

Public Rights of Way Sub-Committee

Date of Meeting:	5 th December 2022
Report Title:	Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 – Part III, Section 53. Application No.CO/8/39: Application to add a Public Bridleway between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane, Moston
Report of:	Jayne Traverse, Executive Director Place
Ward(s) Affected:	Brereton Rural

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1. This report outlines the investigation into an application made by David Nixon to amend the Definitive Map and Statement to add a Public Bridleway between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane in the parish of Moston. This report includes a discussion of the consultations carried out in respect of the claim, the historical evidence, witness evidence and the legal tests for a Definitive Map Modification Order to be made. The report makes a recommendation based on that information, for quasi-judicial decision by Members as to whether an Order should be made to add a Public Bridleway to the Definitive Map and Statement.
- 1.2. The work of the Public Rights of Way team contributes to the Corporate Plan priority “A thriving and sustainable place”, and the policies and objectives of the Council’s statutory Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The report considers the evidence submitted and researched in the application to add a Public Bridleway between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane in the parish of Moston. The evidence consists of use on foot, horseback and bicycle by individual witnesses over a period of over 20 years and historical documents that demonstrate the existence/status of the route over a period of over 200 years. The report determines whether on the balance of probabilities the status of the bridleway has acquired and/or whether the route already has higher rights. The documentary

evidence considered in this case demonstrates the existence of the route as a bounded lane of a status higher than footpath from the early 18th Century, and that the route historically is evidenced to have had public road status. The user evidence investigated and discussed provides strong evidence of use by walkers, horseriders and cyclists over a relevant 20 year period and, in conjunction with the historical evidence, leads to the assertion that Restricted Byway rights exist, the rationale for this legal status being explained in the report.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1** An Order be made under Section 53(3)(c)(i) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement to add a Restricted Byway as shown between point A and B on Plan No. WCA/025.
- 3.2** Public notice of the making of the Order be given and, in the event of there being no objections within the specified period, or any objections received being withdrawn, the Order be confirmed in exercise of the power conferred on the Council by the said Act.
- 3.3** In the event of objections to the Order being received, Cheshire East Borough Council be responsible for the conduct of any hearing or public inquiry.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1** The evidence in support of this claim must show, on the balance of probabilities, that public restricted byway rights subsist along the claimed route. It is considered there is sufficient use of the route without force, secrecy, or permission, that is without interruption and as of right; to support the existence of restricted byway rights along the route shown between points A - B on Plan No. WCA/025. It is also considered that the historical evidence discovered demonstrates the existence of higher rights than a footpath or bridleway along the route consistent with a restricted byway.
- 4.2** It is considered that the requirements of Section 53(3)(c)(i) have been met in relation to restricted byway rights and it is recommended that the Definitive Map and Statement should be modified to show a Restricted Byway between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane.

5. Other Options Considered

5.1. Not applicable.

6. Background

6.1. *Introduction*

6.1.1 The Application was made to Cheshire East Council on 14th July 2014 by Mr David Nixon to add a Public Bridleway between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane in the parish of Moston. The application consisted of user evidence forms and maps and photographs. A total of 11 user evidence forms were submitted demonstrating use on foot, horseback and pedal cycle.

6.1.2 Further evidence was also submitted in the form of photographs, copies of county maps, Ordnance Survey maps, Definitive Map draft and provisional maps and a Tithe Map extract and other letters, documents and reports.

6.2. *Description of the Application Route*

6.2.1 The claimed route commences from the southern end of the public highway known as Plant Lane. The first section of the route runs from a rough stone surfaced layby off Plant Lane before proceeding down a route bounded between two fences along a grassy/earth surfaced route. It passes initially between 2 widely spaced metal bollards and then continues for approximately 400 metres along a route in a generally north easterly direction varying in width and with surrounding vegetation and small trees. The route gets wetter as it approaches Dragons Lane at the northern end and is also narrower at this end. It exits onto Dragons Lane again, passing between metal bollards.

6.3 *Main Issues*

6.3.1 Section 53(2)(b) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 requires that the Council shall keep the Definitive Map and Statement under continuous review and make such modifications to the Map and Statement as appear requisite in consequence of the occurrence of certain events:-

6.3.2 One such event, (section 53(3)(c)(i) is where

“(c) the discovery by the authority of evidence which (when considered with all other relevant evidence available to them) shows:-

- (i) that a right of way which is not shown on the map and statement subsists or is reasonably alleged to subsist over land in the area to which the map relates, being a right of way such that the land over which the right subsists is a public path, a restricted byway or, subject to section 54A, a byway open to all traffic.

The evidence can consist of documentary/historical evidence or user evidence or a mixture of both. All the evidence must be evaluated and weighed, and a conclusion reached whether, on the ‘balance of probabilities’ the rights subsist. Any other issues, such as safety, security, suitability, desirability or the effects on property or the environment, are not relevant to the decision.

6.3.3 Where the evidence in support of the application is user evidence, section 31(1) of the Highways Act 1980 applies. This states; -

“Where a way.....has been actually enjoyed by the public as of right and without interruption for a full period of twenty years, the way is deemed to have been dedicated as a highway unless there is sufficient evidence that there was no intention during that period to dedicate it.”

This requires that the public must have used the way without interruption and as of right; that is without force, secrecy or permission. Section 31(2) states that “the 20 years is to be calculated retrospectively from the date when the right of the public to use the way is brought into question”.

6.3.4 In the case of, *R (on the application of Godmanchester Town Council) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2007)*, the House of Lords considered the proviso in section 31(1) of the Highways Act 1980:

“...unless there is sufficient evidence that there was no intention during that period to dedicate it”.

The proviso means that presumed dedication of a way can be rebutted if there is sufficient evidence that there was no intention to dedicate the way, during the relevant twenty year period. What is regarded as ‘sufficient evidence’ will vary from case to case. The Lords addressed the issue of whether the “intention” in section 31(1) had to be communicated to those using the way, at the time of use, or whether an intention held by the landowner but not revealed to anybody could constitute “sufficient evidence”. The Lords also considered whether use of the phrase “during that period” in the proviso, meant during the whole of that period. The

House of Lords held that a landowner had to communicate his intention to the public in some way to satisfy the requirement of the proviso. It was also held that the lack of intention to dedicate means “at some point during that period”, it does not have to be continuously demonstrated throughout the whole twenty year period.

- 6.3.5** For public rights to have come into being through long use, as stated above, a twenty year period must be identified during which time use can be established. Where no challenge to the use has occurred, this period can be taken as the twenty years immediately prior to the date of the application. In this case the date of challenge can be identified as the date on which the application was submitted, being 14th July 2014.
- 6.3.6** The Planning Inspectorate guidelines state, “Section 31, Highways Act 1980, as amended by section 68 of Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006, provides that use of a way by non-mechanically propelled vehicles (such as a pedal cycle) can give rise to a restricted byway”.
- 6.3.7** The case of *Whitworth v Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs* (2010) is often quoted where there is evidence of use on horseback and pedal cycle. Section 30 of the Countryside Act 1968 gave pedal cyclists the right to ride on a bridleway; consequently, any use from 1968 onwards is said to be “by right”. In *Whitworth* the route was found to have pre-existing bridleway status, i.e., it was decided the status was a bridleway prior to 1968. It was suggested that subsequent use by cyclists of an accepted, but unrecorded, bridleway, where use of the bridleway would have been permitted by virtue of section 30 of the Countryside Act 1968, could not give rise to anything other than a bridleway.
- 6.3.8** The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC) Section 67 (1) extinguished existing motor propelled vehicular rights where they were not recorded on the Definitive Map and Statement at commencement (i.e. the date of the Definitive Map) although there are a few exceptions to this outlined in subsections S67(2) & (3) of the Act.

6.4 *Investigation of the Claim*

- 6.4.1** An investigation of the available evidence has been undertaken. The documentary evidence that has been examined is referred to below and a list of all the evidence taken into consideration can be found in **Appendix 1**.

6.5 *Documentary Evidence*

County Maps 18th/19th Century

- 6.5.1** These are small scale maps made by commercial mapmakers, some of which are known to have been produced from original surveys and others are believed to be copies of earlier maps. All were essentially topographic maps portraying what the surveyors saw on the ground. They included features of interest, including roads and tracks. It is doubtful whether mapmakers checked the status of routes or had the same sense of status of routes that exist today. There are known errors on many mapmakers' work and private estate roads and cul-de-sac paths are sometimes depicted as 'cross-roads'. The maps do not provide conclusive evidence of public status, although they may provide supporting evidence of the existence of a route.

The claimed route is described on various early commercial maps, being identified by solid parallel lines and marked as a cross road route. The route is described in the key as "Cross Road" on Greenwood's map of 1819, under "Cross Roads & House" on Swire and Hutchings's map of 1828/9 and as "Lanes & Bridle Ways" on the Bryant's map of 1831. This identification of the claimed route as a cross road route is strong evidence of the route as a public highway but doesn't prove stand-alone higher rights than bridleway status.

Tithe Records

- 6.5.2** *Moston Township Tithe Map and Apportionment 1840*

Tithe Awards were prepared under the Tithe Commutation Act 1836, which commuted the payment of a tax (tithe) in kind, to a monetary payment. The purpose of the award was to record productive land on which a tax could be levied. The Tithe Map and Award were independently produced by parishes and the quality of the maps is variable. It was not the purpose of the awards to record public highways. Although depiction of both private occupation and public roads, which often formed boundaries, is incidental, they may provide good supporting evidence of the existence of a route, especially since they were implemented as part of a statutory process. Non-depiction of a route is not evidence that it did not exist; merely that it did not affect the tithe charge. Colouring of a track may or may not be significant in determining status. In the absence of a key, explanation or other corroborative evidence the colouring cannot be deemed to be conclusive of anything.

The Tithe Map of Moston Township, dated 1840, is a second-class map, which means it does not have a certified seal by The Tithe Commissioners as first class maps do. Only first class maps were considered sufficiently accurate to serve as legal evidence of boundaries and land plots, the second class maps vary in accuracy. The Moston Tithe Map shows the full extent of the claimed route marked by two parallel solid black lines. It is unnumbered and not within a numbered parcel and therefore there is no evidence for the route in the associated apportionment records. The route is shown as a clear linking route in the same way as the public roads of Plant Lane and Dragons Lane. The route is marked as a clearly defined physical through-route and provides strong evidence this was not part of surrounding hereditaments and likely to have public status.

6.5.3 *Railway Plan Records (1871)*

On the Sandbach and Winsford Junction Railway Plan of 1871 the route is shown specifically numbered, in this case as “22” within the Limits of Deviation. The book of reference describes the route as ‘public’, in this case a “Public Road”, in parcel number “22”. The route is listed with the owner of the route as public body or officer, in this case “Highway Board of the Highway District of Northwich in the Hundred of Northwich, Charles Frederick Barker, Clerk, Thomas Swinton, Surveyor”, with the implied responsibility for the maintenance of public highways. Given such Railway Plans were drawn up under an Act of Parliament, they provide strong evidence where public status routes are indicated.

6.5.4 *Ordnance Survey Records*

Ordnance Survey (O.S.) mapping was originally for military purposes to record all roads and tracks that could be used in times of war; this included both public and private routes. These maps are good evidence of the physical existence of routes, but not necessarily of status. Since 1889 the Ordnance Survey has included a disclaimer on all of its maps to the effect that the depiction of a road is not evidence of the existence of a right of way. It can be presumed that this caveat applied to earlier maps.

O.S. 1st edition 1 inch 1842 (Old Series) & 1902 (New Series)

This mapping shows the route as a clear double solid line bounded feature similar to the surrounding public roads it joins, Dragons Lane and Plant Lane. “Dragons Lane” at the north end is annotated.

The New Series 1 inch edition of 1902 marks the route as a 3rd class metalled road.

O.S. 1st Edition County Series 25" to 1 mile 1875

The route is shown on this map again as double solid lines with a double pecked track feature down the middle but clearly part of surrounding solid line route. The route is also shown lined with trees on the boundaries.

O.S. 2nd Edition County Series 25" to 1 mile 1897

The route is shown throughout in the same way as on the 1st edition.

O.S. 3rd Edition County Series 25" to 1 mile 1909

The route is again shown throughout unchanged from the previous edition.

O.S 25" 1st edition Book of Reference (Parish of Warmingham) 1876

The Book of Reference covers the area of the claimed route but demonstrates no evidence of the claimed route.

6.5.5 *Finance Act 1910*

The Finance Act of 1910 involved a national survey of land by the Inland Revenue so that an incremental value duty could be levied when ownership was transferred. Land was valued for each owner/occupier and this land was given a hereditament number. Landowners could claim tax relief where a highway crossed their land. Although the existence of a public right of way may be admitted it is not usually described or a route shown on the plan. This Act was repealed in 1920.

The Finance Act Survey map demonstrates evidence for the route and shows it as uncoloured and excluded from hereditaments. This suggests the route was considered a public highway at the time of the survey, but does not in itself provide evidence about the class of rights of over it.

6.5.6 *Definitive Map Process – National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949*

The Definitive Map and Statement is based on surveys and plans produced in the early 1950s by each parish in Cheshire, of all the ways they considered to be public at that time. The surveys were used as the basis for the Draft Definitive Map.

There is no public right of way marked up on the Walking Survey maps of 1951 & 1952 for the claimed route although the route is clearly shown as a physical feature bounded by two solid parallel lines joining Plant Lane and Dragons Lane either end. The route was therefore not marked on the final Definitive Map, hence this application, and whilst the Provisional and Draft Map of the early 1950s also does not show the claimed route as a public right of way, they do again show the route as a clear throughfare between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane as it is depicted in the same way to these public roads by parallel solid black lines.

6.5.7 *Land Registry Information*

The claimed route is on land that is un-registered at the Land Registry. A land registry search was conducted in 2022 to confirm this. It did show that there was one landowner abutting the whole length of the claimed route to the east of the route and a collection of 3 other landowners immediately abutting the west of the claimed route.

6.5.8 *Photographs and other evidence*

Photos

The applicant submitted photos with their application to demonstrate that they had attempted to notify any landowner of the route of the application. The notice was dated 29th August 2014 and informed the public an application had been made to claim the route as a public bridleway. Further notices were also posted in summer 2022 in order to again attempt to notify any affected landowner.

During consultation a planning consultant also provided photographs of the route from around 2011 to demonstrate it had become rather overgrown in places but appeared to have been used.

Discovery of Lost Ways Project

In 2018 a company called LandAspects completed an investigation as part of the "Discovery of Lost Ways" national project. They completed and supplied the Council with a review of documentary evidence in relation to this route. They examined and analysed the evidence, most of which is already incorporated into this report. They came to the conclusion that the claimed

route was a public carriageway i.e. it had public vehicular rights based on the reasons summarised in the conclusion of this report.

Sales particulars of 1999

The applicant supplied with their application sales particular maps dated 1999 from Strutt & Parker that relate to sale of Hill Farm, Moston Green. This clearly identifies the claimed route by solid parallel lines with a pecked line track feature down the middle. The claimed route is labelled clearly down the side as “Dragons Lane” and at the southern end of the claimed route annotated “Grass Road”.

Additional verbal evidence

During a site visit, which the landowner to the west of the claimed route and the applicant attended on 24th August 2022, it was mentioned that a now-deceased local landowner had explained that in the past, underneath the current earth/grass surface, the route had a cobbled surface down the middle. Whether this is true has not been ascertained physically.

6.6 *Witness Evidence*

- 6.6.1 The Application, when made in 2014, was accompanied by 11 user evidence forms. Since that time, 2 of the users are now deceased and 2 have moved away from the area. In total 7 witnesses were contacted to be interviewed. Interviews with 3 were held face to face and the remaining 4 were conducted as phone interviews. The users all clearly refer to the same route, all believe it to be a bridleway and can give evidence of use from 1936 to 2014 on foot, by horse and by bicycle. A chart illustrating the user evidence from the total number of 11 witnesses is attached as Appendix 2.
- 6.6.2 The use of the route appears to have been entirely recreational. Their use of the route was for the full range of normal activities, including walking dogs, exercising horses, and taking children for walks. This often involved such things as picking blackberries, watching birds, and going fishing.
- 6.6.3 The witnesses refer to the lack of maintenance of the route, and how it has become narrower and more overgrown over time, but still passable. It seems that the surface was probably originally of stone but has become covered by soil and vegetation. The

route is enclosed by hedges on either side and has not changed its course in recent memory. Some of the horse riders interviewed remember being able to ride two abreast in the past when the route was not so overgrown, and all horse riders said they used the route with others at times and know of many other users (at least 5 other individuals each) who also used the route on horse, thereby making the total horse rider usage greater than initially submitted with the application.

- 6.6.4 5 of the witnesses mention the erection of bollards at either end to prevent the use of the route by vehicles. Upon interviewing it has been established that the parish council erected these (just over 5ft apart) sometime in the early 2000s to prevent quad bikes and vehicles going down the route and to discourage anti-social behaviour, which there had been an issue with. None of the witnesses mentioned any challenges to use on foot, horse, or bicycle by any landowner, and no one was given permission to use the route or had any connection with the land or landowners in question. In fact, one witness mentioned they were seen using the route by 4 different landowners, who all own abutting land, without any challenge.
- 6.6.5 In the relevant 20 year period prior to the application 1994-2014, no challenge to use of the route has been identified and therefore the 20 year period of deemed dedication has been satisfied. During this period, 6 people claim use throughout the time on foot – 2 of which also claim use by horse. A further 4 people claim use for some part of the period – all 4 on foot, 2 by horse and one by bicycle. At no time between 1994 and 2014 were there less than 7 people claiming use on foot, with a peak of 10 between 2007-2009. In the same period, there were 4 people claiming to be riding horses every year, except for 3 in 2012 and 2013. Bicycle use peaked in 1994-1995 at 2, was 1 until 2009, and then none. The use attested to varied in frequency from people using it occasionally to daily, and also varied through time.
- 6.6.6 From interviewing it appears to have been a very well known and used route, with those interviewed stating they had named the route locally with many different local names, ranging from “Gypsy Lane”, “Plant Lane Bridleway”, “Cow Lane” and other similar names. A few of the witnesses remembered historical use by Gypsies and Travellers with horses and carts and one interviewee mentioned that in the wider area half way down the route, Gypsies would camp out for a period and pegs were made by them before they moved on.

6.6.7 It can be concluded from the user evidence presented, and more detailed interviewing of witnesses, that a prima facie case of sufficient evidence of use in the relevant 20 year period has been made for deemed dedication to have occurred as a public bridleway, at least.

6.7 *Conclusion*

6.7.1 The documentary evidence considered in this case demonstrates the existence of the route as a bounded lane of a status higher than footpath from the early 18th Century. The three key documents that evidence this route had indeed public road status are (i) the Finance Act of 1910 which clearly shows the route uncoloured and separate from the surrounding hereditaments (ii) The Railway Plan of 1871 that clearly describes the route as a Public Road (iii) The Tithe Map of 1840 which has no number and is separate from the surrounding hereditaments. In addition to these three the O.S. map records also add weight to public road status having it recorded as a 3rd class metalled road on the 1 inch new series map of 1902, combined with the fact the route has been over time recorded on other maps such as sale particulars as a lane or road.

6.7.2 Under s.31(1) of the Highways Act 1980, a right of way can come into being by prescription unless there is evidence to the contrary. The use of the route by walkers, horse riders and cyclists can be demonstrated by the witness evidence over the 20 year period 1994-2014. This use can also be supported by the significant length of use up to this period. The use provided is reasonably frequent and covers a long time period and can be considered suitable for the acquisition of rights to have been demonstrated. From interviewing particularly, it has been demonstrated that there is certainly sufficient bridleway use to demonstrate bridleway rights have come in to being.

6.7.3 The evidence in support of this application must show, on the balance of probabilities, that restricted byway rights subsist along the claimed route. The balance of user evidence certainly supports the case that a public bridleway, at least, subsists along the routes A-B (Plan No. WCA/025) and combined with the documentary evidence that the route historically is evidenced to have had public road status. However, due to the implications of NERC Act (see paragraph 6.3.8), that higher status cannot now be recorded, this means the status on balance has to be lower, that of restricted byway status (use on foot, pedal cycle,

horseback and horsedrawn carriage). It is considered that the requirements of Section 53(3)(c)(i) have been met and it is recommended that a Definitive Map Modification Order is made to record a Restricted Byway between Dragons Lane and Plant Lane and thus amend the Definitive Map and Statement.

7. Consultation and Engagement

- 7.1 Consultation letters and a plan of the claimed route were sent out to the Ward Member; Parish Council; user groups/organisations; statutory undertakers and landowners on the 21st July, 2022. Further letters were sent to the adjoining landowners to the west and east of the claimed route.
- 7.2 No responses were received from the landowners to the west of the claimed route however the landowner to the east of the claimed route did respond and also attended a site visit. The following responses were also received:
- 7.3 Ward Councillor John Wray covering the parish of Moston, responded to say he fully supported the application.
- 7.4 A Peak and Northern Footpath Society Area Officer responded stating they have walked the claimed route and noted from evidence on the ground that it is well used.
- 7.5 Moston Parish Council responded to say, further to a meeting on 10th August 2022 when they discussed the application, that they gave the application full support as a public bridleway. They also mentioned that on no occasion had anyone been prevented from walking the track that had been in existence for 200 years. They state that they believe that since the application was made there were further reasons to add the route, including covid which has brought an increase of use and they also believe that this route is safer. They also mentioned the Moston Neighbourhood Plan of 2019 mentioning protecting public rights of way and that horse riding takes place on various land and the particular claimed track.
- 7.6 Sandbach Footpath Group responded stating they strongly supported the addition of the claimed public bridleway. They referred to various walks they organise in the area from the car park at the Plant Lane end and that this route being on the Definitive Map would be a very useful addition for walking possibilities.
- 7.7 A Planning consultant who stated they assisted with applications/appeals for the Traveller pitches for the land to the west of the claimed route, mentioned that as part of their investigations they noted the claimed route but never saw

anyone else on it, but it was clear it was being used by the public and connected the two roads. They mention not remembering seeing any locked gates or signs but due to the vegetation doubted it was being used as a bridleway. The consultant attached various photos from 2011 onwards stating it looked rather overgrown.

7.8 United Utilities also responded to state they had no objection to the application.

8. Implications

8.1. Legal

8.1.1 Under section 53 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (WCA), the Council has a duty, as surveying authority, to keep the Definitive Map and Statement under continuous review. Section 53 (3) (c) allows for an authority to act on the discovery of evidence that suggests that the Definitive Map needs to be amended. The authority must investigate and determine that evidence and decide on the outcome whether to make a Definitive Map Modification Order or not

8.1.2 Upon determination of this application, the authority must serve notice on the applicant to inform them of the decision. Under Schedule 14 of the WCA, if the authority decides not to make an order, the applicant may, at any time within 28 days after service of the notice, appeal against the decision to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will then consider the application to determine whether an order should be made and may give the authority directions in relation to the same.

8.1.3 Legal implications are also included within the report.

8.2. Finance

8.2.1 If objections to an Order lead to a subsequent hearing/inquiry, the Council would be responsible for any costs involved in the preparation and conducting of such.

8.3. Policy

8.3.1 There are no direct policy implications of this report.

8.4. Equality

8.4.1 The legal tests under section 53 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 do not include an assessment of the effects under the Equality Act 2010.

8.5. Human Resources

8.5.1 There are no direct implications for Human Resources

8.6. Risk Management

8.6.1 There are no direct implications for risk management

8.7. Rural Communities

8.7.1 There are no direct implications for Rural Communities.

8.8. Children and Young People/Cared for Children

8.8.1 There are no direct implications for Children and Young People.

8.9. Public Health

8.9.1 There are no direct implications for Public Health.

8.10. Climate Change

8.10.1 The Council has committed to becoming carbon neutral by 2025 and to encourage all businesses, residents and organisations in Cheshire East to reduce their carbon footprint.

8.10.2 The addition of a restricted byway to the Definitive Map represents the formal recognition of pedestrian, equestrian and cycle rights, creating more opportunities for active travel and leisure and potentially reducing the use of cars for short local journeys. It also has the potential for the improvement and promotion of healthy lifestyles.

Access to Information	
Contact Officer:	Jennifer Ingram jennifer.ingram@cheshireeast.gov.uk 01270 686029
Appendices:	Appendix 1 – Archive List Appendix 2 – User Evidence Chart Plan No. WCA/025
Background Papers:	File no. CO/8/39