



PEAK AND NORTHERN
FOOTPATHS SOCIETY
1894-1973

Annual Report 1972-73

WALKERS CROFT

The sketch on the front of the report is of Walkers Croft, Manchester. The site of this hemmed-in lane was long ago a gathering place for Flemish weavers known locally as "Walkers". Eventually tracks were formed to the croft from the surrounding hamlets and in 1600 one of these paths was illegally blocked by a local landowner, Mr. T. Strangeways. The local people brought him to court, where he was fined £2 for obstruction, which just serves to demonstrate that in the matter of footpath obstructions, as in everything else, there is nothing new under the sun.

Walkers Croft led to a mill which was demolished when Victoria Station was built around the middle of the 19th Century. The croft was at a lower level than the new station and therefore a flight of steps was put in to make a short cut.

The sketch is taken from the Hunts Bank end of the croft looking up towards Victoria Station. You can just see the top of the station in the sketch. On the left is part of the old Railway offices and on the right can be seen part of Chetham's Hospital. If you walk to the end of this view you will see the flight of steps which leads up to Victoria Station. If you climb these steps and look back you will get a good view of Chetham's.

JOHN NEEDHAM.

PEAK AND NORTHERN FOOTPATHS SOCIETY

Founded in 1894

President: F. S. H. HEAD, Ph.D., D.Sc.

Vice-Presidents:

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|
| The Rt. Hon. LORD CHORLEY, Q.C., M.A., J.P. | |
| P. DALEY | A. J. MOON, B.A. |
| N. REDFORD | A. SMITH |
| H. E. WILD | |

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

L. G. Meadowcroft (*Chairman*) H. Gilliat (*Vice-Chairman*)

Hon Treasurer: G. S. Cooper,
13 Duffield Road, Salford, M6 7RE. Tel. 061-736 2360

Hon. General Secretary: E. A. W. Newton,
79 Taunton Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancs. Tel. 061-330 4191

Membership Secretary: J. Needham,
23 Woodland Crescent, Hilton Park, Prestwich, M25 8WQ

Closure and Diversion Secretary: D. W. Lee,
7 Mossway, Alkrington, Middleton, M24 1WR

Signpost Supervisor: T. Ewart,
129 Old Hall Lane, Fallowfield, Manchester 14 9HL

Footpath Walking Scheme: A. O'Brien

Librarian: Miss N. Firby

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Dr. A. J. Bateman | Miss M. Fletcher | V. J. Simson |
| Dr. W. F. Beech | Miss R. Irlam | E. E. Stubbs |
| D. T. Berwick | H. Lees | W. Whalley |
| Miss M. Brackenbury | W. N. Norton | E. McCormick |
| C. H. Chadwick | Miss B. Richardson | A. Scargill |
| A. Eaton | Miss B. Rowland | |

Footpaths Inspectors:

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| L. Abel | C. Evison | J. B. Johnston |
| D. Alsop | Mrs. E. A. Evison | Mrs. Harrington |
| Mrs. G. W. Bennett | D. N. Flinn | Mrs. O. Lucas |
| Mrs. M. H. Boyle | F. Higgins | M. R. Milner |
| Mrs. M. Doody | D. W. Lee | J. A. Whinray |
| G. R. Estill | H. Jones | F. Riddell |

Delegates from Affiliated Clubs and Societies:

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| J. G. Baker | Mrs. R. Hampshire | H. S. Swift |
| F. Barlow | Mrs. Beech | Miss D. Robins |
| W. Brookfield | Mrs. E. Johnson | L. G. Walters |
| Mrs. M. Barratt | F. R. Mason | F. Walls |
| N. W. Checkley | S. E. Morton | W. Wilson |
| A. Beswick | J. Ogden | N. W. Yelland |
| D. Cummings | D. Piggott | K. Howarth |
| G. Fernley | F. Rowlinson | Mrs. A. Ridgway |
| A. R. Gordon | P. R. Helm | |

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| L. G. Meadowcroft (<i>Chairman</i>) | G. S. Cooper (<i>Convenor</i>) |
| D. T. Berwick | G. Fearnley |
| Dr. F. S. H. Head | D. W. Lee |
| H. Gilliat | J. Needham |
| | |
| | |
| | |

E. W. Newton
H. E. Wild
J. Willison

TRUSTEES:

Messrs. G. S. Cooper, F. S. H. Head and L. G. Meadowcroft

Auditor: A. Brackenbury

FOREWORD

RATIONALISATION and rumours of it continue to dominate the footpaths scene. Though not directly involved we are particularly disturbed at the progress of the scheme in West Sussex which involves the closure or diversion of considerable numbers of paths. We do not accept the National Farmers Union's propaganda that because the footpath system was evolved for the needs of local users "in a bygone age" it is obsolete today and should be replaced by a more limited system better suited to what they conceive as the needs of hikers. The road system also was evolved in a bygone age and includes many little used lanes of doubtful economic value, but nobody proposes to close them; indeed many have been "improved" at public expense in recent years.

Unfortunately there is evidence that the NFU propaganda is influencing people in local government circles. In county strategic plans and so forth we repeatedly come across the familiar line that a system better suited to modern needs is called for. It is clear also that these people are thinking in terms of planned cross country routes for holiday walkers rather than for the kind of varied traditional network used and beloved by the great majority of regular footpath users.

If the existing system was really so unsatisfactory ramblers and others would have been pressing for major improvements long ago as the motorists have done for better roads. But there is no evidence at all of any such dissatisfaction. Our main concern in recent years has been the defence of the network against widespread attempts to curtail it by illegal closure, obstruction, ploughing, and so on, and there can be little doubt that this is at the bottom of all the trouble. Resenting our not very successful attempts to secure the enforcement of the ploughing regulations and other footpath laws, the farmers and landowners' organisations are campaigning for widespread legal closures.

The latest move in this campaign—the second prong of the pitchfork—is an attempt to persuade county councils to relax the bull byelaws which at present protect footpath users in most English and Welsh counties, but this is discussed later on.

When rationalisation was first proposed in 1966 we, along with the Ramblers' Association and other bodies, opposed it. The official Gosling Footpaths Committee rejected it and the Countryside Act (1968) made no provision for it. It seems wrong therefore that individual counties should seek to achieve the same object by promoting large numbers of diversions and closures as West Sussex is doing.

We have not had to deal with this situation in the northwest so far, but there are grounds for fearing that at least one of our counties might promote a rationalisation scheme. If they do, we shall oppose it outright and we have joined with the Manchester Area of the R.A. in setting up a committee to co-ordinate opposition.

COMMENTARY

Footpath Hearings, Chapel-en-le-Frith

On 27th May 1971 Derbyshire published a series of modifications to their Draft Map of Chapel Rural District. These included a number of proposed deletions and a series of proposed upgradings of bridleways in Hope Woodlands parish to "carriage road-bridleway" status. There were fears that the upgraded ways might be used for a motorcycle circuit. The Society, in conjunction with the Sheffield and Manchester Areas of the R.A. lodged objections to a number of the modifications and in due course the county arranged hearings to consider them.

The outcome has been highly satisfactory. None of the six bridleways concerned has been upgraded and five of the seven proposed deletions have been revoked. Of the remaining two, the Society has appealed to the Minister in respect of Chinley F.P. 32, but has conceded Hayfield F.P. 39.

We are greatly indebted to Mr. A. Eaton who collected evidence and represented us at the footpath hearings. Sheffield took the lead at the Hope Woodlands hearing and we had the energetic support of Mrs. E. Evison. As documentary evidence was anticipated we engaged the services of Mr. S. Furey, Chairman of Sheffield C.P.R.E. to represent us legally.

Trends in Closure and Diversion Decisions

In recent years we have noted a welcome reluctance on the part of the Secretary of State for the Environment to agree to contested orders. Consideration has been given to possibilities of future uses of paths and various plausible, but legally irrelevant, grounds for closure have been dismissed. In the main this trend has continued and some interesting decisions have been reported. The Minister refused to confirm the extinguishment of a bridleway at Donington, Lincs., although the only objection came from the local R.A. Area which gave no evidence of user. The decision was based on written representations from both sides without an inquiry. A similar procedure was adopted in respect of an obstructed path at Aston, Cheshire, where there was again only one objector (an individual, Mr. D. W. Lee of Middleton, Lancs.) and no evidence of user. Extinguishment was refused because the path clearly had amenity potential and might be well used, if it was not obstructed.

It has been ruled many times in the past that inconvenience to farming is irrelevant and this was said again in respect of a path at Hascombe, Surrey, but in arriving at a decision to extinguish Moor Crichel F.P. 1, Dorset, the Inspector evidently took this factor into

account and was not over-ruled by the Minister. Evidently these administrative decisions lack the consistency characteristic of court rulings and it cannot be said with certainty that similar cases will receive similar treatment. At Wentworth, Yorks., a diversion order was confirmed, although the development for which it was needed had already been carried out; on earlier occasions it was held that the Minister had no power to confirm an order in such circumstances. A disturbing feature of the Dorset case was that only 22 days' notice was given in the *London Gazette*, but it was ruled that this did not matter because the statutory 28 days' notice had been given in a local paper.

Most closure and diversion orders are unopposed and as such are confirmed by the local authorities concerned without further ado. Statistics suggest that about 70% of diversion orders and 56% of extingishments are confirmed in this way. But when there is opposition the local authorities abandon three-quarters or more of the orders! The remaining opposed orders go to the D.O.E. for decision, usually after an inquiry. Confirmations amount to about 8% of the total number of orders made and refusals to about 2%. The importance of opposition stands out clearly from all this. The figures also indicate that diversions are more likely to succeed today than outright closures; in the sixties the opposite was true.

Courts Act, 1971

Under this Act which came into force on 1st January 1972 most of the functions of Quarter Sessions have been transferred to the new Crown Courts. These include appeals by landowners against provisional maps, appeals against magistrates' decisions on "Section 108" orders, and applications for orders requiring highway authorities to repair highways or bridges.

Bull Byelaws

The Countryside Bill (1968) as drafted provided for a uniform requirement that bulls should not be kept in fields crossed by footpaths. This requirement was generally on the lines of the Home Office model byelaw, but with some concessions to farming interests. It was dropped in the face of their opposition, but a counter proposal to exclude "non-dairy breed bulls" was also unacceptable to Parliament. The position was therefore left unchanged with individual counties deciding whether to adopt a byelaw or not.

In fact, of the 58 county councils in England and Wales only Breconshire and Carmarthenshire have no bull byelaws. Forty-four counties prohibit bulls broadly in accordance with the model byelaw, and the remaining twelve (including Cheshire) permit bulls in fields containing public paths, provided they are accompanied by cows.

Now we are confronted with attempts by the N.F.U. to persuade several county councils to relax their byelaws. The changes proposed in most cases go beyond what was suggested and found unacceptable by Parliament in 1968. One of the counties concerned is Staffordshire

which proposes to permit accompanied bulls provided they belong to one of eleven specified "non-dairy" breeds. The walker confronted with a bull will have to decide whether it is of a supposedly safe breed or not and his decision may be as vital as distinguishing correctly between edible and poisonous fungi.

Though some breeds may be less aggressive than others there is only one safe rule. All bulls are potentially dangerous and should be given a wide berth whether with cows or not. An elderly man was killed recently by a castrated animal.

Whatever the motives behind these proposed changes they would clearly be prejudicial to public safety and a major deterrent to the use of footpaths. Unfortunately they are likely to be represented as necessary for increasing beef production and it is already rumoured that the Home Office may review the whole byelaw position.

Obstruction by Crops

In 1969 Rickmansworth U.D.C. successfully prosecuted a farmer at Watford magistrates' court under Section 121 of the Highways Act (1959) for "wilfully obstructing a highway (Footpath No. 9) by growing crops thereon". Though not a legally binding precedent this decision was of great significance since any individual can prosecute for obstruction, whereas only a local authority can secure restoration of a ploughed path. It is therefore of interest that an individual, the secretary of the Pontefract Group of the R.A., has successfully prosecuted a landowner for obstructing two paths by growing peas, grains and potatoes thereon. The paths in question were formerly lanes between hedges, but had been ploughed and planted after the hedges had been removed. The R.A. Group had been complaining to the farmer and the local authority for several years because the paths had not been restored, but without result.

Repair of Highways

Another part of the Highways Act which can be brought into operation by any individual is Section 59, under which a highway authority can be compelled to repair a highway for which they are responsible. The Preston and Fylde Group of the R.A. complained five times to the Preesall U.D.C. that a footbridge was missing, but received no reply on any occasion. The machinery of the Act was therefore set in motion and application made for a court order requiring the U.D.C. to put the path into proper repair. The bridge was repaired before the application reached the court!

Footpath Worker

Much of the information in this article was taken from *Footpath Worker*, issued by the Ramblers' Association, 1-4 Crawford Mews, York Street, London, W.1 at 25p for four quarterly issues, post free. All footpath workers who wish to keep up to date should take it.

“CAUGHT IN THE LEGAL WEB”

A Review of 1972's Interesting Cases

By DONALD W. LEE (*Closure and Diversions Secretary*)

It is some time—1969—since the Society was involved in a prosecution for illegal obstruction, but 1972 saw us back in Court, only this time appearing as witnesses in a case that had been troubling us since 1966. Successful prosecutions by a council for deliberate obstructions are not as frequent as they need to be and when the path concerned is not even on the Definitive Rights of Way Map they are a decided rarity. Thus the Society owes *HEYWOOD CORPORATION* a special vote of thanks for their positive action in providing an example and a precedent for other councils.

The path, known locally as “Bob Cobs”, runs for half a mile along the Heywood/Middleton border (2½in. O.S. map SD80.858.085 to 865.086) from Heywood Road to Saxon's Farm. It is an ancient, well-used and vital link to walkers in the area as amply demonstrated by our Vice-President, Arthur Smith (“Perigarth”) in his 1951 book *50 Weekend Walks Around Manchester*—but being on the borders, neither council had claimed it on their Footpath Map. Under the M62 Motorway Side Roads Order of 1965, Bob Cobs was to be diverted slightly at the farm end, but at that time no-one spotted that the new diversion was to be a private access lane only. The Ministry had clearly been misled into thinking that this was so, due to the absence of the path from the Definitive Map. This demonstrates the absolute necessity of claiming *all* paths when the opportunity arises.

No physical difficulty arose until the motorway was built in 1970 and the diversion was laid. Then the farmer at Saxon's Farm, David Dearden, taking advantage of the legal omission and in defiance of local feeling, deliberately blocked the old lane, choking it with hawthorn branches. Ample evidence, painstakingly collected by local member, Arthur Ellis, helped to convince Heywood Corporation that Bob Cobs was public, but the Road Construction Unit, as builders of the M62, would not change the status of the new portion from “private” to “public” until such time as a Court proved that Bob Cobs was a right of way. Heywood Corporation subsequently grabbed hold, literally, of the thorny problem and last October duly prosecuted Dearden at Heywood Magistrates' Court for wilful obstruction under Section 121 of the Highways Act 1959. There were several elderly residents to give evidence of usage and we spoke of the history of the controversy, incidentally referring to Mr. Smith's book of 1951. The Magistrates found the case proved and Dearden was fined £5. There was no appeal. This means that Bob Cobs has now been reopened and will appear on the Rights of Way Maps at the first opportunity.

Members will know of our poor opinion of *ROCHDALE CORPORATION* and how they close and divert paths by using the undemocratic Rochdale Improvement Act of 1872. Their attempts in 1972 to grab "The Cornflags" (Footpath No. B8. 2½in. O.S. sheet 101. 867.143 to 868.147) rightly ended in failure. This is a spectacular, one-third of a mile long, old stone flagged path leading through fields from Edenfield Road, Bamford, to the hamlet of Shawfield. They argued closure was necessary because the Education Department required 100 yds. of it to incorporate into a huge playing field complex. The Highways Department, of course, readily agreed and so did the Planning Department so we had to do battle on three fronts; yet all that was needed was a length of fencing and then both path and playing field could easily co-exist. The Corporation didn't heed the warning from the anger generated by their 1971 activities—see last year's Annual Report—and clearly were not prepared for the embarrassing publicity and the furore created when they tried to shut Cornflags. There was leader comment in the *Rochdale Observer* about their methods and they had to face being called "the worst footpath authority in England"—a little extreme perhaps, but at least it made them sit up. Councillor Chadwick took the matter up on our behalf and at the Council meeting that was going to confirm the closure, he objected. Discussion was curtailed by the Chairman of the Highways Committee, who indicated that the Corporation would think again on The Cornflags. After the meeting's conclusion I spoke to Alderman Cyril Smith, now Rochdale's M.P., and he said that the closure had been put forward by some minor official who had been suitably instructed for the future. So now we know.

We appeared at only one Public Inquiry in 1972 and this was a prime example of greedy developers trying to destroy a path in the housing "gold rush". *MARPLE U.D.C.* were equally to blame for an about-turn in siding with the developers, Arthur Wardle Homes Ltd., after agreeing on a new path 5 years previously.

Footpath 64 runs between Marple Hall Drive and Flaggwood Avenue (2½in. sheet SJ98. 956.892) and in 1967 it was agreed that when the path came to be built over, a new path running through a "grass and trees" amenity area would replace it. This was advertised and confirmed in the normal manner and we waited for the diversion to be implemented. However, Wardles, on developing the land in 1971, found themselves either unable or unwilling to construct the new path and therefore went for a new Order that would close the original path completely and force walkers to use estate roads. The Council—the same Council that had a few years previously decided a new path was necessary—gave their full support to the builders and still stone walled, even after realising the extent of opposition from their own ratepayers. Strong opposition came from some locals whose property backs onto the path—a welcome reversal of the usual situation—for they preferred to gaze onto a semi-rural path rather than a rash of closely packed houses.

We held our, by now almost obligatory, pre-Inquiry walk to ensure maximum local interest and to brief objectors for the Inquiry, in April. The packed Inquiry, held in Marple Council Offices, listened to the Council's and developers' excuses and reasons, as well as to our member, Dr. Frank Beech, who eloquently put forward the objectors' case. In July, the Department of the Environment announced their decision and it was that the path must stay, being a valuable respite from spreading urbanisation.

Too often, builders think that they have some divine right to throw their weight around over footpaths in their profit-search disguised as "house-building for the people" image, but this case shows that with proper organisation their overtures will not be recognised at the expense of valuable footpaths.

The Society suffered a lawyers' picnic in 1972 at the hands of *WORSLEY U.D.C.* and *FAILSWORTH U.D.C.*, but the resultant confusing web of legality should ensure that future repeats are unlikely. A handful of councils, perhaps alive to the fact that at Public Inquiries we ask too many searching questions and have a habit of winning, seek to use Section 108 of the Highways Act, 1959, which allows them to apply to local Magistrates very quickly in order to close footpaths. Of course, they don't realise that our methods and systems are geared to spotting these little quirks and we can more than match their speed and determination.

In November, 1971, *WORSLEY U.D.C.* advertised their intention of getting rid of two small paths as "unnecessary". One path (Footpath 59. 2½in. O.S. sheet SD70. 746.008) was a pleasant woodland short-cut adjacent to Rycroft Children's Home and the real bid for closure was because a new warden of the Home was complaining of lack of privacy and also that the gardens wanted extending. These are both legally invalid reasons for closure, of course. The other case (Footpath 17. 2½in. O.S. sheet SD70. 754.035 to 755.037) concerned a path on Linnyshaw Moss near "Spaghetti Junction" where a farmer wanted to shut a path legally that had already been obstructed by barbed wire and grubbed out of existence.

The cases were heard jointly by Strangeways Magistrates in January, 1972. In the case of Footpath 17, even the Council's employee who had been instructed to post the statutory notices, had to admit that he could not carry out his duties properly because he was unable to surmount the obstructions! When will councils ever learn? The Magistrates decided to throw the application out on the ground that Section 108 was inappropriate in the circumstances and that the Council, if they still wished to close the paths, should use Section 110 of the Highways Act 1959 where objectors can, if necessary, have the benefit of a full Public Inquiry. The Council obviously did not want this and they appealed to the Crown Court in Manchester. Here the Society was allowed to appear unrepresented against the Council's

barrister and we explained the difficulties of Section 108. Judge Sir William Morris refused to hear the Council's case for closure but agreed, whilst not expressing any opinions as to its merits, that Section 108 was not legally inappropriate and so referred the case back to the Magistrates for re-hearing. This was done in June when the Magistrates decided to grant the closure application for the Rycroft path, but to refuse permission for the Moss path to be closed. No reasons—which is very regrettable—were given for these decisions.

Perhaps elated at their half success, the Council announced their intention of going through the same procedure for two more paths, but such was the public outcry that the Council, realising at last what a hornets' nest they were stirring up, quickly capitulated.

Perhaps the most discreditable performance of the year was made by *FAILSWORTH U.D.C.* Someone there had perhaps been watching Worsley's progress and decided to use Section 108 to close Footpath 36 between Shropshire Road and Nottingham Drive (2½in. O.S. sheet SD90. 901.006). This was a 60 yds. long passage between houses, laid in 1966 as a replacement of a country path diverted for housing development. It provided a quick way through the estate for walkers wanting to get to the countryside around Woodhouses and Daisy Nook. After a clash between users and residents a closure petition was organised by those people in the vicinity of the path because they said it was a nuisance. The Council decided to apply to Strangeways Magistrates on the ground that the path was unnecessary. We opposed it and argued that the path was certainly necessary as the Council had agreed to lay it in 1966 and the long walk round estate roads was an imposition and an unnecessary inconvenience to walkers, especially when the only benefit to be gained by closure would be that some free land would be tacked on to house gardens for the benefit of private individuals, hardly a democratic solution. The Magistrates agreed with us and rejected the application.

Looked at in isolation, some people might say that a 60 yd. length of passage is not important enough to fight about. However, it is a principle of our Society that when we fight hard or negotiate to get a substitute path (in this case in 1966) we do not surrender lightly when an attempt is made to take the new path away from us. Furthermore, this particular passage, small though it is, proved to be a vital connection in avoiding estate roads when I wrote and planned the "Manchester Footpath Circle" (*Walking Around Manchester—Dalesman* 1973).

The last case I want to discuss also concerned *FAILSWORTH U.D.C.* (as local authority) with *OLDHAM CORPORATION* (as landowners). Both of them combined to attempt to close Footpath 21 in Failsworth which is part of the canal towpath of the Hollinwood Arm of the Ashton Canal between "The Roxy" and Street Bridge (2½in. O.S. sheet SD90. 906.025 to 907.020). This case is of general

environmental importance in demonstrating the need to preserve the line of old canals for future leisure purposes no matter how decrepit or how run down the surroundings may be. Therefore, I propose to go into some detail.

The Hollinwood Arm of the Ashton Canal was closed to navigation in 1932 but the towpath continued to be used by people, particularly for access to Crime Lake and Daisy Nook. In the 50's Failsworth Council claimed the towpath as public and it duly appeared on the Definitive Map, being designated Footpath 21. Despite 30 years of neglect and non-maintenance, people walked it until, in 1968, Oldham Corporation, as landowners, filled in the disused canal. This left both canal and towpath a muddy rubbish-strewn morass that five years later is still a public disgrace. Certain adjoining landowners with premises on to the canal, were not slow to see that at last the public were being effectively prevented from using the towpath and before long barbed wire fences began to appear across the line of Footpath 21. These obstructions were duly reported by the Society to Failsworth Council in March 1969. They replied that enquiries were being made and as soon as they had any fresh information they would pass it on. They didn't, of course, and 2½ years went by until in November, 1971, I spotted a notice in the *London Gazette* that Failsworth U.D.C., without any prior consultation or warning, were applying to Strangeways Magistrates to close Footpath 21 under Section 108 of the Highways Act 1959. The Council said they were doing it for Oldham Corporation as landowners who wanted to sell the land for development. The Society argued that they should use the provisions of the Planning Act which allowed for Public Inquiries, but they would not listen to us. Failsworth Council did not even have the decency to clear the obstructions so that people could inspect the path before the Court date.

I was unable to attend at Court, but wrote to the Magistrates' Clerk pointing out our feelings and that we thought a more positive way of dealing with the present linear rubbish-dump should be to subject it to green finger treatment under Operation Eyesore as it could then provide a pleasant walk for Hollinwood people to the proposed new Medlock Valley Country Park centred on Daisy Nook. At that hearing the Magistrates refused to grant the application and suggested, so I understand, that further discussions with the objectors should take place. Oldham Corporation called a site meeting but the dice was loaded 12 to 1 against us and it was clear that the local authorities had no time for our suggestions. The fresh hearing was fixed for January 1972 and at that hearing I did make an appearance. I explained to the Magistrates that the authorities had not given the 28 days' notice required by the Act. They had only advertised their intentions in the *London Gazette* of the 5th November, 1971, and the original hearing was on the 23rd November, 1971. This contravened Section 72 of the Highways Act 1971. Furthermore, Failsworth Council had not removed the obstructions on the path, so no-one

could inspect it. Accordingly, the Magistrates refused to grant the closure. Some people will argue that this is legal trickery and taking advantage of fine points of law. Maybe so, but they are important and Councils should not ignore their statutory duties.

One might reasonably assume that the two Councils, after two attempts, would now gracefully retire and let the path remain, particularly as, after pressure from the Society, the obstructions had at last been cleared. Not so, however. Oldham Corporation wrote a letter to me and said they intended to re-apply to the Magistrates again. I suggested that a Public Inquiry was still needed in view of the planning implications, but, of course, the Corporation, as landowner, was the tail that was wagging the dog (Failsworth U.D.C.) and didn't want an Inquiry. In an important letter dated the 30th May written to me, Oldham Corporation said: "I feel sure that the Secretary of State would not make a Closure Order". Naturally, I produced this to the Magistrates when they heard the case again in September, 1972. I also pointed out that the obstructions had re-appeared, thus indicating someone's contempt for authority. After a long sitting, during which time we listened to some excellent local objectors who spoke of the need for the towpath, the Magistrates, after a lengthy adjournment, decided that the path must stay open.

Perhaps now the authorities will realise that the more they fight us, the more experienced we become and therefore they stand less chance of success. The vicious circle which they initiated of ignoring complaints, neglecting to clear obstructions and requesting closure, is at last recoiling upon them with a vengeance.

© DWL 1973.

THE MANCHESTER ASSOCIATION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT FOOTPATHS

HAROLD E. WILD

The Manchester Association for the Preservation of Ancient Footpaths was formed in 1826—thirty-nine years before the inauguration in 1865 of the Commons Preservation Society. It functioned actively for seventy years, until soon after the birth of the Peak District and Northern Counties Footpaths Preservation Society in 1894. When the latter society opened a “Kinder Scout Special Fund” to establish the right of way from Hayfield via Mill Hill to the Snake Inn, the Acting Treasurer of the 1826 Manchester Association sought the approval of the handful of his surviving fellow members and the old Association was wound up in 1896 by the transfer of its funds (£184 2s. 10d.) to the Peak District Footpaths Society.

Early History

The formation of the Manchester Association in 1826 was a direct outcome of the selfish action of a Flixton landowner, Mr. Ralph Wright. Anxious to give his estate a more park-like appearance he began removing footpaths and fences. Later he shut in one footpath completely without applying for a Magistrate's Order and diverted another path further away from his house. His neighbours, not wishing to appear unfriendly towards him, refrained from intervening, but when he took his next step—attempting to divert paths beyond his property altogether, local feeling was aroused. Mr. Wright was a magistrate and had little difficulty in getting two brother-magistrates to sign his diversion orders. (Under an Act of 1815 any two magistrates could close a path subject to an appeal to Quarter Sessions.) But he acted too hastily and before the Orders were confirmed by Quarter Sessions, he stopped up the entrance to his property, ploughed up the old path and sowed the land with oats. Mr. Samuel Wood, a local farmer, and others broke down the obstructions and restored the original path by treading down the oats. The magistrate then hesitated, but in 1824 he got another Order. It was appealed against but then abandoned. After two more efforts the Closing Orders were confirmed at Quarter Sessions. The legal costs involved in continuing the struggle were too great to be borne by Mr. Wright's neighbours and a meeting was held in the old (King Street) Manchester Town Hall on 15th November 1826 at which it was resolved to form a Society for the Preservation of Ancient Public Footways. A strong and representative Committee of fourteen persons was appointed to draw up rules and initiate action. The Flixton people were greatly encouraged and a new attempt was made to assert their ancient rights. The Court of King's Bench quashed the Quarter Sessions Order and Flixton residents and members of the Manchester Association in an orderly procession cut down the offending fences and restored the ancient way.

The success of the Manchester Association soon became very widely known. A similar case of footpath stealing had occurred near Bromsgrove in Worcestershire. An appeal was received by the Manchester Association for advice and assistance. The Association's solicitor journeyed to Worcestershire and on appeal to the Court of King's Bench in 1828 secured the quashing of the Quarter Sessions Closing Order.

But in the main, active participation in footpath struggles was confined to Manchester and its immediate neighbourhood. The extensive Parish of Manchester in 1826 included much of rural attractiveness. Indeed, one contemporary writer in referring to the formation of the Ancient Footpaths Association declared:—

“There are so many pleasant footpaths, that a pedestrian might walk completely round the town in a circle which would seldom exceed a radius of two miles from the Exchange, and in which he would scarcely ever have occasion to encounter the noise, bustle and dust of a public cart road or paved street. The beautifully undulating country between the valley of the Irk and Cheetham Hill; the fine valley of the Irwell, with its verdant meadows; the slope from Pendleton to the plain . . . All this delightful scenery lies open to the pedestrian.”

An outstanding case in which the Association took direct action to open an unlawfully closed footpath occurred in 1830. Mr. G. Jones, a lessee of Duchy lands in Pendleton, in planning the development of his estate, had closed an ancient footpath leading from Tanner's Lane to the village of Eccles. Friendly approaches by the Association had proved fruitless and a warning letter from their solicitor provoked a defiant reply. The Association then notified Mr. Jones that as he had failed to re-open the obstructed footpath the Association had resolved to re-open it themselves, and on a given date five members of the Committee together with a workman carrying suitable tools reached the obstructed footpath. Mr. Jones and his surveyor were there to meet them and protest. The labourer soon wrenched the barrier down and levelled the banking. The party then traversed the path making a way through the laid-out shrubberies and reached the further obstruction which was similarly dealt with.

Samuel Cottam, Honorary Secretary

Samuel Cottam, son of S. E. Cottam, the founder, was Secretary or Treasurer of a number of local societies including the Association for the Preservation of Ancient Public Footpaths. The period covered by his records is mainly the fourteen years from 1858 to 1872, though the Cottam Estate Ledgers contain entries from 1852 to 1876. Footpath preservation societies have always been vigilant in regard to the provision and maintenance of footbridges and it is of interest that the first and last letters of Samuel Cottam in these records concerned footbridges which had disappeared.

During his secretaryship, the Footpath Association meetings were held at monthly intervals in the old Manchester Town Hall. Space will only permit a brief listing of a few of the issues revealed in letters written by Cottam:—

A letter to Guardians of the Poor re destruction of Jack Clough Bridge, at Moston.

To William Brickell, wheelwright, a complaint of his having stopped up a path from Northenden Churchyard to Northenden Village.

To Surveyor of Highways, Flixton, re legal liability to repair Carrington Bridge.

To Stockport Solicitors—a complaint re closing of paths in Hough End Clough. 1859.

To John Walker, farmer, Blackley—a request for removal of obstructions on path from top of Boggart Hole Clough. 1859.

To the Surveyors of Highways, Lymm—an objection to the proposed closing of footpath in Lymm Churchyard. 1861.

To the farmer of Piperhill Farm and to a farmer at Crossacres—letters objecting to interferences with public paths. 1861.

From time to time Cottam received requests from many parts of the country, seeking advice on the preservation of threatened paths.

The following letter, dated 16th January 1860 was sent to Mr. John Cheal, Mead Vale, Red Hill, Surrey. It is typical of others.

“Dear Sir,

My advice is to stir up your neighbours to a full sense of the injustice they suffer in being deprived of the rights of the public walks in your neighbourhood.

Then call a meeting and organise a Society for carrying out the powers and provisions of the Highways Act. Get for that purpose *Foote on Highways*, published by Crockford, London.

The moral force of such a Society is very great and will probably effect more than the strong arm of the law; nevertheless it is essential to take up a strong position, which the law if desirable can defend.

Avoid all hostile and seek all conciliatory means of effecting the end in view and doubtless there will soon be fewer causes of complaint.

Yours truly,

Samuel Cottam.”

The letters received by Cottam during the fourteen years covered by these records ranged over a wide area. Two letters complained of attempts to stop the riverside footpath from Jackson's Boat to Northenden. From Withington came two complaints, one concerning the attempt to close a footpath from Heaton Road to Alan Road, and the other relating to a diversion at Yew Tree Cottage near the Egerton lands. During 1860 the Association took an active interest in a Quarter Sessions application concerning footpaths at Bower House Fold, Heaton Norris. An inquirer from Hull sought advice on how to contest a proposed railway diversion of a footpath. A clergyman at Huddersfield complained of being turned back on a Greenfield footpath. A letter from West Riding Prison, Wakefield, and signed John Farrer declared "We have had an old footpath stopped up . . . Will you give a little information how to proceed to put it right?" A long and interesting letter dated 20th September 1871, was received by the Association from Over Peover, Knutsford:—

"I have to complain of the old road to my Church having been shut up in the late and present Sir H. Mainwaring's times, so that I, the vicar, have no other carriage road to my Church than through a farm yard at the back of the Baronet's stables . . ."

A gate had been padlocked and he could not reach the church with his pony and carriage. He lifted the gate off its hinges. After divine service he found the gate again hung and fixed so firmly that he could not drive out—until he had smashed the gate with a crow bar which happened to be near at hand. "Is this a case", the Vicar inquired, "in which I can have help from your Society?"

Another interesting letter received by Cottam came from T. Ratcliffe, Beerhousekeeper, West Leigh, Lancashire. His letter begins in the following terms:—

"Sir,

About a fortnight since, I was walking home from Tyldesley to West Leigh through a field which has had a footpath through it for upwards of 40 or 50 years and which can be proved. He threatened me if I did not turn back. I told him I should keep going on and he said he would fetch his gun and make me. I remained until he returned with his gun and a dog, (of) neither of which I was afraid. He has sown the field with oats, removed the footpath, removed the approaches at either end by erecting a permanent barrier . . . T. Ratcliffe."

Another Lancashire case of the same year (1865) concerned a disputed right of way from Wesham to Treales, near Kirkham. The landowner was Captain Fazackerly-Westby of Mowbreck Hall who continued to contest the way by padlocking gates. A Kirkham foot-

path enthusiast named Robert Catterall was reported to have broken no less than nineteen padlocks. The landowner caused an iron gate to be fixed. Catterall had occasion to send his man along the road soon afterwards and finding the obstructing gate, he simply backed his cart into it, breaking the gate in pieces!

The knowledge that the Manchester Association had successfully contested encroachments on public footpaths stimulated the formation of similar societies in other parts of the country and within the short period detailed in the Cottam records several new societies benefited by the advice which Manchester's experience could offer.

In 1863 a deputation from a newly formed Association came to Manchester for moral support in proceedings they were taking concerning threatened paths on the Castle Carr Estate near Halifax. About the same time Mr. Adam Fox, solicitor to the Manchester Association, reported that he had had an interview with a deputation from Liverpool who intended forming a local Footpath Association. In the same year Mr. Cottam received a request from a doctor at Northallerton on behalf of a group wishing to form a local Footpath Association. A resident of Chislehurst in Kent wrote in July 1864 for information with a view to establishing a Footpath Association in Kent. He was concerned in encroachments on a footpath in the village where he was born. In October 1864 Mr. Cottam was asked for information and advice from a group who wished to form a Footpath Association in Blackburn. An appeal for guidance was received in 1865 from Nottingham, where in the face of a local footpath dispute the decision had been taken to form a local Association. In 1866 a deputation from a newly formed "Preston Association for the Protection of the Right of Ancient Footpaths" sought information.

One brief reference may be quoted from an outside source. On 5th September 1876 at a public meeting held in Hayfield the decision was made to form the Hayfield and Kinder Scout Ancient Footpaths Association and a Committee was elected. At the Committee's first meeting, held one week later, it was resolved:—

"That with a view to the formation of rules for the Society the Secretary write to Mr. Cottam, Secretary to the Manchester Society, asking for a copy of its rules."

During the Hayfield Association's brief life it had three distinctions to its credit. It saved for public use the Carr Meadow—Kinder—Stonyford bridle road, it produced a splendid little guide book with map and illustrations describing the public paths in the Hayfield area and it made the first move in the struggle for the Hayfield—Mill Hill—Snake Inn right of way.

The letter and cheque which marked the winding up of the old Manchester Association were forwarded to the Chairman of the Peak District Footpaths Society, Mr. Abel Heywood, on 15th September

1896. Samuel Cottam's death had been announced but four days earlier. His span of life was some two years less than the full seventy years of the Manchester Association's existence, and these records of fourteen years of that period reveal him as a dedicated enthusiast for public rights.

This is an abridged version of an article which appeared in the "Manchester Review", 1965-66' page 242.

GENERAL

The Society was represented by the General Secretary at meetings in Buxton, of the Voluntary Joint Committee for the Peak District National Park, in Chester of the Rural Committee of the Cheshire Community Council, in Matlock of the Countryside Standing Conference Conservation Advisory Group of the Derbyshire C.C. in London of the Commons, Open Spaces and Footpaths Preservation Society, in Oldham of The Medlock and Tame Valley Conservation Committee and of the Conservation Societies in the Manchester area.

We are also represented by Mr. J. Needham at meetings in Leeds, of the Pennine Way Council.

With the exception of the County Groups we are also affiliated to the C.P.R.E. Branches of the Lancashire and Peak District. Illustrated Talks were given by the General Secretary to: Blackbrook Conservation Society; Heywood Senior High School.

FOOTPATH INSPECTORS

We are grateful to those who have responded to our appeals for additional Inspectors in recent years. Thanks to them our position is much better than it was, but there are still gaps we should like to fill. If you are willing to help, please choose from any of the areas A to AF shown as vacant. Offers to deal with part of an area are acceptable. An outline of the duties is given below, and the Society will reimburse Inspectors for all reasonable travelling expenses incurred in the work.

Duties of Inspectors

The primary duty of an Inspector is to investigate footpath complaints made to the secretary and to take appropriate action. Time permitting, he should also inspect the paths in his area.

Complaints may arise from misleading notices, deliberate obstruction or removal of stiles, disappearance of footbridges, locking of gates, blocking of paths by undergrowth or overgrowth, ploughing without reinstatement, or personal intimidation by landowners, tenants, uncontrolled dogs, bulls, etc. All of these call for positive action on our part.

On receipt of a complaint the Inspector should first visit the path in question and establish the facts. Complainants sometimes encounter obstructions because they are not on the path. For this purpose, $2\frac{1}{2}$ -inch maps are essential and the Society will provide them. It is also desirable, but by no means essential, to consult the official "definitive map" of footpaths (if there is one) at the Local Council Office. Inclusion of a footpath in such a map is conclusive evidence that it is a right of way, *but the opposite is not true*. An omitted path may still be public, though it will be much harder to prove that it is. It is useful to be able to refer to a definitive map and quote the official F.P. Number, but inability to do so need not deter an Inspector from following up a complaint.

If the complaint is confirmed, a tactful approach to the owner may help in some cases, but it is best to avoid involvement in disputes. It is unwise to remove an obstruction unless you are quite sure the path is public, and that you are on the correct line. You should remove only so much of the obstruction as is necessary for *you* to get through.

Having fully ascertained the facts, Inspectors should report to the Secretary (quoting map, grid reference and official path number, if available), who will then write to the appropriate local authority. Inspectors should also attend the Society's Council Meetings and submit *brief factual reports on their work*. They will be lent a copy of a recently issued booklet on the "Law of Footpaths", and an Inspector's card of authority.

Offers of help should be addressed to the Society's Secretary.

SIGNPOSTS

Signposting for the year 1972, was most satisfactory. Some twelve new ones were put up, three of which were replacements in the Slippery Stones and Cranberry Clough area, Derwent.

Manchester Fellowship kindly provided two signposts. No. 159 is at Rowarth (grid ref. 893 913), but the sign was missing some three weeks after the dedication. New Mills U.D.C. came to the rescue and provided a county sign for us, and we are most grateful to them for this prompt action. No. 164 was erected near to Otterspool Bridge (grid ref. 936 895) and we are indebted to the Bredbury and Romiley U.D.C. for their co-operation. Both these signposts were dedicated to the late Jack Pye, who was a long standing member of the Manchester Fellowship, and the ceremony took place on June 18th.

On March 12th the ceremony of the signpost dedication to the memory of the late H. J. (Jimmy) Widdicombe took place at Reed's Bridge (Kettleshulme). No. 157 is at the lower end of the well known Charles Head footpath.

The Stockport CHA Rambling Club dedicated No. 158 signpost at Charles Head on July 1st with some 80 persons being present. The signpost was to the memory of the late Bill Clayton, a well known personality in this club.

The Ramblers' Association (Sheffield Area) kindly donated our No. 170 signpost to the memory of the late Victor Reed. The position is at Lidgate, Holmsfield (grid ref. 307 778), signposted "Public Footpath to Horsleygate Hall". Despite wintry conditions the dedication ceremony took place on Saturday April 8th, and it was well attended. Thanks are due to Len Stubbs, who took the sign, post, cement, etc. to the position, where it was duly erected with the assistance of our Sheffield friends.

May 7th was Signposting Day again through the generosity of the Warden Guides and Adventure Group of the Ramblers' Association (Manchester Area). Arrangements were made through the Secretary, Mr. Ken Lawson, and the committee. The day was most successful, with some seven small parties and a larger one. Everybody was soon busy with paint, brush, etc. from the Flouch Inn, Cut Gate, Foulstone Delf, Abbey Brook, over the lower footpath from the reservoir, Derwent Edge to Mascar Cottage, Snake Road around Hayridge Farm, and footpath from Westend to the Alport. The main party took on the big job of painting the footbridge over the River Alport. Some 36 signposts were painted and many thanks are due to the members of these two groups for a grand job done.

Three replacements of signposts were also put up on this day at Slippery Stones (grid ref. 171 953), No. 31 Cranberry Clough (originally presented by Mr. Fred Heardman, B.E.M.) and No. 16 further up the clough. The erection of this latter one was finished some three weeks later, with assistance from Mr. Jack Ogden and a Peak Park Warden. Many thanks to Mr. Len Stubbs for once again providing transport to take the signs, posts, cement, sand, etc. from Manchester to the Derwent.

No. 176 was donated by the Altrincham CHA in memory to George Rochford. The dedication took place on November 5th, with some 80 persons present.

No. 169 signpost (grid ref. 972 807) at the junction of footpaths for Rainow and Lyme Handley just south of Bowstonegate Farm, was kindly presented by Mrs. Lomas of Stockport. The signpost was to the memory of her late husband; no ceremony took place, according to Mrs. Lomas's wish.

No. 166 signpost was erected at Shaw's Farm (grid ref. 991 865) with the kind permission of Mr. Burgess the landowner. The signpost is in memory of the late Bill Clarke of Reddish, and is the gift of a few friends of his. The ceremony took place on August 27th, some 20 persons being present. Once again thanks are due to Len Stubbs for giving transport and also assisting me to erect this signpost.

Signposts Number 161, 162 and 163 are the gift of Mr. Sol. Almond of Buxton, who kindly presented them in memory of his late wife Mrs. Lil Almond. The positions are Jenkins Chapel (grid ref. 984 766); north of Buxterstoop's Farm on the highway (grid ref. 976 763) footpath Rainow 77; and at the other end of this footpath, again on the highway at grid ref. 957 763. This ceremony took place on December 10th with a few close friends of Mr. Almond present.

The Society is most grateful to the Cheshire County Council (Roads, District No. 7, Lyme Green) for providing posts and erecting signposts 161, 162, 163, 169 and 176.

Our Vice-President, Harold Wild, and Mr. Donald Berwick attended all seven dedications, and accepted the signposts on behalf of the Society. I am most grateful to both for carrying out these duties.

The following have kindly offered to provide signposts, which will be erected during 1973:—

Davenport (A) Townswomen's Guild (Stockport District), Stockport CHA, Stockport Field Club, Mr. Frank Turton of Sheffield, and Mrs Bellhouse of Combs (Chapel-en-le-Frith).

The Society is indebted to Mr. Jack Ogden for painting the six-fingered signpost near to Blackshaw Farm. It is some nine years ago since it was last painted by Mr. John Harvey of Bulshaw Farm, now a retired farmer. We wish him well.

Working Party. Signposting Day is on May 6th, 1973, for the Ramblers' Association (Manchester Area) Warden Guides and Adventure Group. This time it will be centred on the Wildboarclough area, to include Shutlingsloe footpath, Cat & Fiddle, Crag footpaths, etc. Arrangements will be made with the Warden Guide Secretary, Ken Lawson, and full particulars will be in the Ramblers' Magazine, May issue. It is hoped that we shall have another record turnout.

The following signposts are additional to the list given in the Annual Report for 1971/2:

| <i>Post No.</i> | <i>Grid Reference</i> | <i>Position</i> |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 156 | 987 698 | Wildboarclough, roadside footpath via Banks Top connects to Shutlingsloe Farm. |
| 157 | 983 794 | At Reed's Bridge, footpath to Charles Head and B5089 road. |
| 158 | 975 790 | Position at Charles Head and B5089 road, footpath to Kettleshulme. |
| 159 | 893 913 | At Rowarth (Goddard Lane near Poplar Farm). Footpath to Cown Edge. |
| 160 | 974 765 | Near to Cranberry Clough footbridge. Slippery Stones. |
| 161 | 984 766 | Jenkin's Chapel (Rainow 6). |
| 162 | 976 763 | At roadside North of Buxterstoop's Farm (Rainow 77 footpath to Rainow). |
| 163 | 957 763 | On roadside Rainow 77 footpath for Jenkin's Chapel and Kettleshulme. |
| 164 | 936 895 | At Otterspool Bridge on the highway B6103. |
| 166 | 991 865 | Shaw's Farm junction of footpaths, Cobden Edge. |
| 169 | 972 807 | Junction of footpaths Lyme Handley and Rainow (south of Bowstonegates Farm). |
| 170 | 307 778 | Lidgate (Holmesfield) on highway B6054. |
| 176 | 980 768 | Between Jenkin's Chapel and Burton's Farm on rough lane. Footpath for Kettleshulme. |

T. EWART, *Signpost Supervisor.*

MEMBERSHIP

We need more Members. I have written this lament each year with, I must admit, little effect. We need in particular regular members who actually pay their subscriptions each year, preferably before the A.G.M., and don't as so many do, think a payment every other year is just as good.

Let's not beat about the bush, if half a dozen people in this Society suddenly decided to throw in the sponge the Peak & Northern would be moribund. This situation is not very healthy; in fact it is downright dangerous.

I suggest the only way to save a situation of this nature arising, is new members, preferably active new members.

So what I want from the existing membership is a conscious effort to find new members. Why not always have a Membership Form in your pocket—if you get fed up with it being there, you can always give it to someone!

JOHN NEEDHAM.

ANNUAL DINNER 1972

For the first time since the inception of our one and only social occasion of the year we met in a new venue—the Merchants Hotel—as our previous rendezvous, The Albion, was under the hammer of the demolishers. However, it was not entirely strange to us as the familiar faces of the Albion staff were in attendance and we were treated to the usual high standard of cuisine and service that we had known in the past.

We were honoured to have as our principal guest speaker that stalwart walker and defender of amenity rights, Tom Stephenson, whom some of us regard as an old friend, whilst others became acquainted for the first time. Needless to say, his interesting and illuminating address received the acclamation of all present.

Mike Smith of Radio Manchester's Outsiders programme provided our second interesting speaker and we were all sorry when the evening came to an end.

As usual, quite a number of members extended their evening by social communion in the hotel lounge long after everyone else had departed, but then our Annual Dinner is always an event to be remembered.

L.G.M.

ANNUAL DINNER 1973

This year we have as our guest Chris Hall, General Secretary of the Ramblers' Association. We shall be meeting in the New Albion Restaurant, 32 High Street, Manchester 4. on Friday, 11th May.

Reception 18.45 hrs., the Smoke Room. Dinner 19.15.

Tickets from Mr. G. S. Cooper, 13 Duffield Road, Salford 6. Price £1.55, Please enclose S.A.E. with application.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1972

Although we have a surplus once again for 1972 this has dropped from £615 for 1971 to £283 for the year under review, partly on account of the fact that a legacy of £228 was received during the previous year as against none this year and partly because of increases in certain items of expenditure namely, the cost of producing the annual report, printing and stationery, travelling expenses and postages and telephones.

These increases were not entirely unexpected as the work of the Society grows and the inspectorate becomes larger and more active plus rising costs generally.

The membership still lags behind in producing sufficient income to cover the cost of the work of the Society and we are dependent on grants from local authorities (£66), interest on our investments (£492) and the fortuitous receipt of legacies and such gifts as may be made (£50).

The total receipts from all these sources amount to £1,042 against a total expenditure of £759, but the proceeds of membership fees and donations totalled only £463. The Defence Fund was well supported and donations equalled expenditure as did the Survey Fund but the Signpost Account shows a deficit which will be reduced during 1973 when contributions come to hand towards the cost of posts erected by request of members and affiliated societies.

The total funds of the Society now stand at £10,209 against £9,820 for 1971, which is a consistant move in the right direction.

The Council is indebted to those members and affiliated societies who have contributed amounts over and above the minimum subscription rates which is reflected in the item of Donations appearing in the Income & Expenditure Account and to those local authorities who have continued their support.

PEAK AND NORTHERN FOOTPATHS SOCIETY
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st DECEMBER, 1972

| DR. | | | | CR. | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| 1971 | £ | To EXPENDITURE | £ | 1971 | £ | By INCOME | £ |
| 125.31 | Annual Report— | | | 9.25 | Subscriptions Paid in Advance | 3.05 | |
| 16.00 | Printing .. . | 154.13 | | 193.81 | Ordinary Members .. . | 174.67 | |
| | Distribution .. . | 26.50 | | 71.90 | Husband/Wife Members .. . | 74.00 | |
| 31.75 | Hire of Rooms .. . | 180.63 | | 1.75 | Junior Members .. . | 1.10 | |
| 139.89 | Printing, Stationery and Administration .. . | 39.72 | | 85.02 | Affiliated Societies .. . | 114.84 | 367.66 |
| 4.15 | Insurance Premiums .. . | 227.66 | | 40.84 | Donations .. . | 95.35 | |
| 8.80 | Subscriptions to Kindred Societies .. . | 1.78 | | 29.40 | Grants from Local Authorities .. . | 66.40 | |
| 9.83 | Advertising .. . | 6.61 | | 227.92 | Legacy H. Robinson .. . | — | 161.75 |
| 10.00 | Sundry Expenses .. . | 4.87 | | 0.90 | Sundries .. . | — | 8.77 |
| 5.52 | Cost of A.G.M. .. . | 15.90 | | 452.97 | Interest on Deposits & Investments .. . | 459.74 | |
| 30.00 | Honorarium to Secretary and other officials .. . | 14.75 | | 29.35 | Interest from P. M. Oliver Trust Fund .. . | 31.79 | |
| | Travelling Expenses— | 33.75 | | 3.05 | Subscriptions Paid in Advance .. . | 491.53 | |
| 19.69 | Secretary .. . | 21.95 | | | | 11.85 | |
| 50.27 | Footpaths Inspectors .. . | 72.54 | | | | | |
| 13.58 | Other Officials .. . | 10.51 | | | | | |
| | | 105.00 | | | | | |
| 56.10 | Postages and Telephones .. . | 108.16 | | | | | |
| 4.50 | Bank Charges .. . | — | | | | | |
| 2.20 | Maps and Plans .. . | 7.89 | | | | | |
| 3.05 | Subscriptions paid in Advance .. . | 11.85 | | | | | |
| 530.64 | Balance being Excess of Income over Expenditure carried forward to the General Expense Reserve Account .. . | 758.57 | | | | | |
| 615.52 | | 282.99 | | | | | |
| £1,146.16 | | | £1,041.56 | | £1,146.16 | | £1,041.56 |

GENERAL EXPENSE RESERVE ACCOUNT AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1972

| 1971 | £ | | 1971 | £ | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1,423.36 | | Balance brought forward from 1971 | 2,485.49 | | |
| 446.61 | | Matured Investments | 2,485.49 | | |
| 615.52 | | Surplus from Income and Expenditure Account | 282.99 | | |
| | | | £2,768.48 | | 2,768.48 |
| | | | £2,485.49 | | £2,485.49 |
| | | | | | £2,768.48 |

INVESTMENT RESERVE ACCOUNT AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1972

| 1971 | £ | | 1971 | £ | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------|
| 5,131.39 | | Balance brought forward from 1971 | 4,684.78 | | |
| | | Bonus Issues Received | 116.00 | | |
| | | | £4,800.78 | | 4,800.78 |
| | | | £5,131.39 | | £4,800.78 |

DEFENCE FUND AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1972

| 1971 | £ | | 1971 | £ | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1,994.41 | | Balance brought forward from 1971 | 1,995.59 | | |
| 16.18 | | Donations Received During Year | 31.50 | | |
| | | | £2,027.09 | | £2,027.09 |
| | | | £2,010.59 | | £2,027.09 |

SURVEY ACCOUNT AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1972

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------|
| 1971 | | 1971 | |
| £ | | £ | |
| 183.33 | Balance brought forward from 1971 | 193.43 | Expenditure during year |
| 10.10 | Donations received during year | 9.30 | Balance carried forward to 1973 |
| | | | 0.20 |
| | | | 202.53 |
| £193.43 | | £202.73 | |
| | | £193.43 | |
| | | | £202.73 |

SIGNPOST ACCOUNT AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1973

| | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------|
| 1971 | | 1971 | |
| £ | | £ | |
| 299.66 | Balance brought forward from 1971 | 335.85 | Signpost Maintenance and Erection |
| 46.51 | Donations received during year | 42.90 | Donations received in advance |
| — | Donations received in advance | 0.60 | Balance carried forward to 1973 |
| | | 335.85 | 138.61 |
| | | | 0.60 |
| £346.17 | | £379.35 | 240.14 |
| | | £346.17 | |
| | | | £379.35 |

EDWIN ROYCE MEMORIAL COMMITTEE GRANT FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES ACCOUNT

| | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------|
| 1971 | | 1971 | |
| £ | | £ | |
| 91.11 | Baance brought forward from 1971 | 91.11 | Balance carried forward to 1973 |
| | | | 91.11 |
| £91.11 | | £91.11 | |
| | | £91.11 | |
| | | | £91.11 |

BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1972

| 1971 | | 1971 | |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------|------------|
| £ | £ | £ | £ |
| 688.83 | Cash in Hand | 30.06 | 1,995.59 |
| | Cash at Bank | 500.84 | 335.85 |
| | Petty Cash | 20.00 | 193.43 |
| 8,964.60 | Deposits and Investments | 9,330.79 | 2,485.49 |
| 167.02 | Accrued | 328.11 | 4,684.78 |
| | | | 91.11 |
| | | | 3.05 |
| | | | 31.15 |
| | | | Accrued |
| <hr/> | | <hr/> | |
| £9,820.45 | | £10,209.80 | £9,820.45 |
| <hr/> | | <hr/> | |
| | | | £10,209.80 |