rubbish – unfortunately, a record number.

PR mentioned that the Caru Eryri volunteers had collected an additional 600kg of litter over the season which was significant (and unfortunate).

In terms of the wall at Bwlch Y Moch. He reminded members that a site visit had taken place with nominated LAF members prior to Covid, and they had elected for the one wall approach as a continuation of the current structure. But would slightly overlap and where people would have to make a conscious decision to turn around to access Crib Coch approach rather than blindly `follow on` thinking they were heading for the summit. Hopefully if heli lifts can be arranged it will be done this year.

*MJ asked if it may be worth putting some information on the North Wales live to ask people to highlight this issue specifically.*

PR stated that this may have mileage and that this would be useful. There was a significant pillar at that point indicating the route along the PyG track to the summit. So it was a difficult one. New signage installed on the wall recently had already been vandalised. Many signs, put in previous years, by the Warden Service had suffered the same fate and in his view this was grossly irresponsible and dangerous.

*TJ added that in Europe on any major route signage was expected at junctions such as this. It was unfortunate that this purist mindset persisted when it could endanger lives.*

*PW asked if then it may be wise to install more bins.*

PR mentioned that bins soon become magnets for people and then they accumulate additional rubbish and then spirals out of control. All bins in the pass lay-byw had been removed for this reason.

SR confirmed that when accumulations occur it frequently falls to the Wardens to clear up. As a trial the bins in Cwellyn – Snowdon Ranger car park had been removed to see what the outcome would be. The accompanying signage asked people to take responsibility and take it home. But some litter is appearing.

TJ mentioned that this was a problem in many areas including Foel Famau.

*EN stated that is was an ongoing problem and saw himself this in the Crimea (NP) car park recently.*

*He thanked SR for updating the members and his report.*

## **12. Recommended Agenda items for next meeting**

- i) Recreation Strategy
- 2) Rob Taylor – update on the Animal Welfare Act if available.
- 3) Revised Agri Bill consultation (access factors only)
- 4) Drones' advice detail.

## **13. Any Other business**

*i) DF asked what the portion was in Nant Gwynant and the double yellow lines. In the last half term it was chaotic once again.*

PR recommended that we ask Angela Jones (ENP) for the latest information, and he would inquire as to her availability.

*ii) MJ asked what the position was regarding the NP Trumper accessible vehicle.*

PR stated that the NP has two machines. One is based in the south of the NP and frequently used on the Mawddach Trail and the other, which is based in the Forest Campsite in Beddgelert, is used most frequently on Lon Gwyrfai. The Trampers are particularly useful for stroke victims as the controls are easily reversable from one side to another. It was also important to consider that the Trampers were equally important for carers as they allowed them to have a reasonable break whilst being out with their partner as no pushing or pulling involved as a wheelchair would require. Many had reported that this allowed them to `take a break` of sorts.

Maintenance costs for these are going up and although there was no charging regime in place we may have to consider applying a limited charge which could be then allocated to their maintenance budget.

The NP also had a four-wheeler which appeals to younger persons, but this required repairs after someone had vandalised it.

The Trumper had a significant endurance battery which allows it to traverse the entire length and back of Lon Gwyrfai, Cwellyn over to the Llanberis via Maescwm and Pen Y Pass to Llyn Llydaw return.

The new suite of videos that the NP has produced<sup>6</sup> allowed disabled and less abled users to determine for themselves what they could achieve rather than the NP being prescriptive.

He was very grateful to JG and others for their perseverance in assisting us as out test pilots for many of these routes.

*iii)* PR stated that it was felt that holding 4 meetings of the LAF a year for both the NP LAF`s was quite an administrative burden and he had floated the idea with Management Team and the LAF Chairs that possible we could reduce this down to 3 each. This would give him more time to prepare minutes and papers. I

It would not affect any collective subgroups that may be required from time to time for consultations when necessary. Having 3 was still within the LAF regulations which required a minimum of 4. This meant holding meetings every 4 months instead of 3. He wished to hear the views of the members.

EN recommended that we consider February, June, and October.

Following a discussion members Agreed

*EN thanked all members and Officers for their attendance and respective contributions this evening.*

## **12. Date of next meeting – 12<sup>th</sup> February 2024**

### **Secretary's Contact details**

[Peter.Rutherford@eryri.llyw.cymru](mailto:Peter.Rutherford@eryri.llyw.cymru)

**07900267538**

---

<sup>6</sup> The National Park has produced a series of short 2-minute videos showing the various accessible routes that are available using a Trampler or other disabled/less abled battery powered vehicles.

Mawddach example - [Mawddach Trail | Walks and Routes Snowdonia National Park \(gov. Wales\)](#)



