

**DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET MEETING**

**18 June 2013**

Report of the Acting Strategic Director – Environmental Services

**ADOPTION OF A NEW STATEMENT OF ACTION FOR  
DERBYSHIRE'S RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2013-  
2017 (JOBS, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT)**

(1) **Purpose of the Report** To present Cabinet with a new Statement of Action for Derbyshire's Rights of Way Improvement Plan for the period from 2013-2017 and to recommend it be approved by the Council.

(2) **Information and Analysis**

**Background**

Under Section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000), the County Council has a duty to produce a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) and to review the document every ten years. The RoWIP was approved in November 2007 and contained a five year Statement of Action which finished at the end of 2012.

Cabinet received a report at its meeting on 24 July 2012 which detailed the progress for delivering the first Statement of Action and approved a three month public consultation exercise for a new draft Statement of Action to take the document up to its formal ten year review in 2017.

**Consultation on the Draft Statement of Action**

The consultation on the new Statement of Action took the form of a questionnaire published on the County Council's website. This was promoted through a press release, posters displayed in libraries/countryside visitor centres and through letters sent to the main stakeholders and interest groups. A paper based version of the questionnaire was also provided for anyone who did not have on-line access. The two Local Access Forums within the County, which are statutory bodies set up to provide advice to local highway authorities on matters to do with countryside access, have been heavily involved in the process.

In parallel with this, an Equality Analysis was produced and distributed to target groups, and raised through relevant forums that the County Council is involved with, for example, the Youth and Over 50's Forum Groups and Local Access Groups around the County. The Equality Analysis considered the

proposed actions in the new Statement of Action and assessed the impact they could have on any of the protected characteristic groups.

The revised Statement of Action still forms part of the RoWIP and is based on the same underlying principles which remain valid. The consultation therefore did not set out to assess whether the original aims and identified needs were right, but rather whether consultees agreed with the way they had been prioritised or, if any proposed actions were missing. A copy of the final Statement of Action 2013 – 2017 is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

A total of 200 responses were received, mainly from individuals but 45 responses were on behalf of several organisations. Of the organisations who responded half were local authority/public bodies and the remainder were split between local community groups and user groups.

A detailed report on the responses to all the specific comments which were received during the consultation is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

The key points and subsequent comments and alterations can be summarised as follows:

#### **General Points:**

- Overwhelmingly, the vast majority of respondents, 94%, supported the RoWIP.
- From the questionnaire, respondents also supported keeping all of the Aims and Identified Needs in the order presented in the draft document so there are no proposals to make any changes to the order. There were, however, several representations against the principle of prioritising the aims and needs. Respondents also wanted reassurance that adequate resources would be made available to deliver the proposed actions. The identified needs set out under each aim have been prioritised in light of the current economic climate. However, those which have not been assigned a high priority will not be ignored and the Council will try to deliver them all.
- Several comments were made expressing concern that the delivery of the actions could increase the 'managed' feel of the network resulting in a reduction in the wilder countryside/natural experience. There are very clear statements within the document in relation to the underlying themes and the supporting Environmental Statement that should provide reassurance that this will not be the case.

#### **Aim 1: Existing Network**

- Several respondents thought that the annual percentage performance targets set for reporting the ease of use of the network were not ambitious enough, being a constant figure rather than seeking year on year improvements. The County Council has been reporting year on year improvements over the past 6-7 years and the current figure of

72.5% reflects this improved availability of the network. In light of the current climate, it is suggested that the target should be maintained as a constant figure but to undertake to review the results and target each year and strive for year on year improvements.

- Suggestions were made on actions relating to signposting, which have been taken on board, relating to the need to ensure that routes can be followed along their length, as well as being signposted at each end.
- Comments were made about suitable path surfacing to ensure that it is sympathetic to the environment and does not disadvantage different users. The Council has a good track record in delivering such surfacing and keeps up to date with any new techniques to ensure that the most suitable methods and materials are used.

## **Aim 2: Definitive Map and Statement**

- The majority of the comments in conjunction with this Aim related to the Definitive Map and the need to improve its promotion and availability.
- There were requests for more information to be provided about the processing of applications for legal orders and also general support for some form of prioritisation. More information will be provided about the processing of applications and there is already an action in the document about developing a priority framework.
- Chesterfield Borough Council responded with a request that the production of a Definitive Map for Chesterfield be given a higher priority. The centre of Chesterfield was officially excluded from the original Definitive Map produced in the 1950s as the area was already so built up and densely populated that a survey was considered to be inexpedient. There is now a requirement to produce a Definitive Map and Statement for these formerly excluded areas and, where there is sufficient evidence to suggest that routes within the centre of Chesterfield do carry public rights of access, they will be added to the Map and Statement by means of individual definitive map modification orders. It would therefore seem logical to move the action to develop a programme of work for recording paths in the central area of Chesterfield into the identified need which deals with clarifying the legal status of routes, thereby according it a higher priority.

## **Aim 3: An Improved Network**

- The most number of comments (61) received through the whole consultation were in connection with the issue of motorised vehicles in the countryside. The views were polarised for and against, but the issues raised are already well known to the Authority and are being addressed through the Management of Green Lanes Policy, approved by Cabinet in July 2012. The delivery of this Policy is an action in the RoWIP.
- The next highest number of comments related to safety issues caused by potentially vulnerable users (walkers, horse riders and cyclists) having to use the road network to access rights of way. These users

wanted improved links onto the Greenways and trails, and better connections generally between public rights of way to avoid the need to use roads. This is a much longer term goal which will require many more resources to deliver. It will be something that the Authority will aspire to address where it can and where resources for development and ongoing maintenance permit.

- There was support for improving and promoting the network to benefit everyday use, as well as recreational use, which is the reason that the RoWIP is aligned to the Local Transport Plan process.
- The suggested wording from Chesterfield Borough Council for an extra aim to be included in relation to developing much better connectivity in the network has been woven into one of the existing proposed actions under the identified need to improve the provision of circular or connected routes.

#### **Aim 4: Provision of Information**

- The majority of the comments stressed the need to improve information about access opportunities in a variety of formats and also the need to encourage responsible use. The comments received reinforced the importance of the actions identified in this section as being what the public and stakeholders want.

#### **Aim 5: Greater Community Involvement**

- The comments received in respect to this Aim reinforced the support for the actions to empower local community groups, user groups and local councils to encourage greater involvement in the management and promotion of the network.

#### **Equality Analysis**

Comments were received from members of the Equality Group within the Authority but none from any of the organisations which were notified about the consultation. Those who responded stated that the document provided a balanced and comprehensive view which should encourage and promote better utilisation by groups within the protected characteristics. No changes have therefore been made to the draft Equality document. The final document is attached as Appendix H to the Statement of Action.

#### **Alterations**

The main alterations that have been made between the Draft and Final Statement of Action include:

- The draft document referred to the period 2012 to 2017 as this is when the consultation was carried out. In the final document, the dates have been changed throughout to refer to 2013-2017.
- Several of the action points have been made clearer or the context explained more fully in the document.

- Some clarification of the situation with respect to the Non-Classified Highway network and the relationship with the public rights of way network has been included.
- An executive summary has been produced and a publicity document will be written in association with the Public Relations Department to highlight how the main actions will affect local people.
- The action to develop a programme of work for adding paths within the formerly excluded central area of Chesterfield to the definitive map and statement has been moved into the identified need which deals with the clarification of the legal status of routes as explained above.

The document has been produced in more challenging times than when the RoWIP was first published in 2007, in terms of the current economic climate and significantly reduced budgets over the next five years. The new Statement of Action is more streamlined, with 25 percent fewer actions, not only to reflect the fact that there is less money available for delivery, but also the success of the original Statement of Action. Many actions that were introduced for the first time in 2007 have been completed or absorbed into routine work.

As with the first Statement of Action, progress on delivery will be reported through a series of progress reports to promote the work.

**(3) Financial Considerations** The Statement of Action within the Plan identifies which actions are achievable within existing budgets and those which would require additional funding in order to avoid raising expectations. The actions have also been reviewed in the light of diminishing resources and the need to work in partnership with others.

A budget allocation has been awarded through the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to deliver some of the capital items identified in the RoWIP that share common themes with the LTP.

Officers will seek additional external funding and develop increased partnership working to deliver other aspects of the Plan as opportunities present themselves.

**(4) Legal Considerations** The County Council has a statutory duty to prepare and publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan under Section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and to assess and review the document every ten years.

As part of the Council's LTP, the Rights of Way Improvement Plan is included in the Council's Policy framework. The Council's Constitution provided that it must therefore be approved by the Council.

**(5) Equality and Diversity Considerations** The RoWIP gives particular attention to the needs of people of all abilities. Disabled people

were involved in the original consultation process. An Equality Analysis was carried out in parallel with the public and stakeholder consultation.

The findings have been incorporated into the final Statement of Action and will be reflected in the annual work programmes for delivery of the RoWIP.

Cabinet should have regard to the Equality Analysis in considering this report.

(6) **Environmental, Health and Transport Considerations** The RoWIP contributes to promoting healthier lifestyles through regular exercise and sustainable travel choices. Matters relating to conservation and biodiversity form one of the key themes within the RoWIP. The specific findings and actions from the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment carried out under LTP3 have also been incorporated into the new RoWIP Statement of Action.

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, human resources, and property considerations.

(7) **Key Decision** Yes.

(8) **Call-In** Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No.

(9) **Background Papers** Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Derbyshire 2007-2012, Draft Statement of Action 2012-2017, Minutes of Cabinet Meeting on 24 July 2012 and Chesterfield Borough Council report to the Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Planning on 22 October 2012. Officer contact details – Gill Millward, extension 39656 or Claire O'Reilly, extension 39652.

(10) **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATIONS** That Cabinet:

- 10.1 Recommends to the Council that the new Statement of Action 2013-2017 for delivering Derbyshire's Rights of Way Improvement Plan be approved.
- 10.2 Supports the implementation of action points within the Plan that can be delivered within existing budgets and efforts to seek additional funding streams to deliver other items.
- 10.4 Notes that achievements will be highlighted at every opportunity, for example, in progress reports given to both Local Access Forums and on the website.

**Mike Ashworth**  
**Acting Strategic Director – Environmental Services**

## **Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) for Derbyshire**

### **Statement of Action 2013-2017**

#### **Contents**

#### **Executive Summary**

#### **1 Introduction**

#### **2 Policy Context**

#### **3 Statement of Action 2013-2017**

Aim 1: Existing public rights of way network

Aim 2: Definitive Map and Statement

Aim 3: A more connected, safe and accessible network

Aim 4: Promotion, understanding and use of the network

Aim 5: Greater community involvement

Equality analysis

#### **4 Implementation and Monitoring**

#### **Appendices:**

Appendix A Glossary of Terms Used

Appendix B Summary of Relevant Plans and Strategies

Appendix C Environmental Statement for the RoWIP

Appendix D Extracts from LTP3 Investment Protocol (2011) relevant to the RoWIP

Appendix E Rights of Way Charter 2011

Appendix F Greenways Delivered and Proposed Schemes

Appendix G Management of Green Lanes 2012-2017

Appendix H Equality Analysis

## **Executive Summary**

### **Vision Statement**

The long term vision for improving access to the countryside and built environment in Derbyshire continues to be:

To have an integrated, well managed and inclusive rights of way and access network which:

- Encourages responsible enjoyment by residents and visitors alike.
- Is a sustainable and safe network in keeping with the County's heritage, landscape and wildlife interests.
- Promotes healthier lifestyles.
- Helps support tourism and the local economy.

### **Background**

We produced our first Rights of Way Improvement Plan in 2007, based on what people told us were the most important issues and what our priorities should be for looking after the network of paths and trails across Derbyshire, including the Peak District National Park. These were developed into a series of key themes and aims which underpin the Plan.

### **Content of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan**

The three key themes are:-

- **Theme A** - Seek to preserve Derbyshire's heritage, landscape and wildlife.
- **Theme B** - Promote the sustainable use of the present and future network, encouraging healthier and more sustainable travel choices.
- **Theme C** - Encourage and create routes that support the local economy and boost tourism.

The five aims are:-

- **Aim 1** - Ensure that the public rights of way network is open and available for use.
- **Aim 2** - Provide an up-to-date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement.
- **Aim 3** - Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users.
- **Aim 4** - Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network.
- **Aim 5** - Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way.



The main focus of the Plan is a statement of the action we proposed to take for managing local rights of way and securing an improved network of routes for the five year period through to 2012.

### **A new Statement of Action for 2013 to 2017**

Building on the successes of the last five years, we want to make sure our network of paths and trails remains fit for purpose and continue to deliver the improvements which people have asked for, while at the same time being mindful of the current economic climate and significantly reducing budgets.

This new statement of action has been produced following a three month public consultation which has helped to set the priorities for the next five years. We have updated the proposed actions to take us through to 2017, when we will be required to publish a new Rights of Way Improvement Plan for the county.

A summary of the aims and identified needs in Derbyshire County Council's Statement of Action for 2013 to 2017 can be found in Figure 1.

**Figure 1 Summary of Aims and Identified Needs in Derbyshire County Council's Statement of Action for 2013 to 2017**

**Aim 1: Ensure that the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network is open and available for use**

- 1a) The efficient management and maintenance of the existing network of PRoW
- 1b) Ensure that the PRoW network is well signposted
- 1c) Improve the quality and accessibility of path furniture on PRoW
- 1d) Improve the surface condition and drainage of routes

**Aim 2: Provide an up to date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement**

- 2a) Speed up the process for clarifying the legal status of routes
- 2b) Improve the availability of information relating to the Definitive Map and Statement
- 2c) Produce and maintain an up-to-date digital Definitive Map and Statement

**Aim 3: Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users**

- 3a) Improve the provision of routes for bridleway users
- 3b) Improve the provision of circular or connected routes
- 3c) Continue with the development of the Greenway programme for the county
- 3d) Provide more easy access routes
- 3e) Provide a safer network for all users
- 3f) Improve the management of recreational motorised vehicles in the countryside
- 3g) Improve the investment in the access network

**Aim 4: Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network**

- 4a) Ensure that path/route signage is as informative as possible
- 4b) Promote the benefits of the access network for healthy lifestyles, sustainable living, tourism and the local economy
- 4c) Improve the availability and quality of information about the access network for all users
- 4d) Encourage responsible use and develop people's confidence in the use of the access network

**Aim 5: Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way**

- 5a) Increase involvement of user groups and other volunteer groups/ individuals in managing and improving local rights of way
- 5b) Increase involvement of local councils in managing local rights of way
- 5c) Increase involvement of land managers in managing and improving local rights of way

# **Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) for Derbyshire**

## **Statement of Action 2013-2017**

### **Section 1 - Introduction**

#### **1.1 Background**

Derbyshire has a diverse network of footpaths, bridleways and byways which provide 5,155 kilometres (3,203 miles) of routes across the County, including the Peak District National Park. Combined with the many other paths, trails, Greenways and areas of open access land, this unique resource is the County's best tourism and recreation asset offering people the opportunity to explore their local area and enjoy the countryside. The network acts as a focus for day visitors and tourists alike, whilst also providing local paths that link communities and give access to schools, shops, work places and other facilities for many people. If you add to that the other benefits for healthy lifestyles, the local economy and sustainable travel, we truly have a resource to be proud of.

National and local research has underlined the importance of walking and cycling in peoples' everyday lives. Responses from the public consistently refer to the quality of life contribution that walking and riding offer, both within the local community and in accessing the environment around them. They are also sustainable in the short and long term, providing opportunities for people both now and in the future. The Chief Medical Officer has repeatedly reported on the link between physical activity and health, describing walking as probably the best way to increase physical activity levels and the health of the nation. It is also socially inclusive and supported by many voluntary groups as well as contributing to mental well-being.

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) has also published guidance on local measures to promote walking and cycling. It recommends that increasing walking and cycling rates should be part of all council activities such as developing and implementing local plans and joint health and wellbeing strategies. The RoWIP has an important role to play in providing the physical resources and messages to encourage active healthy lifestyles for all ages.

#### **1.2 Rights of Way Improvement Plan and Statements of Action**

We produced our first Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) for Derbyshire in 2007. The long term vision for improving access to the countryside and built environment in Derbyshire continues to be:

To have an integrated, well managed and inclusive rights of way and access network which:

- Encourages responsible enjoyment by residents and visitors alike.
- Is a sustainable and safe network in keeping with the County's heritage, landscape and wildlife interests.
- Promotes healthier lifestyles.
- Helps support tourism and the local economy.

The RoWIP builds on the day to day work in carrying out our statutory duties, as well as providing a unique opportunity for us to move forward and plan strategically for how we would improve the management, provision and promotion of a wider rights of way and access network based on what the public asked for.

The RoWIP refers to 'local rights of way' which include the following paths and access opportunities:

- Public Rights of Way - Footpaths, Bridleways, Restricted Byways and Byways Open to All Traffic
- Non Classified Highways (NCH) or Green Lanes
- Off-road Cycle Tracks
- Greenways - multi user routes catering for easy access, walkers, cyclists and horse riders
- Permissive/ concessionary paths, including those provided through woodlands, parks, estates or along canal towpaths
- Open Access Land.

### **Themes and Aims**

Our own research for the RoWIP resulted in the identification of a series of key themes and aims which form the main focus of the RoWIP and underpin the new Statement of Action.

The three key themes are:

#### **Theme A – Seek to preserve Derbyshire's heritage, landscape and wildlife:**

The principles relating to this theme illustrate the commitment that we have towards landscape issues and wider conservation matters including both heritage and biodiversity. In the RoWIP, we have made the following commitments:

- We will ensure that all maintenance methods and use of surfacing materials are in keeping with the surrounding landscape character and sympathetic to the ecology of the area.
- We will consider, from the outset, the visual, ecological and heritage impact of all access projects.
- We will adopt an integrated approach to the development of access projects, where possible, in order to investigate whether wider environmental projects can be delivered to benefit the landscape, wildlife and historic environments.

**Theme B – Promote the sustainable use of the present and future network, encouraging healthier and more sustainable travel choices:** The principles relating to this theme will seek to establish how rights of way can contribute towards a healthier environment for people, encouraging them to cut down on car use, increase opportunities to take part in physical activity and establish closer links between rights of way and public/community transport, all of which work towards improving peoples' quality of life. The health and wellbeing agenda has gained in importance over the past five years and will be a significant factor over the life of this document, so the RoWIP needs to continue to target actions that provide

health benefits. In the RoWIP, we have made the following commitments under this aim:

- We will carry out maintenance and surface improvements on the local rights of way network targeting paths in greatest need of repair or with the potential to benefit the greatest number of users.
- We will target rights of way improvements on those routes that best address accessibility requirements and/or benefit the greatest number of users, such as routes in and around urban areas, routes that provide direct access between settlements or routes from settlements out into the countryside.
- We will look for opportunities to promote the use of the local rights of way, both circular and linear routes in conjunction with public transport.

The Environmental Assessments undertaken to develop the third Local Transport Plan (LTP3), which includes the RoWIP as a supporting plan, also address the issues covered by Themes A and B and provide comprehensive details of the measures that we will adopt (see Appendix C).

**Theme C – Encourage and create routes that support the local economy and boost tourism:** The principles behind this theme emphasise how the access network can benefit the local economy, supporting local business, tourism and leisure outlets. In the RoWIP, we have made the following commitments:

- We will encourage the management of the network within the context of providing attractive routes that benefit the local economy and boost tourism.
- We will seek opportunities to raise the profile of Derbyshire as a walking, horse riding and cycling destination.
- We will continue to develop a multi-user Greenway network for everyday and recreational journeys which contributes to the development of the County's Strategic Cycle Network.

The Statement of Action is organised around the following five aims:

- **Aim 1** - Ensure that the public rights of way network is open and available for use.
- **Aim 2** - Provide an up-to-date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement.
- **Aim 3** - Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users.
- **Aim 4** - Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network.
- **Aim 5** - Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way.

The Aims are listed in the order of priority determined during the production of the first Statement of Action for the RoWIP in 2007-2012. Our statutory duties are covered in Aims 1 and 2 and the main actions that relate to the LTP and other strategies are covered in Aims 3 and 5. Aim 4 relates to the provision of

information which is vital if the benefits of the actions within the other aims are to be realised.

### **Statement of Action**

Before we produced the RoWIP, we carried out extensive consultations and, from that, developed our first Statement of Action for managing local rights of way and securing an improved network of routes to meet the current and likely future needs of the public. That Statement of Action covered the period from 2007 to 2012 and we now present a second Statement of Action to take us through to 2017. It still forms part of the RoWIP and is based on the same underlying principles which remain valid. This document therefore needs to be read in conjunction with the original RoWIP for Derbyshire 2007-12.

We have produced this new Statement of Action during what is a very challenging time for local authorities as we are faced with significantly reduced budgets over the next five years. Within this context, we need to be able to strike the right balance between being realistic about what can be achieved against the need to continue to be aspirational and respond to what the consultations have revealed about the wishes of both local residents and visitors to Derbyshire in terms of an improved network.

The proposals set out in the first Statement of Action were focused on improving what we provide in terms of infrastructure and how we provide it. The challenge is to build on this and encourage a wider section of society to make healthy exercise and sustainable travel choices part of their everyday lives. This Statement of Action includes proposals to maintain and develop the network, as well as maximising its use through more effective promotion and marketing. We cannot do this alone so we will also be working with partners to encourage more people to use the network on a regular basis.

We achieved a considerable amount during the first five years of the RoWIP and these achievements are described as we establish the context for the next actions moving forward. Within this document, the Statement of Action takes each of the aims in turn and provides:

- Background information to the issues behind each aim.
- Progress and developments since 2007.
- The main changes that have taken place between the two Statements of Action.
- A list of identified needs and actions required to deliver each of the aims and to secure improvements.
- An indication of the resources required.
- The level of partnership working involved in delivering the actions.
- Strategic links to the RoWIP themes, LTP and other relevant strategies.

The RoWIP and its associated Statements of Action are developed in consultation with the Peak District and Derby and Derbyshire Local Access Forums, each with a statutory role to advise their appointing authorities and other bodies, on the

improvement of public access for the purposes of open air recreation and enjoyment of the area.

The second Statement of Action has also been informed by the responses received during a 12 week public consultation which took place between 6 August and 29 October 2012. This included an Equality Analysis consultation targeted at forums and groups representing the protected characteristic groups as defined by the Equality Act 2010.

## **Section 2 - Policy Context**

### **2.1 Introduction**

The nature of the RoWIP means that it sits alongside and complements many other strategies, plans and documents. Since the RoWIP was produced in 2007, many of the relevant policy frameworks relating to transport, planning, climate change, local economic development, public health and the localism agenda have moved on, developed or been superseded. This section describes some of the key changes that have taken place over the past five years:

### **2.2 Countywide – Derbyshire Leading the Way**

The Sustainable Community Strategy for Derbyshire provides an overarching guiding framework for partnership working in the County which we contribute to alongside other key public, private and voluntary organisations. The data collected in the process of producing this strategy has informed the production of our Council Plan for 2010-2014 “Derbyshire - Leading the Way”. The RoWIP is set within the context of these countywide strategies and the five key priorities for:

- Leading the way.
- Making good use of public money.
- Raising aspirations.
- High quality personalised services that meet individual needs.
- Places where people want to be.

### **2.3 Transport Planning – Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) 2011-2026**

Our existing long-term transport strategy (2006-2021) has been rolled forward with the production of LTP3 covering the whole of Derbyshire, excluding Derby City. This Plan, which was subject to stakeholder and public consultation, sets out the priorities and details for a more specific programme of delivery for 2011-2016, including the maintenance and improvement of the network of public rights of ways and Greenways.

The five main Transport Goals within the Transport Strategy are:

- Supporting a resilient local economy.
- Tackling climate change.

- Contributing to better safety, security and health.
- Promoting equality of opportunity.
- Improving quality of life and promoting a healthy natural environment.

In order to address the challenges of delivering these transport goals, the LTP has identified five key transport priorities:

- Well maintained roads and rights of way.
- Efficient transport network management.
- Improving local accessibility and achieving healthier travel habits.
- Better safety and security.
- A considered approach to new infrastructure.

The RoWIP is identified as a distinctive strand within the LTP programme and delivers solutions to many of the challenges identified. There is considerable integration between the two documents and internal management procedures ensure continued effective co-ordination.

### **Investment Protocol**

A new development within the LTP has been the adoption of an Investment Protocol, a supplementary document to the LTP3 to help prioritise and guide the delivery of the current funding for the LTP programme 2011-2016. This protocol takes the five key transport priorities, together with one covering environmental mitigation and enhancement, and provides guidance for decision making about transport investment. It indicates which areas of investment will be supported, which measures will only be used sparingly and which measures will not be supported, unless in exceptional circumstances. The Investment Protocol will be reviewed regularly to be more specific about when certain actions might be undertaken and to provide detailed guidance on the selection of particular schemes and projects to give best value for money. Appendix D provides an extract from the LTP3 Investment Protocol with a list of the items relevant to the RoWIP.

### **Environmental Assessments**

Integral to the production of LTP3 was the completion of a 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' (SEA) and a 'Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). These assessments incorporated rights of way and access issues and the SEA objectives, specific findings and actions from the procedure have been incorporated into the new RoWIP Statement of Action. The SEA also incorporated human health as a topic, ensuring that all environmental and health issues were taken into account. Of particular note was the need to consider the protection and restoration of habitats and species alongside public rights of way, in accordance with the findings of statutory Environmental Assessments. This is described within the Investment Protocol as IP7c. The relevant extracts from these assessments are summarised into an Environmental Statement for the RoWIP in Appendix C.

Most of the capital funding stream for RoWIP delivery, up to 2016, will come from the LTP and schemes will be assessed against this Investment Protocol and also considered in light of the Environmental Assessment objectives and findings.



More information on the Derbyshire LTP can be found here:  
<http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/localtransportplan>

## **2.4 Health Agenda – Health and Wellbeing**

New Government proposals within the Health and Social Care Act mean that we are taking over public health responsibilities for health improvement and tackling health inequalities from April 2013. A newly established Health and Wellbeing Board has produced the Derbyshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy for 2012-2015, following extensive consultation. The overarching aims of the strategy are to reduce health inequalities, strengthen investment in prevention and deliver high quality care. It has been developed around five high level priorities:

- Improve health and wellbeing in early years.
- Promote healthy lifestyles.
- Improve emotional and mental health.
- Promote the independence of people living with long term conditions and their carers.
- Improve health and wellbeing of older people.

The RoWIP has a role to play in providing the physical resources and messages to encourage active healthy lifestyles for all ages (both informal and formal), through walking for health type schemes, outdoor play opportunities and mental health benefits. There is scope to tap into the £35 million of funding which is being made available to help deliver the health agenda.

The Active Derbyshire Plan, produced by Derbyshire Sport has several targets relating to health and activity that complement or mirror the actions identified in the RoWIP.

## **2.5 Landscape Character**

### **The Landscape Character of Derbyshire**

The RoWIP operates across a broad range of Landscape Character Types as defined by the Landscape Character of Derbyshire 2003 publication (due for revision in 2013). Landscape is the result of the way that different components of our environment, physical, natural and historic, interact together and are perceived by people. Over the past five years, this area of work has gained in importance as we increase our awareness of its significance in Derbyshire. Landscape character is the mechanism for assessing and describing landscape diversity based on these particular components so that we can ensure that any of our access work is better able to respond to site context and local distinctiveness.

### **Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity (AMES)**

AMES are broad areas of landscape that have been identified as being sensitive with respect to a range of environmental datasets. This is a new area of work whereby areas are defined using the Derbyshire landscape character assessment as a spatial framework for reviewing data relating to biodiversity, the historic environment and visual unity (the 'intactness' of the landscape). Those areas

assessed as being the most sensitive, with respect to these environmental datasets, will be the most susceptible to significant change. Those areas that are defined as the least sensitive are the areas that have the potential for more change and, in particular, change that can help to deliver a range of environmental benefits which will provide strategic Green Infrastructure and bring about enhancements for landscape character and local distinctiveness. New access schemes will be developed within the context of this work.

## **2.6 Planning Framework**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The NPPF, published in 2012, provides national guidance on the planning system, in a single document which replaces many previous guidance documents. It states that the planning system has an economic role, a social role and an environmental role to perform and that economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system to achieve sustainable development.

The NPPF recognises the role that planning can play in creating healthy, inclusive communities. This includes the importance of promoting safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. The NPPF states that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, and that local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example, by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

### **Local Plans**

The District and Borough Councils and the Peak District National Park Authority are the Local Planning Authorities responsible for producing Local Plans in Derbyshire. The Peak District National Park Authority's Local Plan (Core Strategy) was adopted in October 2011. The other Local Plans are still in production.

Local Plans set out a vision for how an area will develop and change over time, as well as being a guide for future development. It is important that these Plans identify opportunities to provide benefits and improvements to the local rights of way and Greenway networks in line with the principles of the NPPF.

The progression of Minerals and Waste Plans for Derby and Derbyshire and also the Peak District National Park provide opportunities for adoption of planning policies relating to public access provision through site reclamation and restoration.

### **Infrastructure Plans**

The Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan, adopted by the County Council in 2012, focuses on strategic infrastructure including highways and transport, surface water flood management, waste, broadband, green infrastructure, libraries, children and younger adults' services, education, adult care and public health and wellbeing. The Plan complements and provides a strategic overview for local Infrastructure Delivery Plans that are being prepared by local planning authorities.

The Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan provides evidence on the condition of and investment currently taking place in existing strategic infrastructure. It sets out strategic priority projects, delivery schedules for future investment and potential sources of funding. It has a key role in informing Local Plans, Local Infrastructure Delivery Plans and Community Infrastructure Levies. Consequently, it will play an important part in identifying and protecting opportunities for development of and improvements to rights of way and Greenways under either transport or green infrastructure projects.

More information on the Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan can be found here:

[http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/planning\\_policy/infrastructure\\_planning/default.asp](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/planning_policy/infrastructure_planning/default.asp)

Infrastructure Plans are also being produced by the District and Borough Councils and the Peak District National Park Authority.

In 2010, a Green Infrastructure Strategy was published for the 6C's area. This is a partnership between the respective City and County authorities around Derby, Nottingham and Leicester. Within Derbyshire this covers the areas of South Derbyshire, Erewash and Amber Valley, together with Derby City.

Green Infrastructure (GI), as defined in the GI Strategy comprises:

*“Networks of multi functional greenspace which sit within, and contribute to, the type of high quality natural and built environment required to deliver sustainable communities. Delivering, protecting and enhancing these networks require the creation of new assets to link with river corridors, waterways, woodlands, nature reserves, urban greenspace, historic sites and other existing assets”*

The vision of the document is to maintain, develop, enhance and extend a multi-functional GI network. The rights of way and Greenway network is a key asset in the access element of this work, including links between existing and new development and the wider network. The development of proposed access corridors meets the vision set out in the GI Strategy for the 6C's growth points. This has also been incorporated by several local planning authorities in the County who have developed local GI proposals through the Local Plan and Infrastructure Planning process. These include:

- Supporting and providing links to new housing and regeneration projects.
- Helping to meet Government and local planning targets for new developments to be accessible on foot and by bicycle, including links to the surrounding path network.
- Encouraging the use of non-motorised transport corridors contributing to congestion targets and indicators.
- Stimulate further local usage of the path network as a green gym and meeting indicators for physical activity levels.
- Providing access to green corridors for urban based communities and contributing to a sense of place for local communities.
- Enhancing and linking places of interest and tourism destinations for local people and visitors to the area.

## **Neighbourhood Plans**

The Localism Act 2011 introduced a new right for communities to prepare Neighbourhood Plans. Community groups can now draw up planning policies for the use and development of land under a Neighbourhood Development Plan, including:

- Where new homes, shops and offices should go.
- Which green spaces should be protected.
- What new development should look like.

At the time of writing no Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted in Derbyshire, however, a number of Town and Parish Councils are in the process of preparing them.

More information about Neighbourhood Plans can be found here:

[http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/neighbourhood\\_plans/default.asp?VD=ndp](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/neighbourhood_plans/default.asp?VD=ndp)

## **2.7 Other plans and strategies**

### **Peak District National Park Authority**

The Peak District National Park covers a significant area of the County. The National Park designation requires that the special qualities of the area relating to conservation, enjoyment and economic and social wellbeing have to underpin any decisions that affect the National Park area. The RoWIP will therefore take account of these principles with respect to actions within the Peak District National Park.

The Peak District National Park Authority has a number of relevant strategies and plans in place that are highly relevant to and complement the RoWIP. In addition to the Authority's Local Plan, these include the following:

- National Park Management Plan 2012-2017.
- Recreation Strategy and Action Plan for the Peak District National Park 2010-2020.
- Sustainable Transport Action Plan 2012-2017.

A list of other initiative plans and strategies that support or have a direct link to the preparation and development of the RoWIP can be found in Appendix B.

## **Section 3 – Statement of Action 2013-2017**

The Aims are listed in the same order of priority determined during the production of the first Statement of Action for the RoWIP in 2007-2012. Our statutory duties are covered in Aims 1 and 2 and the main actions that relate to the LTP and other strategies are covered in Aims 3 and 5. Aim 4 relates to the provision of information which is vital if the benefits of the actions within the other aims are to be realised.

The identified needs set out under each Aim have also been prioritised in the light

of the current economic climate. However this is not to say that those which are not assigned a high priority will be ignored and we will try to deliver them all.

The second Statement of Action will be supported by detailed annual work programmes that will take into account available resources at the time. These will set out more detailed plans and targets, list individual schemes and will be submitted to the Local Access Forums each year.

### **Key to Statement of Action tables**

#### **Resources required to deliver action points:**

- ★ Action point can be achieved within funding and staffing resources equivalent to those allocated for 2012/13.
- ★★ Action point could be achieved with a slight re-prioritisation of resources or where additional resources are required but are likely to be successfully sourced.
- ★★★ Actions that would require additional resources to be allocated by us or require external funding to be sought before they can be progressed. Within the current economic climate, these actions are more aspirational.

#### **Estimated costs:**

It is difficult to include precise figures for all action points. Instead, the following symbols have been used to cover potential revenue or capital costs. Where funding is achievable through the LTP programme or other committed sums this is indicated. If delivery is primarily a staffing issue then no symbol is recorded.

£ Estimated cost less than £10,000 per year.

££ Estimated cost between £10,000 and £50,000 per year.

£££ Estimated cost more than £50,000 per year.

#### **Main partnership delivery mechanisms:**

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>No shading</b>    | Action point would be delivered primarily by ourselves.  |
| <b>Light shading</b> | Action point would be delivered through partnership working with other organisations.              |
| <b>Dark shading</b>  | Action point would be delivered mainly by other partner organisations with our support and advice. |

## **Abbreviations for key partners/organisations:**

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Access stakeholders</b> | Large landowners or other key organisations involved with access such as: National Trust, Forestry Commission, Severn Trent Water, United Utilities, UK Coal, large private estates such as Chatsworth, Sitwell or Welbeck, National Forest Company                            |
| <b>CLA</b>                 | Country Landowner and Business Association   |
| <b>CRT</b>                 | Canal and River Trust (formerly British Waterways)   |
| <b>DACES</b>               | Derbyshire Adult Community Education Service   |
| <b>DALC</b>                | Derbyshire Association of Local Councils   |
| <b>DCC</b>                 | Derbyshire County Council  |
| <b>DDDC</b>                | Derbyshire Dales District Council  |
| <b>defra</b>               | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs   |
| <b>GDD</b>                 | Groundwork Derby and Derbyshire  |
| <b>HPBC</b>                | High Peak Borough Council  |
| <b>LAFs</b>                | Local Access Forums (Peak District LAF and Derby and Derbyshire LAF - DADLAF)  |
| <b>LNP</b>                 | Local Nature Partnership   |
| <b>Local Councils</b>      | Town Councils, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings   |
| <b>NE</b>                  | Natural England  |
| <b>NFU</b>                 | National Farmers Union   |
| <b>PCT</b>                 | Primary Care Trust   |
| <b>PDNPA</b>               | Peak District National Park Authority  |
| <b>SDDC</b>                | South Derbyshire District Council  |
| <b>TCV</b>                 | The Conservation Volunteers (formerly BTCV)  |
| <b>TIC</b>                 | Tourist Information Centre   |
| <b>TPT</b>                 | Trans Pennine Trail  |
| <b>User Groups</b>         | National and local groups representing all the different groups of users, examples of which include: Ramblers Association (RA), Peak and Northern Footpaths Society (PNFS), British Horse Society (BHS), Cyclists Touring Club (CTC), Sustrans, Trail Riders Fellowship (TRF). |

## **Other Abbreviations:**

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>LTP</b>   | Local Transport Plan  |
| <b>MMA</b>   | Minor Maintenance Agreement (for Local Councils to manage some elements of path maintenance works on paths in their own area) |
| <b>NIA</b>   | Nature Improvement Area   |
| <b>PRoW</b>  | Public Rights of Way  |
| <b>RoWIP</b> | Rights of Way Improvement Plan  |
| <b>SEA</b>   | Strategic Environmental Assessment within LTP3  |
| <b>SLA</b>   | Service Level Agreement   |

## Aim 1: Ensure that the Public Rights of Way network is open and available for use

### Background

As a Highway Authority, we have a statutory duty to assert and protect the legal rights of the public to use and enjoy the existing network of PRow. We need to make sure that any improvements which benefit one class of user are not made at the expense of others and ensure that safety is paramount.

The existing PRow network as recorded in the Definitive Map and Statement is made up as follows:

| Public Rights of Way in Derbyshire (January 2013) |  |                  |                 |             |
|---|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Type of Route                                     | Available to   | Number of Routes | Total length km | % by length |
| Footpaths (FP)                                    | Walkers  | 8,953            | 4,509           | 87.5        |
| Bridleways (BW)                                   | Walkers, horse riders and cyclists                                       | 602              | 557             | 10.8        |
| Restricted Byways (RB)                            | Walkers, horse riders, cyclists and horse drawn vehicles                 | 86               | 63              | 1.2         |
| Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT)                 | Walkers, horse riders, cyclists, horse drawn vehicles and motor vehicles | 29               | 26              | 0.5         |
| <b>Total</b>                                      |  | <b>9,670</b>     | <b>5,155</b>    |             |

| Length of Public Rights of Way by District (km)       |              |            |           |           |              |
|---|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| District  | FP           | BW         | RB        | BOAT      | Total        |
| Amber Valley  | 663          | 47         | 15        | 0         | 725          |
| Bolsover  | 229          | 43         | 0         | 0         | 272          |
| Chesterfield  | 97           | 12         | 0         | 0         | 109          |
| Derbyshire Dales                                      | 1,464        | 158        | 17        | 17        | 1,656        |
| Erewash   | 224          | 20         | 3         | 0         | 247          |
| High Peak   | 798          | 136        | 18        | 8         | 960          |
| North East Derbyshire                                 | 525          | 82         | 4         | 1         | 612          |
| South Derbyshire                                      | 509          | 59         | 6         | 0         | 574          |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>4,509</b> | <b>557</b> | <b>63</b> | <b>26</b> | <b>5,155</b> |
| Peak District National Park (PDNP) area in Derbyshire | 1,240        | 214        | 26        | 18        | 1,498        |

The above tables do not include the 234km of unsealed non classified highways (or green lanes) which are concentrated predominantly in the Derbyshire Dales and High Peak areas of the county. These appear on the County Council's "list of

streets” as routes which are publicly maintainable, but where the rights of the public to use them, other than on foot, is often unclear.

However, they are particularly important to horse riders and cyclists who rely on them to help create circular routes. Many are also subject to claims to record them in the Definitive Map and Statement as Byways Open to All Traffic and therefore have the potential to increase the network available to riders, as well as drivers of horse drawn carriages and recreational motor vehicles (see Aim 2).

The actions in this section should ensure that the existing PRow network is well signed, free from unlawful obstruction, safe and well maintained, thereby encouraging greater public use, enjoyment and confidence in a network which is welcoming to its users.

Focusing on making the existing network easier to use was one of the main priorities for all groups consulted during the production of the RoWIP in 2007. Consultees wanted to see paths correctly signposted, with well-maintained surfaces and structures, including the cutting back of intrusive vegetation and the efficient removal of illegal obstructions. This work is carried out with regard to the Environmental Statement for the RoWIP and our commitments under Theme A.

## **Progress and developments since 2007**

**Ease of use condition surveys:** We continue to carry out condition surveys to monitor progress on how well signed and easy to use the PRow network in Derbyshire is. These are based on the methodology developed for the former National Best Value Performance Indicator BVPI 178. The steady improvement recorded in the lead up to 2007, when the percentage of the network deemed ‘easy to use’ increased from 51.5% in 2003/04 to 70.6% in 2007/08, continued until 2011/12 when it reached 75.7%. In 2012/13 the overall pass rate fell to 68.8%. We have made a commitment to continue to carry out these surveys, but the possibility of raising the target above 72.5% would be difficult in the present economic climate. However, we will keep this under review and continue to analyse why paths are failing the assessment. The PDNPA also carries out its own ease of use surveys relating to the condition of the network for the whole of the National Park.

**Staffing resources:** In 2007, we identified that there was a need to redirect additional staffing resources into rights of way and access work. The annual target that we set ourselves, of allocating over 450 days of additional staffing or volunteer days from within the wider countryside service to support the work of the existing rights of way team, has been achieved. With access work still being a priority this is set to continue and therefore no longer needs a separate action. We now deal with the management of the public rights of way network in South Derbyshire ‘in house’ since the District Council withdrew from the agency agreement in 2009. As a result, we created an additional PRow inspector post to accommodate the extra work.

**Management and maintenance of the network:** There are still challenges to be faced in tackling the issues reported to us and, in order to help us improve our



service to the public, we published a Rights of Way (RoW) Charter in 2011 which is included as Appendix E. It provides details about the level of service a member of the public can expect when they contact the PRow section and also sets out the priorities that we will work to. Working to the Charter will be a key element in this next Statement of Action and we will report progress against it.

On average, we have 3,500 enquiries relating to the PRow network reported to us each year. We have steadily improved our performance in resolving obstructions and other related issues over the past five years with 76% resolved within 12 weeks in 2007/08 rising to 86% in 2011/12.

We set a target of investing at least £100,000 per year from the LTP2 programme to carry out capital surface repairs during the first five years. We have exceeded this figure each year and carried out large scale surface works to over 50 routes since 2007. Other paths have also been improved but are recorded under Aim 3 because the work was designed to fulfil specific actions in relation to access for all schemes or to provide better routes to local services or schools.

We have placed a high priority on improving the signposting of rights of way. The challenge has been to increase the number of paths that are signposted from the road and to improve the consistency and quality of information provided, whilst being mindful of the need to reduce any unnecessary roadside signage (in line with a countywide Highway Assets Review and Reduction Project). Over the past five years, we have replaced or installed over 2,200 roadside signposts. We now routinely provide additional information on our roadside signposts, such as destinations and distances where appropriate.

We have also placed a high priority on making the path furniture on the network as user friendly and accessible as possible. We have tightened up the procedures that we follow when authorising new structures and adopt a principle of the least restrictive option of gaps rather than gates, with stiles as a last resort.

The PDNPA contributes towards the upkeep of the PRow network within the Derbyshire area of the Peak District National Park through an SLA described in Aim 5.

**Capital Investment:** We have invested over £3 million through the LTP2 programme on schemes that provide RoWIP benefits. This has included specific projects, such as the development of the Greenway network, essential surface repairs (including some green lanes), improvements to path furniture and signage, and also the provision of safe road crossings or new links along highway verges.

In addition to the investment through the LTP programme, we have been successful in attracting over £2 million in grants from a variety of external sources. This has included monies from Natural England, to fund the development and maintenance of the Pennine Bridleway National Trail, central Government funding for several Greenway schemes, Heritage Lottery funding for Limestone Journeys and direct contributions as a result of planning gain.

## Changes within the Statement of Action tables

### Added in:

- Aim 1a) - We have included a section on how we deliver the routine management of the PRow network. This work will be governed by the RoW Charter and one of the ways of monitoring the outcomes will be via the ease of use surveys.
- Aims 1b) and 1c) - In the first Statement of Action, we developed an improved and more consistent signposting framework, along with a revised approach to authorising path furniture. Now this has been achieved, these approaches are part of our routine delivery and have been moved from Aims 3 and 4 into Aim 1.

### Removed:

- We had a section in the first Statement of Action about working with landowners which has been moved to Aim 5.
- There was a separate section that included targets for tackling obstructions and ploughing and cropping issues which have been incorporated into Aim 1a) as they are now included within the RoW Charter.
- Information about investment in the network and external funding has been moved to Aim 3 since the external funding relates to improvement projects found in that section.
- Aim 1d) relating to surface vegetation clearance has been incorporated into the new Aim 1d) on surface condition.

### Aim 1: Ensure that the Public Rights of Way network is open and available for use

|  | Proposed Actions   | Resources | Delivered by | Key Partners                              | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies   |
|--|--|-----------|--------------|---|-------------|--|
| <b>Identified need: 1a) The efficient management and maintenance of the existing network of Public Rights of Way</b> |  |           |              |   |             |  |
| i  | To work to the RoW Charter set up to prioritise and deal with enquiries. Report progress annually. | ★★        | DCC          | LAFs, User groups, Parish Councils, PDNPA | Ongoing     | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7 RoW, IP51 Walking and IP52 Cycling), RoW Charter, DCC Service Plan |
| ii   | To continue to carry out and report progress from an annual ease of use condition survey.          | ★         | DCC, PDNPA   | Volunteer surveyors, User groups          | Ongoing     | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7 RoW), DCC Service Plan   |

|   | <b>Proposed Actions</b>   | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b>                | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>                             |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|
|   | Target a minimum of 72.5% of paths surveyed to pass the ease of use test.   |                  |                     |                                    |                    |   |
| <b>Identified need: 1b) Ensure that the Public Rights of Way network is well signposted</b>                 |   |                  |                     |                                    |                    |   |
| i   | Replace all roadside signposts recorded as missing at 1 April each year, including those affected by legal changes if funding permits. Report numbers replaced and repaired.                                    | ★<br>££          | DCC                 | PDNPA, Local Councils, User groups | Ongoing            |   |
| ii  | Provide waymarking along routes if a need is identified. Report number of paths waymarked.  | ★<br>£           | DCC                 | Local Councils, User groups, PDNPA | Ongoing            |   |
| <b>Identified need: 1c) Improve the quality and accessibility of path furniture on Public Rights of Way</b> |   |                  |                     |                                    |                    |   |
| i   | Adopt least restrictive option of gaps, gates, stiles and observe the defra Good Practice Guidance on authorising structures on rights of way in line with the Equality Act 2010. Report achievements annually. | ★<br>£           | DCC                 | PDNPA, Local Councils              | Ongoing            | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7a RoW Access for All and IP51 Walking) |

|  | Proposed Actions  | Resources         | Delivered by | Key Partners              | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies   |
|--|---|-------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| <b>Identified need: 1d) Improve the surface condition and drainage of routes</b> |   |                   |              |                           |             |  |
| i  | Carry out an annual programme to maintain the structural integrity of the PRow network prioritised by key routes in most need of surface improvements or which benefit the most users. Aim to carry out a minimum of £100,000 surface improvements each year to 2016. | ★★<br>LTP3<br>£££ | DCC          |                           | 2013-16     | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7b RoW, Structural Integrity, IP51 Walking and IP52 Cycling), DCC Service Plan, RoWIP Themes A and B |
| ii   | Implement improvement works to routes carrying public vehicular rights for the benefit of all users where resources permit.   | ★★<br>£££         | DCC, PDNPA   | LAFs, Vehicle user groups | 2013-16     | DCC Management of Green Lanes 2012-2017, RoWIP Theme A   |
| iii  | Carry out an annual programme of surface vegetation clearance and make available the list of paths including timing and frequency of cut (taking account of wildlife and nature conservation concerns).   | ★<br>££           | DCC          | Local Councils, PDNPA     | Ongoing     | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7c Protection and restoration of habitats and species alongside PRow), RoWIP Theme A                 |

## **Aim 2: Provide an up-to-date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement**

### **Background**

As the Surveying Authority, we have a statutory duty to bring the Definitive Map and Statement up to date and keep it under continuous review, and to also make it available for public inspection.

The actions in this section will continue to address the need for an accurate, up to date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement for the whole of Derbyshire. They will also ensure that there is greater clarity over the legal status of routes.

During the original RoWIP consultation, people highlighted the need to tackle illegal or inappropriate use which could only be delivered against the background of a properly recorded PRow network. It was vital to speed up the process for determining the legal status of routes and deal with the backlog of legal orders.

### **Progress and developments since 2007**

**Resources:** During 2010, in recognition of the need for adequate resources to be dedicated to the processing of legal orders and definitive map work, a permanent post was created within the Rights of Way team, along with four additional two year posts (two in Legal Services and two in Rights of Way). The temporary posts have since been extended for a further two years until 2014 and all officers continue to contribute effectively in both areas of work.

**Digitisation of the Definitive Map and Statement:** With continuing support from Definitive Map officers, the two digitisers have accurately digitised 100% of the PRow network across the eight districts of the County. This information takes account of the legal changes which have taken place since the production of the original Definitive Maps and Statements. It is available to view on-line via the Derbyshire Mapping Portal. This electronic data can now be supplied directly to those who need it in a variety of formats and can be kept up-to-date more easily. The mapping team has also surveyed all paths affected by these legal changes and updated the definitive statements, prior to publishing these details on-line.

This work will assist the production of a new consolidated definitive map and statement for the county. The consolidation process brings together all the original definitive maps and statements that exist for Derbyshire into one, up to date document which incorporates the legal changes which have taken place. Because these changes have already been subject to public scrutiny, there is no further consultation required when the consolidated map and statement is published.

No definitive map was originally produced for the centre of Chesterfield, as this area was officially excluded from the survey of public rights of way carried out in the early 1950s. This was due to the fact that the area was already so built up and densely populated that a survey was considered to be inexpedient at the time.

There is now a requirement to produce a definitive map and statement for this formerly excluded area of Chesterfield. Where there is sufficient evidence to suggest that a public right of way exists, routes will be added to the definitive map and statement by means of individual modification orders, to which the public will have the opportunity to make objections or representations.

**Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs):** The Rights of Way team has worked closely with officers in the Legal Services Division dealing with applications for DMMOs. The additional temporary staffing resource referred to above has enabled us to set improved targets for increasing outputs and, as a result, DMMO application cases are being scheduled for consultation and reporting to Committee up to 12 months ahead. The extra resources have contributed towards a reduction in the number of outstanding claims from 229 in 2007 to 152 at the present time.

**Legal orders:** Both LAFs have been consulted on a draft legal order priority framework which is currently being finalised before it is submitted to Cabinet for approval. The legal order priority framework will complement with the adopted RoW Charter.

**Registers of applications:** In addition to the registers of applications for DMMOs and Statutory Declarations, which are available on our website as the law requires, a list of temporary closures affecting the access network has also been set up to help people plan their routes or visits.

## **Changes within the Statement of Action tables**

### **Added in:**

- Aim 2a) - The lack of a Definitive Map and Statement for the central area of Chesterfield will be addressed through a programme of work for adding paths to this formerly excluded area.
- Aim 2b) - A new register of applications to extinguish, divert and create PRow under the Highways Act 1980 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990 will be published to complement those which are already available.
- Aim 2c) - Following the accurate digitisation of the PRow network, efforts will now concentrate on keeping that information up to date, as well as producing a new consolidated Definitive Map and Statement for the county.
- Aim 2c) - Work is also underway to publish a working copy of the definitive statements on-line. By selecting the PRow mapping information tool, it will be possible to view the definitive statement for each path, as well as report a problem via email. In the longer term, we also intend to provide further information about the location and type of path furniture on each route.

### **Removed:**

- The proposed action to improve the availability and quality of information about the Definitive Map and legal orders has been moved into Aim 4b) and combined with that for the whole range of access opportunities.
- There is no longer a specific action to make Definitive Map Modification Orders for non-classified highways (NCH's) likely to be rights of way. This action has been incorporated into that for other legal orders in Aim 2a).

**Aim 2: Provide an up-to-date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement**

|  | <b>Proposed actions</b>  | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b>                | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/other strategies</b>   |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <b>Identified need: 2a) Speed up the process for clarifying the legal status of routes</b> |  |                  |                     |                                    |                    |  |
| i  | Develop priority framework (aligned with Rights of Way Charter) for dealing with legal orders and secure Member approval.  | ★                | DCC                 | LAFs                               | 2013/14            |  |
| ii   | Produce an ongoing work programme, based on agreed priority framework for legal orders and applications. Report progress annually.   | ★★               | DCC                 |                                    | From 2013/14       |  |
| iii  | Continue to create a record of Definitive Map inconsistencies, including those affecting cross boundary routes. Prioritise within work programme identified in 2a) ii above. | ★★               | DCC                 | Adjacent highway authorities, LAFs | Ongoing            | RoWIPs from adjacent highway authorities |
| iv   | Develop a programme of work for adding paths within the formerly excluded central area of Chesterfield to the Definitive Map and Statement.                                  | ★★★              | DCC                 |                                    | 2014-17            |  |

| <b>Identified need: 2b) Improve the availability of information relating to the Definitive Map and Statement</b> |  |   |     |   |         |  |
|--|--|---|-----|---|---------|--|
| i  | Deliver access to accurate and up-to-date rights of way information, in a variety of formats which can be shared with other systems and applications, including investigating opportunities to exchange data and charge where appropriate. | ★ | DCC | Adjacent highway authorities, PDNPA, District and Local Councils, Ordnance Survey, User groups, Access stakeholders, Land managers, Statutory undertakers | Ongoing |  |
| ii   | Maintain existing registers/ lists of DMMO applications, statutory declarations and temporary closures.  | ★ | DCC |   | Ongoing |  |
| iii  | Publish register of applications to extinguish, divert and create PRoW under the Highways Act 1980 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990.   | ★ | DCC |   | 2013/14 |  |
| <b>Identified need: 2c) Produce and maintain an up-to-date digital Definitive Map and Statement</b>              |  |   |     |   |         |  |
| i  | Maintain an up-to-date digital working copy of the Definitive Map and Statement for the public to view via the Derbyshire Mapping Portal. Report number of legal changes made during the year.   | ★ | DCC |   | Ongoing |  |



|     |  |   |     |  |         |  |
|-----|--|---|-----|--|---------|--|
| ii  | Publish a working copy of the Definitive Statement on-line for each path. Report progress. | ★ | DCC |  | 2013/14 |  |
| iii | Produce a new consolidated Definitive Map and Statement for the county.                    | ★ | DCC |  | 2013/14 |  |

### **Aim 3: Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users**

#### **Background**

The actions in this section are to ensure that the needs of individual user groups are considered and that safety is given a high priority. The emphasis is on providing a network that makes sense and connects to homes, facilities, public transport, places of interest, as well as providing circular links for recreational use. Where we have made significant developments in providing a good network of connected Greenways and trails, there have also been wider benefits for tourism and to the local economy as a whole which demonstrates the links to Theme C.

In the original consultation, everyone who was consulted expressed a high priority for having well connected paths, providing opportunities for circular routes. Most walkers cited the lack of suitable paths near to where they lived as the one of the main limitations. The general conclusion was that overall the footpath network in the County is quite good but that the situation for higher categories (bridleways, restricted byways and BOATs) is not so good. Horse riders and cyclists emphasised the fragmented nature of the bridleway network as being the most significant limiting factor. The need to provide easy access routes for people with limited mobility and other groups of users was identified as the top priority in the key issues consultation.

Many of the improvements identified in this Aim are tied in closely with the Accessibility chapter in the LTP3 and the Transport Infrastructure section of the Infrastructure Plan for Derbyshire.

#### **Progress and developments since 2007**

**Routes to benefit horse riders and cyclists:** Due to the fragmented nature of the bridleway network in the County, an emphasis was placed on providing more routes that benefit bridleway users (specifically horse riders and cyclists.). As a result, 30 bridleways (totalling 22.1km), 3 Restricted Byways (2.9km) and 21 BOATs (18km) have been added to the Definitive Map since 2007.

Specifically for horse riders we have:

- introduced a horse box parking scheme in the north-east of the County which has won a national award from the British Horse Society;
- completed two sections (4km) of the Pennine Bridleway on the ground and almost finalised landowner agreements for the remaining approved section of the route through Glossop;
- upgraded two significant sections of the Midshires Way for horse riders (Long Horse Bridge near Shardlow and Hopwell to Dale Abbey in Erewash). There are still major challenges in making the route fully rideable, but this will remain a target in the second Statement of Action;
- supported the PDNPA's Black Harry Trails project which has created opportunities for horse riding and mountain biking in the Longstone Edge area by improving the surface of several routes and providing better signage.

Specifically for cyclists we have:

- mapped the Chesterfield Cycle network, which is beginning to be developed and signed on the ground;
- carried out cycle audits in Long Eaton and Ilkeston and installed new cycle lockers at a variety of locations around the County;
- established a range of partnership working arrangements, such as with the Chesterfield Cycle Campaign in Chesterfield and Sustrans to deliver the Connect 2 project in Killamarsh. We are keen to build on these partnership opportunities in the future.

**Pennine Bridleway National Trail:** We have developed and maintained this route over the past 13 years through considerable investment from Natural England. Natural England is in the process of reviewing its input into National Trails and the capital grants for National Trail development are expected to cease beyond 2013/14. Grant offers are being secured for three of the four approved sections of the route, still to be constructed, but there is unlikely to be any further funding after that. This situation may also affect the Pennine Way, the other National Trail in the County, which is currently managed by the PDNPA and funded by Natural England.

**Open Access Land:** There are large tracts of mapped open access land within Derbyshire. The majority, approximately 370 sq km, are located within the Peak District National Park for which the PDNPA is the access authority. The remainder of open access land (851ha) is our responsibility as access authority. During the last five years, the Forestry Commission has designated all of the woodland in its ownership as access land. More needs to be done to improve signage and information about access land and to identify ways to improve the connections between centres of population and access land and between isolated pockets of access land. There is an opportunity to work with the two Local Access Forums to achieve this.

**Easy access improvements:** The introduction of the Equality Act 2010 and new defra publication "Authorising structures (gaps, gates and stiles) on rights of way - Good practice guidance on compliance with the Equality Act 2010" have provided the framework required to ensure that we work to make the countryside and rights

of way network as accessible as possible to all users. They have also removed the need to develop a separate policy.

- 17 schemes have been delivered to improve accessibility;
- access audits and various improvements have been carried out at four locations where tramper mobility scooters are hired out: at Tapton Lock Visitor Centre, Elvaston Castle Country Park, Shipley Country Park and on the High Peak Trail;
- we have made a considerable investment in new furniture to make paths easier to negotiate. Over the last 5 years, we have installed over 1,500 gates across the rights of way network, the majority of which replaced stiles. In 2009, we carried out a successful gates and stiles campaign where in addition to 281 gates being installed to replace stiles, 69 items of redundant furniture were removed altogether, leaving gaps instead of stiles or gates;
- we have made useful contacts with some local access groups and local disabled people but we can always do more and this is reflected in the Statement of Action.

**Greenways development:** 65km of new Greenways (exceeding the target of 60km), have been developed in Derbyshire, providing easy access routes catering for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. This brings the total length of the Greenway network across the county to 325km. Appendix F provides a list of the main Greenway schemes completed between 2007 and 2012. In addition a further 25km of our older trails have been upgraded to modern Greenway standards, including the Stockley Trail, Trans Pennine Trail, Chesterfield Canal and sections of the Five Pits and High Peak Trails.

As part of the planning process, Section 106 agreements have contributed to 22km of this length being delivered on the ground emphasising the importance of making good links into the Planning frameworks. The inclusion of the RoWIP and Greenway Strategies in the new County/District/Borough Council Infrastructure Plans and the Local Plans being produced by the local planning authorities should help to ensure that new routes are safeguarded or even developed in future through planning gain.

The increase in the extent of the Greenway network has led to the need to identify and quantify any ongoing maintenance commitments that we would become liable for and the challenge is to build in programmes that minimise any additional liabilities whilst still developing new key routes that provide local economic, tourism or transport benefits. The PDNPA is also tackling this through the development of a Management Plan for trails in its ownership.

The LTP3 and its Investment Protocol promotes a considered approach to new infrastructure, so each new Greenway will have to be judged on its merit. There is still considerable support for the continued development of Greenways due to the multiple benefits that they bring in providing the links that further the vision of creating an interconnected strategic network of safe off-road trails around the County. The current economic climate, together with a reduction in funding opportunities, many external funding sources having dried up, and considerable

uncertainty in the foreseeable future, means that we have to exercise a degree of caution in what can be achieved over the next five years. This is also recognised in LTP3 where there is a commitment within the Investment Protocol (IP52) to identify a strategic cycle route hierarchy in order to guide the decision making process. A list of current priorities and active projects can be found in Appendix F. This will form the basis for developing new schemes over the next five years as opportunities present themselves.

**Motorised vehicle users:** We have carried out a long awaited revision of our policy on the Management of Motorised Vehicles in the Countryside which went out for public consultation in 2011. The final document, entitled 'Management of Green Lanes' was produced in 2012 and can be found in Appendix G. At the same time, the PDNPA has been reviewing its own equivalent document.

The focus for this element of our work since 2007 has been in the Peak District. We have worked very closely with the PDNPA, the Peak District LAF and representatives from the vehicle users to develop a pilot project in the Peak District National Park to identify and produce a series of management plans for sustainable vehicular use of routes in the area. In connection with that project, we have also been involved in two successful joint projects organised with the Police, vehicle user groups and PDNPA to tackle illegal use of the network.

## **Changes within the Statement of Action tables**

### **Added In:**

- There are still a series of actions that support individual groups of users: horse riders and cyclists, walkers, those benefiting from easy access provision and motorised vehicle users.
- There is more about working with partners on identifying and mapping particular access networks under Aim 3a) following on from the successes in the 2007-12 Statement of Action, such as the Chesterfield Cycle Project. We have already been discussing possible projects with partners, such as the National Trust, Eastern Moors Partnership and several cycling/horse riding groups, such as Sustrans, Chesterfield Cycle Network, Choose Cycling, Peak Horsepower and also with the PDNPA about developing a National Park-wide Cycling Strategy as part of its Recreation Strategy. This will recognise the need to accommodate horse riders wherever possible.
- We have added a new action into Aim 3c) to specifically support the development of a Greenway loop between Matlock and Buxton, a scheme that has generated much support over the past few years.
- New section Aim 3g) (from Aim 1) about the amount of external funding levered in as most of this is for improvement or development monies that relate to actions in Aim 3. The capital funding element that relates to capital maintenance, particularly through the LTP programme, will continue to be reported in Aim 1.

### **Removed:**

- There is less in Aim 3 about working with landowners as some of this has been moved into Aim 5.

- The actions relating to path furniture, particularly in relation to gaps, gates and stiles under Aim 3c), is now being reported in Aim 1 as any improvement work has now become standard practice.
- There are no specific actions under Aim 3a) to promote circular bridleway links but these will still be considered under Aim 4 within the section about improvements to promoted routes.
- There are no targets in Aim 3b), with respect to improving access within the National Forest Tender scheme, as this was investigated and completed in the first Statement of Action for 2007-12.
- Several actions within Aim 3e), relating to the safety of vulnerable users (road crossings, use of verges, etc), have been combined as the few that were reported in 2007-12 tended to be incorporated into single schemes. There is also a presumption in the LTP3 Investment Protocol against any new road crossings unless they are linked to wider schemes, such as new Greenway developments.

**Aim 3: Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users**

|   | Proposed actions  | Resources | Delivered by | Key Partners  | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies  |
|---|---|-----------|--------------|---|-------------|---|
| <b>Identified need: 3a) Improve the provision of routes for bridleway users</b> |   |           |              |   |             |   |
| i   | Prioritise bridleway claims (upgrades or new routes) or creations and dedications that contribute to or improve the safety and connectivity of the existing bridleway network and that of the Greenway network. Report number of orders/ agreements processed per year. | ★         | DCC          | PDNPA, User groups, LAFs National Trust, Forestry Commission, Eastern Moors/ Sheffield Moors Partnerships | 2013-17     | Policy for tackling legal orders in preparation, RoWIP Theme C Links to Aim 2a) |
| ii  | Work with partners to support individual projects to identify, map and promote access networks for horse riders and cyclists.   | ★★<br>£   | DCC, PDNPA   | LAFs, User groups, Sustrans, District Councils, Access stakeholders,                                      | Ongoing     | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7 RoW, IP52 Cycling and IP91 Complete routes for    |

|   | Proposed actions  | Resources                | Delivered by                  | Key Partners   | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies  |
|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------|---|
|   |   |                          |                               | National Trust, Forestry Commission, Eastern Moors/ Sheffield Moors Partnerships |             | healthy cycle networks), RoWIP Theme C  |
| iii   | Complete the Pennine Bridleway route through Glossop between Monks Road and Glossop Road.   | ★ Natural England<br>£££ | DCC                           | Natural England  | 2013/14     | National Trails, RoWIP Themes B and C   |
| iv  | Continue to improve route of Midshires Way to make it accessible to horse riders where opportunities and funding permit.  | ★★★<br>£££               | DCC                           | User groups, Land managers   | Ongoing     | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7 RoW, IP52 Cycling and IP99 New assets), RoWIP Theme C |
| <b>Identified need: 3b) Improve the provision of circular or connected routes</b> |   |                          |                               |  |             |   |
| i   | Integrate RoWIP principles into relevant County/ Districts Plans and encourage PProW improvement and protection through the development control process via Section 106 legal agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy. | ★                        | DCC, District Councils, PDNPA | Private developers   | Ongoing     | DCC and District Council Infrastructure Plans, RoWIP Themes B and C                 |

|     | <b>Proposed actions</b>  | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b>   | <b>Key Partners</b>   | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b> |
|-----|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| ii  | Negotiate and support others in identifying new links that will enhance the usability of the network by connecting existing routes and creating local circuits where opportunities permit. This can be achieved (through the use of public path orders, creation agreements or concessionary routes for which the Authority would cover the costs and fast track the work if there was sufficient public gain. | ★★★<br>££        | DCC,<br>PDNPA         | Land managers, District and Local Councils, Public bodies, National Forest, Forestry Commission, Natural England, LAFs, Local volunteers, National Trust, Eastern Moors/ Sheffield Moors Partnerships | Ongoing            | RoWIP Themes A, B and C                 |
| iii | Identify opportunities and negotiate improved access to open access land and provide links between rights of way and other open access land to help create circular routes.  | ★★★<br>£         | DCC,<br>PDNPA<br>LAFs | Forestry Commission, Access stakeholders, Natural England   | Ongoing            | RoWIP Theme C                           |
| iv  | Investigate the dedication of public access routes on County Council owned land, specifically Countryside sites.   | ★★               | DCC                   |   | 2013-15            |   |



|  | Proposed actions   | Resources   | Delivered by | Key Partners  | Time scales  | Link to themes/ other strategies  |
|--|--|---|--------------|---|--------------|---|
| <b>Identified need: 3c) Continue with the development of the Greenway programme for the County</b> |  |   |              |   |              |   |
| i  | Combine the three existing Greenway Strategies under one policy document to be accompanied by 3 separate sets of area based route maps. Keep sections under rolling 10 year reviews, starting with the East Derbyshire area.                           | ★   | DCC          | District Councils, Local Councils, User groups, Access stake-holders    | 2013 onwards | LTP3, Local Plans, Greenway Strategies, RoWIP Themes B and C  |
| ii   | Continue to develop a multi-user Greenway network and protect future routes. A list of possible schemes can be found in Appendix F. Schemes will be judged on their own merit based on the multiple benefits that they can contribute towards the LTP. | ★★LTP3, Landfill Tax, Planning gain, Private Industry | DCC          | District Councils, Network Rail, Sustrans, Private land owners, UK Coal | 2013-17      | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7a RoW Access for All, IP52 Cycling, IP54 Local travel to railway stations, IP78 Safer routes to school, IP91 Complete routes for healthy cycle networks, IP94 Access to green space and IP99 New assets) Infrastructure Plan for Derbyshire, Greenway Strategies, Active Derbyshire Plan, RoWIP Themes B and C |



|   | <b>Proposed actions</b>   | <b>Resources</b>                 | <b>Delivered by</b>                   | <b>Key Partners</b>   | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>   |
|---|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| iii   | Work with partners to support and deliver a 'White Peak' Greenway loop between Matlock and Buxton.  | ★★★<br>LTP3,<br>External funding | DCC,<br>PDNPA,<br>HPBC,<br>DDDC       | Peak Cycle Links, Sustrans, Peak Rail   | 2013-17            | LTP3, RoWIP Themes B and C  |
| iv  | Identify ongoing maintenance and management liabilities for the Greenway network and seek the necessary resources for its upkeep.   | ★★<br>£££                        | DCC,<br>PDNPA,<br>Sustrans            | Volunteers  | 2013-17            | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7b RoW structural integrity, IP94 Access to green spaces and IP83 New Infrastructure) |
| <b>Identified need: 3d) Provide more easy access routes</b> |   |                                  |                                       |   |                    |   |
| i   | Work with Local Access Groups and other organisations to identify existing easy access routes and small scale improvements to paths or associated facilities for delivery as funding permits. Report projects achieved. | ★★LTP3<br>£                      | DCC,<br>PDNPA,<br>Local Access Groups | LAFs, Local Councils, National Forest, Health Walk Groups, Forestry Commission, CRT, Moors for the Future | 2013-16            | Equality Act 2010, LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7a Rights of Way Access for All), RoWIP Themes B and C             |

|   | <b>Proposed actions</b>   | <b>Resources</b>          | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b> | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>   |
|---|---|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|
| <b>Identified need: 3e) Provide a safer network for all users</b> |   |                           |                     |                     |                    |   |
| i   | Carry out systematic and targeted improvements on existing routes to make best use of what we have got with a preference for local routes and links from strategic networks to local facilities and services. Links to Aim 3b) ii | ★★LTP3<br>£££             | DCC                 |                     | 2013-16            | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7a RoW Access for all, IP51 Walking, IP72 Quiet Lanes, IP92 New Pedestrian Networks and IP99 New Assets), RoWIP Themes B and C                    |
| ii  | Develop safer routes to schools to encourage walking and cycling - work with safe routes to schools team to identify suitable paths/trails.   | ★★LTP3<br>Sustrans<br>£££ | DCC                 | Sustrans            | 2013-16            | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP51 Walking, IP52 Cycling, IP78 Safer routes to school, IP91 Complete routes for healthy cycle networks and IP99 New Assets), RoWIP Themes B and C |

|   | <b>Proposed actions</b>   | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b>                                | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>   |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| iii   | Using collision/ casualty data and other information, identify and undertake initiatives (eg, safer road crossing points, use of verges) to reduce the number of road casualties among vulnerable users of the access network. Report projects. | ★★★<br>LTP3<br>£ | DCC                 | PDNPA, User groups, LAFs                           | 2013-16            | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP51 Walking, IP72 Quiet Lanes, IP92 New Pedestrian Networks and IP99 New Assets), RoWIP Theme A Relevant to Aims 3a, 3b and 3e |
| <b>Identified need 3f) Improve the management of recreational motorised vehicles in the countryside</b> |   |                  |                     |  |                    |   |
| i   | Work to the new DCC "Management of Green Lanes 2012-2017" Policy. Report outcomes.  | ★★               | DCC                 | PDNPA, Vehicle users, LAFs, Access stakeholders    | 2013-17            | LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP7b and IP7c RoW, IP82 Community Safety Improvement), RoWIP Theme A  |
| ii  | To assist PDNPA where appropriate with their work on managing recreational motorised vehicles.  | ★                | PDNPA, DCC, LAFs    | Vehicle users, Access stakeholders                 | 2013-17            | PDNPA Vehicle Strategy and TRO Policy, RoWIP Themes A and B   |
| iii   | Address the illegal use of the network. Record information and work with the Police. Consider the need for physical barriers.   | ★★               | DCC, PDNPA, Police  | Community safety partnerships, PDNPA, User groups, | Ongoing            | DCC Managing Green Lanes Policy, LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP82   |

|  | Proposed actions   | Resources     | Delivered by | Key Partners  | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies                             |
|--|--|---------------|--------------|---|-------------|--|
|  |  |               |              | Access stakeholders, Local communities, LAFs, Land managers |             | Community Safety Improvement)                                |
| <b>Identified need: 3g) Improve the investment in the access network</b> |  |               |              |   |             |  |
| i  | Secure funding through LTP3 to maintain the investment in the access network and carry out improvements in line with the Investment Protocol. Report the amount of investment achieved annually.   | ★ LTP3<br>£££ | DCC          |   | 2013-16     | LTP3 Investment Protocol                                     |
| ii   | Bid for funding through other external bodies and support other bids by partner organisations to support schemes delivering actions listed in the RoWIP and the LTP Investment Protocol. Report amount of extra funding received annually. | ★★<br>£££     | DCC          | Funding bodies (private and public), PDNPA                  | 2013-17     | DCC Service Plan, LTP3 Investment Protocol (IP99 New Assets) |

#### **Aim 4: Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network**

##### **Background**

The actions in this section will address the need for better co-ordinated and targeted information to be made available to as many people as possible, to encourage a more diverse, responsible and sustainable use of the access network.

It is also important that any signage or key messages are informative, consistent and as welcoming as possible to help people feel more confident in their ability to use the network.

In the original consultation, users wanted to know where they could go and what or who to expect on routes. Disabled people also needed information about associated facilities, such as car parking and toilets. They also pointed out that any written information should take account of the needs of people who are blind or partially sighted.

Other suggestions included the possibility of a path grading system, similar to that used to designate ski runs, and improved, consistent signage with clear information about who could use the different types of route, details of destination and distance or the estimated time to reach a particular destination. This has to be combined with the challenge to avoid cluttering the countryside, road network or the route itself.

There was a commitment to encouraging a more responsible and sustainable approach to the use of the access network through an increased understanding of other peoples' needs, the implications for wildlife and nature conservation, along with closer links to public transport provision.

## **Progress and developments since 2007**

**Resources:** A considerable amount has been achieved through partnership working and the pooling of resources in this area of work, particularly with the PDNPA.

**Websites:** Our own website has been considerably improved over the past five years, making it much easier to get the right messages across to users of the access network. New facebook and twitter pages have been added to promote use of the countryside and our sites. There has been a greater emphasis on providing information electronically and less on printed promotional material. Improvements to the PDNPA's website have included pages for the Peak District LAF, Open Access restrictions and motor vehicles/green lanes. Our own web pages focusing on responsible recreational driving of motor vehicles in the countryside will be produced alongside our new "Management of Green Lanes" policy. The ability to download or print off maps is limited by Ordnance Survey copyright. However, we have established strong links with the OS to provide and correct the PRow information shown on Explorer maps.

**Signage:** Through working closely with the PDNPA we have:

- Provided signage on the Greenway and promoted route networks with additional information about destinations and local amenities. Examples include the Limestone Way, Monsal and Silverhill Trails.
- Designed signs with symbols showing who can use a particular route and started to install these on the Greenways/Trails network, for example on the Cromford Canal towpath, High Peak Trail and Black Harry Trails at Longstone Edge.

- Produced and installed other advisory signs for vehicular routes to encourage safe and responsible use.
- Established a new signposting protocol for roadside signage incorporating information about who can use a route and providing destination and distance information where appropriate.

**Information for different users:** We have produced a promotional banner, leaflet and new easy access web page to publicise the hire of tramper mobility scooters and list of suitable countryside sites. We have supported the development of several audio trails, e.g. at Shaw Wood near Alfreton and around North East Derbyshire. We have also provided a new Horse Ride Derbyshire leaflet, promotional banner and web page with links to other local horse riding groups and organisations. Path grading information has been introduced on our path survey forms which are shared with others. PDNPA initiatives have included a series of leaflets for the Pedal Peak District and Black Harry Trails projects which encourage more people to cycle for health and sustainability reasons, as well as promoting the trails themselves, local attractions and businesses.

**Codes of Conduct:** We have started to develop and promote the codes of conduct to encourage tolerance and respect between different users of the network in conjunction with the LAF and PDNPA.

**Events and festivals:** Along with a range of other organisations, including the PDNPA, we have organised and supported numerous events and festivals around the county with the aim of encouraging more people to visit the countryside and use the access network.

**Healthy lifestyles:** National changes within the health authorities will result in us taking on the public health role. The RoWIP has a role to play in providing the resources and messages to encourage healthy lifestyles, through active recreation and outdoor play opportunities, especially for new users and to also promote the associated mental health benefits. We have already helped set up seven new walking for health groups in the Bolsover area, created a new Trim Track and cycling for health event at Shipley Country Park and in Chesterfield. Links have also been established with Jog Derbyshire and the Active Derbyshire Partnership meetings. There is also an opportunity to develop links with the two Local Nature Partnerships (LNPs) which have recently been established in Derbyshire to enhance the natural environment, promote health & wellbeing and benefit the local economy. They may also be a potential source of funding for helping to deliver some of the RoWIP actions.

**Promoted routes:** Our countryside area staff and volunteers have inspected over 625 miles of promoted routes each year. We have produced seven new publications, including one for the Phoenix Greenways on the Bolsover and Nottinghamshire border. We have also identified and started to deliver an alternative route for the Archaeological Way as part of the Limestone Journeys project in the north-east of the County and have contributed to the establishment of the Erewash Valley Trail, a circular walking and cycling route on the border with Nottinghamshire.

**Sustainable travel:** We have provided a range of information and facilities to encourage more walking, cycling and visits by public transport, eg, the Events booklet and cycle lockers/ bike stands at several locations around the County.

## Changes within the Statement of Action tables

### Added in:

- We have re-organised and re-labelled the identified needs within Aim 4 in order to create a more logical order. This includes a new section about promoting the benefits of the access network for healthy lifestyles, sustainable living, tourism and the local economy (new Aim 4b) and expands Aim 4c) relating to information about easy access to include information that will benefit all users.
- Aim 4c) - The action to improve the availability and quality of information about the definitive map and legal orders has been moved from Aim 2b) and combined with that for the whole range of access opportunities.
- Aim 4c) - The provision of targeted information for all users has been combined under this aim.
- Aim 4c) - A commitment to investigate the provision of additional map based information has been introduced to this section.

### Removed:

- The actions to provide new signage for PRow with symbols showing who can use each type of route, along with distance and destination details, have been moved to Aim 1 because this is now part of our routine work.
- Aim 4e) - This section has been incorporated into another dealing with how we can promote the network better. The action to carry out a review of routes promoted by partner organisations has been replaced by one in which we support routes promoted by partner organisations that complement RoWIP aims and themes.

## Aim 4: Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network

|  | Proposed actions  | Resources | Delivered by               | Key Partners | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies |
|--|---|-----------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Identified need: 4a) Ensure that path/route signage is as informative as possible</b> |   |           |                            |              |             |                                  |
| i  | Provide new signs with additional information, such as destination and distance, to connect to and from the Greenways/trails network, in addition to motivational | ★★<br>£   | DCC, PDNPA, Local Councils | User groups  | Ongoing     | LTP3, RoWIP Theme B              |

|  | Proposed actions  | Resources | Delivered by                | Key Partners   | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies                          |
|--|---|-----------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|---|
|  | signage along the routes themselves as budgets permit.  |           |                             |  |             |   |
| ii   | Respond to requests for signage to benefit local businesses, landowners, tourism destinations or other places of interest as funding allows.  | ★★★<br>£  | DCC, PDNPA, National Forest | Destination Management Partnership, Local businesses and tourism organisations | Ongoing     | PDNP Management Plan, National Forest Plan, RoWIP Theme C |
| iii  | Ensure that access land is well signed.   | ★★<br>£   | DCC, PDNPA                  | LAFs, Natural England, Land managers   | Ongoing     |   |
| iv   | Install signs that provide users with information about who is entitled to use each category of route and encourage responsible use where appropriate. The priority will be to start with the Greenways/Trails network. | ★<br>£    | DCC, PDNPA                  | User groups, LAFs  | Ongoing     | RoWIP Theme A   |
| <b>Identified need: 4b) Promote the benefits of the access network for healthy lifestyles, sustainable living, tourism and the local economy</b> |   |           |                             |  |             |   |
| i  | Provide information about the social and health benefits of walking, cycling and horse riding.  | ★★        | DCC, PDNPA                  | Groundwork Trusts, PCTs, Derbyshire Sport, LNPs                                | Ongoing     | LTP3, Active Derbyshire Plan, RoWIP Theme B               |



|     | <b>Proposed actions</b>  | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b>                                      | <b>Key Partners</b>   | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>     |
|-----|--|------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|
| ii  | Promote the network as a resource that can be used by health schemes (walking for health, Jog Derbyshire, cycling and mental health projects) or for health referrals by health professionals.                                 | ★★★              | DCC, PDNPA   | Groundwork Trusts, District Councils, PCTs, Walking for Health schemes, Derbyshire Sport, LNPs, DACES                         | Ongoing            | LTP3, Active Derbyshire Plan, RoWIP Theme B |
| iii | Encourage the promotion of routes to support tourism, the local economy and complement RoWIP themes and aims eg new National Forest Way, Derwent Valley Heritage Way and Monsal Trail.   | ★★★<br>£         | All partners with promoted routes, PDNPA, Tourism bodies | Local and District Councils, User groups, National Forest, Groundwork Trusts, Access stakeholders, LNPs, Tourist destinations | Ongoing            | RoWIP Themes B and C                        |
| iv  | Increase opportunities to promote a more sustainable use of the access network, through links to public/ community transport or park and ride/walk opportunities or combined promotional information with transport providers. | ★★★<br>£         | DCC, PDNPA   | Public Transport providers  | Ongoing            | RoWIP Themes B and C                        |

|  | <b>Proposed actions</b>  | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b>                                       | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>  |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| <b>Identified need: 4c) Improve the availability and quality of information about the access network for all users</b> |  |                  |                     |   |                    |  |
| i  | Continue to develop websites and other options to provide information about the whole range of access opportunities, including improvements to on-line PRow mapping.                             | ★★               | DCC, PDNPA          |   | From 2013/14       | RoWIP Themes B and C   |
| ii   | Investigate the feasibility of introducing a path grading system for individual paths.   | ★★★              | DCC                 | PDNPA, LAFs, User groups                                  | From 2013/14       | RoWIP Theme B  |
| iii  | Provide targeted information about easy access paths and facilities (including mobility scooters and electric bike network) providing links to web pages and information in local access guides. | ★★<br>£          | DCC, PDNPA          | Local Access Groups, LAFs, Other disability organisations | Ongoing            | ROWIP Themes B and C   |
| iv   | Promote cycling around the county and specifically to keep the Cycle Derbyshire leaflet and associated information up to date.   | ★★<br>£          | DCC, PDNPA          | Sustrans, User groups, Tourism interests                  | Ongoing            | Tourism, Active Derbyshire Plan, PDNPA Recreation Strategy, RoWIP Themes B and C |

|     | <b>Proposed actions</b>   | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b>  | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b>         |
|-----|---|------------------|---------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| v   | Promote horse riding around the county and specifically to keep the Horse Ride Derbyshire leaflet and associated information up to date. Seek opportunities to expand the horse box parking scheme.               | ★★<br>£          | DCC,<br>PDNPA       | BHS,<br>User groups  | Ongoing            | PDNPA Recreation Strategy, RoWIP Themes B and C |
| vi  | Produce publicly available information, focusing on responsible recreational driving of motor vehicles, providing specific information targeted at motorised vehicle users. New DCC web page planned for 2013/14. | ★★<br>£          | DCC,<br>PDNPA       | LAFs,<br>User groups   | 2013/14            | RoWIP Theme C                                   |
| vii | Ensure that our existing promoted routes and trails are inspected regularly, are in good repair and review the promotion/ alignment of these routes, starting with the Archaeological Way.                        | ★★<br>£££<br>HLF | DCC                 | Volunteers,<br>Local Councils/<br>community groups,<br>User groups,<br>PDNPA,<br>Creswell Crags Heritage Trust | Ongoing            | RoWIP Themes B and C                            |

|  | Proposed actions   | Resources | Delivered by                                      | Key Partners   | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies                                 |
|--|--|-----------|---|--|-------------|--|
| <b>Identified need: 4d) Encourage responsible use and develop people's confidence in the use of the access network</b> |  |           |   |  |             |  |
| i  | Promote the countryside and moorland visitor codes to encourage more responsible use of the countryside and open access land, along with respect for the people who live and work there.   | ★★        | Natural England, Moorland Association, PDNPA, DCC | TICs, LAFs, User groups, Moors for the Future, Land managers                             | Ongoing     | RoWIP Theme A  |
| ii   | Continue to develop Codes of Conduct for all users and raise awareness with land managers and user groups.   | ★★<br>£   | DCC, PDNPA  | LAFs, Adjacent authorities, User groups, NFU/CLA, Land managers                          | Ongoing     | PDNPA Recreation Strategy, RoWIP Themes A and B                  |
| iii  | Develop confidence among current non users through provision of events and support programmes and development of new technology (MP3 players, mobile phones, Bluetooth, audio trails etc). | ★★        | DCC, PDNPA  | Derbyshire Sport, PCTs, District Councils, Groundwork Trusts, Walking for Health schemes | Ongoing     | Active Derbyshire Plan, PDNPA Recreation Strategy, RoWIP Theme B |

## **Aim 5: Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way**

### **Background**

The actions in this section will ensure that there is appropriate support and ample opportunities for communities to be actively involved in monitoring, maintaining and improving their local rights of way network.

The key conclusions from the original assessment carried out for the RoWIP identified the need to develop closer partnership working with local people and make better use of volunteers. This has since been emphasised further with the national introduction of the Localism Act 2011.

## **Progress and developments since 2007**

**Minor Maintenance Agreements (MMA) with local councils:** we continue to work with local councils through MMAs and still have 141 parish/town councils registered with the scheme. About half of these actively carry out work on the ground (mainly in the form of strimming, minor vegetation clearance, waymarking and minor path repairs), and make yearly claims for payment. We had made a commitment in the first Statement of Action to review this scheme but, with reducing revenue budgets, we are not currently in a position to do this. We will honour the agreements that we have in place, providing that we have the money available, and look to provide support to local councils in other ways.

**SLAs:** We have developed four successful SLAs to generate added value to the work that we can deliver on our own. These SLAs have been with the PDNPA, BTCV (now TCV) and two Groundwork Trusts: Groundwork Derby and Derbyshire and Groundwork Creswell. The work that has been carried out through these schemes is varied and includes contributions by the Peak Park Conservation Volunteers to access related work within the National Park, project working based around specific parishes by the Groundwork Trusts and general volunteer tasks on access projects by BTCV. The SLAs have changed and developed over the five years and we will need to keep them under review to take advantage of any opportunities that arise to deliver access projects and also to ensure value for money.

**Condition surveys:** Path surveys have been completed in 74 parishes over the period from 2007-11 using volunteers through SLAs and work with area countryside staff. In addition, volunteers from local user groups have contributed to the twice yearly ease of use condition surveys of public rights of way.

**Work with user groups, other stakeholders and volunteers:** The majority of the work with other groups and individuals is carried out through our area countryside staff. More user groups than ever are keen to help with practical tasks such as the local Ramblers Association (RA) group in Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire working with our north area staff and local RA members in the Derbyshire Dales area carrying out parish surveys with Groundwork and PRow Inspector support. More local parish based footpath and bridleway groups have also been set up in conjunction with local councils or local community groups to whom we have provided support to for delivering access improvements.

Over the past five years, we have generated in excess of 6,000 volunteer days on access projects through the various SLAs and through supporting local groups and individuals. We want to improve on the amount and quality of the work that we do with volunteers of all ages and have recently seized on the opportunity to establish

a new Project Officer for working with volunteers as part of a review of the countryside service.

## Changes within the Statement of Action tables

### Added in:

- The need to investigate how best to harness local interest, what are the options and alternatives (Aim 5b) ii).
- A section on working with landowners previously identified as actions within Aims 1 and 3 in the first Statement of Action.

### Removed:

- The specific actions relating to signposting have been incorporated into routine work in Aim 1.
- The specific actions with respect to path surveys, as these are mainly carried out within Aim 5b) i through SLAs or other types of involvement with groups/ volunteers.

## Aim 5: Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way

|  | Proposed actions  | Resources | Delivered by | Key Partners  | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies |
|--|---|-----------|--------------|---|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Identified need: 5a) Increase involvement of user groups and other volunteer groups/individuals in managing and improving local rights of way</b> |   |           |              |   |             |                                  |
| i  | Give greater emphasis to work with user groups and other local community/ volunteer groups to deliver actions in the RoWIP either through use of SLAs or otherwise. Report number of groups active, number of volunteer days provided and any outputs achieved. | ★<br>££   | DCC, PDNPA   | User groups, LAFs, District and Local Councils, PDNPA, Ground-work Trusts, TCV, Civic Voice, Youth Forums | Ongoing     | RoWIP Themes B and C             |

|   | Proposed actions   | Resources      | Delivered by | Key Partners  | Time scales | Link to themes/ other strategies     |
|---|--|----------------|--------------|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Identified need: 5b) Increase involvement of local councils in managing local rights of way</b>              |  |                |              |   |             |                                      |
| i   | Continue to work with parish and town councils still signed up through the existing Minor Maintenance Scheme.  | ★<br>££        | DCC          | Local Councils  | Ongoing     | RoWIP Themes B and C                 |
| ii  | Provide support and advice and where feasible small amounts of funding to enable parish and town councils to undertake surveys, repairs or improvements to local rights of way that deliver RoWIP actions. Any funding to be identified through the LTP funding programme. | ★★★LTP3<br>£££ | DCC          | Local Councils, User groups, Community groups/ volunteers, DALC | 2012-16     | LTP3, RoWIP Themes B and C           |
| <b>Identified need: 5c) Increase involvement of land managers in managing and improving local rights of way</b> |  |                |              |   |             |                                      |
| i   | Work with landowners/ managers to raise awareness of shared PRow responsibilities.   | ★★             | DCC<br>PDNPA | Land-owners and managers, CLA/ NFU, PDNPA, LAFs                 | Ongoing     |                                      |
| ii  | Work with landowners/ managers to help to identify and secure improvements to the network (providing financial   | ★★<br>£        | DCC<br>PDNPA | Land-owners and managers, CLA/NFU, PDNPA, LAFs                  |             | RoWIP Themes A & C<br>Links to 3d) i |

|  | <b>Proposed actions</b>   | <b>Resources</b> | <b>Delivered by</b> | <b>Key Partners</b> | <b>Time scales</b> | <b>Link to themes/ other strategies</b> |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|
|  | incentives in respect to new path furniture, legal orders and where appropriate implementing work on the ground). |                  |                     |                     |                    |   |

### **Equality Analysis**

The RoWIP with its Statement of Action has an important role to play in providing the physical resources and messages to encourage active healthy lifestyles and physical wellbeing for all ages. It has significant benefits for each of the protected characteristic groups as defined by the Equality Act 2010.

We have carried out an equality analysis which is set out in Appendix F. The findings have been incorporated into the new Statement of Action and will be reflected in the annual work programmes for delivering the RoWIP through to 2017. Three additional actions were identified to help address some of the issues affecting the protected characteristic groups:

| Identified Actions  | Timescale                     |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Target Protected Characteristic Groups to be consulted on specific actions as appropriate during the delivery of the RoWIP   | 2013-2017 as required         |
| 2. Large scale projects within the RoWIP Statement of Action should have their own Equality Analysis if appropriate   | 2013-2017 as required         |
| 3. Carry out a periodic review of how we are engaging with the Protected Characteristic Groups and include a section on Equalities within the RoWIP Annual Monitoring Reports to ensure that this work remains high profile | Annually throughout 2013-2017 |

## **Section 4 - Implementation and Monitoring**

### **4.1 Implementation**

The Statement of Action has been structured in order to identify the level of resources required, provide an indication of the estimated costs for a particular action and the level of partnership working that would be required to deliver the action.

We will be implementing this new Statement of Action during what will be a very challenging time for local authorities as we are faced with significantly reduced



budgets over the coming years. We will not be able to implement all the actions immediately or on our own. This is why it will be necessary for us to work in partnership with other organisations and individuals. We will also have to look to attract additional internal and external funding as opportunities arise. Many of our larger projects are realised through funding packages consisting of more than one source and it is common practice to match fund several funding sources to secure a total project budget. Within the current economic climate, these funding streams are increasingly difficult to secure.

The public consultation exercise which was carried out on the draft Statement of Action has helped to identify and set the priorities which, in turn, will affect its implementation. The second Statement of Action will be supported by comprehensive annual work programmes that will take into account the resources available at the time. These will set out more detailed plans and targets, list individual schemes and will be submitted to the LAFs each year.

## **4.2 Monitoring and Review**

We will produce annual monitoring reports to demonstrate progress made against the Statement of Action and the links to the three key themes. These will be reported to the two Local Access Forums for the county and published on our website.

The LAFs will also have a role in the implementation and monitoring of the RoWIP, in addition to its formal ten year review in 2017.

## **Appendix A - Glossary of Terms Used**

**Access Authority** - local highway and national park authorities with powers and responsibilities for areas of open access land.

**Biodiversity** - a way of looking at the whole picture relating to wildlife which includes both habitats and species, and the relationship between them.

**Community Infrastructure Levy** – this is a new levy that local authorities can choose to charge on new developments in their area. The money can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the Council, local community and neighbourhoods want. Charges are based on the size and type of the new development.

**Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000** - creates a legal right of access for people on foot to certain types of open land. Additionally, it made changes to the law governing PRow and strengthened nature conservation legislation to facilitate better management of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs).

**Definitive Map and Statement** - the legal record of PRow, showing their position and status. A surveying authority may produce a new consolidated Definitive Map and Statement for the whole of its area, effectively combining all the separate documents that were originally published for the former rural and urban districts or which have been inherited in part from other authorities as a result of county boundary changes.

**Derbyshire Mapping Portal** - provides a single point of access to geographic information held by councils throughout Derbyshire, including PRow and adopted highways. Using web-mapping technology, it overlays many types of information on one map and, where available, provides links to the relevant council's website.

**Ease of Use Survey** - based on BVPI 178, a former national Best Value Performance Indicator which was used to monitor the 'ease of use' of public rights of way. The assessment is made using a set of criteria relating to the presence of signposting or unlawful obstructions, surface condition and that of any path furniture. Each route is also assessed on the basis of its ease of use for the different groups entitled to use it.

**Equality Act 2010** - replaces most of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and provides the legal framework to tackle disadvantage and discrimination. It applies in several areas, including employment, education, functions of public bodies and access to goods, services and facilities.

**Greenways** - largely car-free, off-road routes connecting people to facilities and open spaces in and around towns, cities and the countryside; for shared use by people of all abilities on foot, bike or horseback, for car-free commuting, play or leisure.

**Highway Authority** - the body responsible for maintaining public highways, including rights of way, and keeping them free from obstruction.

### **Legal Orders**

- Definitive Map Modification Orders
- Public Path Orders
- Traffic Regulation Orders, including temporary closures

**Limestone Journeys** – this is a five year programme (2011-2015) of activity funded through the Heritage Lottery scheme which focuses on the unique landscape and heritage of the North East Derbyshire Magnesian Limestone area. There are several access related projects within this programme, the main one being the re-alignment and re-development of the Archaeological Way.

**Local Access Forum (LAF)** - this is a statutory body established under the CROW Act to provide strategic advice on matters connected to outdoor recreation and access. There are two within Derbyshire: the Peak District LAF and the Derby and Derbyshire LAF (DADLAF).

**Local rights of way** - these include the following paths and access opportunities: PRow (Footpaths, Bridleways, Restricted Byways and BOATs, off-road cycle tracks, Greenways (multi-user trails), permissive paths through woodland, parks, estates or along canal towpaths, open access land and Non Classified Highways.

**Minor Maintenance Agreements (MMA)** - an agreement between the County Council and selected local councils for them to manage some elements of path maintenance works on PRow in their own area.

**National Forest** - the National Forest was established by the Government in April 1995 and is sponsored by defra. It covers a 200 square mile area that straddles the borders of Derbyshire, Staffordshire and Leicestershire, and is being created through working partnerships and with community participation with a view to transforming the area into a range of land uses framed by woodland.

**Non-Classified Highway (NCH)** - a minor public highway. Some are unsurfaced and commonly referred to as “green lanes”. The terminology cannot be relied on to determine the legal status of a route, only the fact that it is maintainable at public expense.

**Open Access Land** - a specific area of land where a new right of access on foot applies (often referred to as the “Right to Roam”). These areas were designated under the CRow Act 2000.

**Permissive Path** - a path which the landowner has given permission for the public to use. These are also sometimes referred to as concessionary paths.

**Promoted Route** - a route which has been endorsed by the County Council, with accompanying information (usually a leaflet or guide book) or which is actively promoted in some other way, eg, with signage or through a website.

**PRoW - Public Rights of Way:**

- (i) **Public Footpath** - a route for people on foot only (but can be used in wheelchairs or with pushchairs).
- (ii) **Public Bridleway** - a route for walkers, horse riders and pedal cyclists.
- (iii) **Restricted Byway** - a route for walkers, horse riders, pedal cyclists and drivers of horse drawn carriages, which motorised vehicles are not entitled to use.
- (iv) **Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT)** - a route that is mainly used for the purposes for which footpaths and bridleways are used, ie, by walkers, horse riders and pedal cyclists, but which motorised vehicles are allowed to use.

**Quiet Lanes** - minor rural roads, carrying light levels of vehicular traffic that can be made more attractive to those people who wish to walk, cycle or ride a horse along them whilst linking other off-road routes.

**Section 106 Agreements** – these are developer contributions (Section 106 Planning Obligations) that can be used to help mitigate the potential negative impacts of new development and minimise any loss or damage to services and facilities, and environmental resources on or adjacent to a development site. In addition to planning conditions, planning obligations can be used where they would help to make new development proposals acceptable.

**Statutory Declarations** – these are statements and maps that landowners have given to the Council which identify the PRow on their land. They then make an associated declaration stating that they do not intend to dedicate any further rights of way on their land. These declarations, which have to be renewed at regular intervals, help prevent new rights of way being claimed across the landowners land.

**Strategic Cycle Network** – this is the cycle network identified in the LTP and relates mainly to the off-road opportunities for safer cycling in the County but there may be some short linking on road sections.

**Surveying Authority** - the body responsible for the preparation and upkeep of the Definitive Map and Statement of PRow.

**Sustrans** - a charity which works on practical projects to help reduce motor traffic, including provision of the National Cycle Network and Safe Routes to Schools. Often used by Government to channel funding for cycle related projects.

## **Appendix B - Summary of Relevant Plans and Strategies**

Statutory guidance issued by defra in November 2002 suggests that a wide range of plans and strategies may be of relevance in the preparation of the RoWIP. The following is not an exhaustive list, but represents the range of interests that overlap with rights of way and wider countryside access issues:-

### **National Government Policies and Guidance**

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Active Travel Choices: Cycling and Walking (Department for Transport (DfT) 2010)
- Guidance for Authorising Structures (gaps, gates and stiles) on PRoW – Good Practice Guidance on Compliance with the Equality Act 2010 (defra 2010)
- Strategy for the Horse Industry in England and Wales (defra 2011)
- At Least Five a Week: evidence on the impact of physical activity and its relationship to health. A report by the Chief Medical Officer (Department for Health 2004)

### **Other National Strategies, Plans and Information**

- UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK Biodiversity Partnership)
- By All Reasonable Means: inclusive access to the Outdoors for disabled people (Natural England 2005)
- Sustrans - various initiatives: Improving access by foot and bike, promoting sustainable travel; Liveable Neighbourhoods; Safe Routes to Schools
- Walking facts and figures!: The benefits of walking (Ramblers Association 2010)
- The Economic and Social Value of Walking in England (Ramblers Association 2003)
- The Health Benefit of Horse Riding in the UK (British Horse Society)

### **Regional Policy and Strategies**

- On Trent Initiative 2005-2024
- The National Forest Strategy 2004-2014
- The National Forest Cycling Strategy 2002
- Putting Wildlife Back on the Map: A Biodiversity Strategy for the East Midlands
- Green Infrastructure Strategy – 6C's Area (2010)

### **County Policies, Plans and Strategies**

- Derbyshire Leading the Way County Council Plan 2010-2014
- DCC Environmental Services Departmental Service Plan 2012-2013
- Sustainable Community Strategy for Derbyshire
- Derbyshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Derby and Derbyshire Mineral Local Plan
- Derbyshire LTP3 2011-2026
- Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan and Developer Contributions Protocol
- Active Derbyshire Plan – Derbyshire Sport.
- Biodiversity Action Plans for Derbyshire (Lowland and Peak District)
- 3 Greenway Strategies for Derbyshire
- The Landscape Character of Derbyshire
- Transport Asset Management Plan

### **Local Plans and Strategies**

- 8 District/Borough Council Local Plans
- Derby City Council Local Plan
- Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) Core Strategy
- Recreation Strategy and Action Plan for the Peak District National Park 2010-2020
- PDNPA Sustainable Transport Action Plan 2012-2017
- District/Borough Economic/Regeneration Strategies
- District/Borough Community Strategies
- Chesterfield Canal Access Strategy
- Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site Management Plan

## Appendix C - Environmental Statement for the RoWIP

### Introduction

The LTP3 2011 - 2026, sets out the long term strategic priorities for the promotion of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport from and within Derbyshire County Council's area.

Throughout the development of the Derbyshire LTP3, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) have been used<sup>1</sup> to ensure a high level of environmental protection and the integration of environmental considerations into its preparation and decision making process. The RoWIP is included within the Derbyshire LTP3 as a more detailed transport-related plan to help deliver our priorities and therefore the aims contained within the RoWIP were subject to environmental consideration through the development of the LTP3 preferred strategy.

By including the RoWIP as a linked Plan, the SEA and HRA were able to incorporate the aims of the RoWIP into the development of the Derbyshire LTP3. This new Statement of Action to be updated for 2012-2017 enables the RoWIP to be fully aligned with the Derbyshire LTP3, its environmental considerations and actions to address these. The SEA and HRA can be found using the link [www.derbyshire.gov.uk/localtransportplan](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/localtransportplan).

### Addressing Environmental Issues

As part of the SEA and HRA, we identified the key environmental issues and potential future trends that were related to transport (including rights of way), and its wider influences in Derbyshire using a wide range of evidence. The result of this stage was the development of 13 environmental objectives, with further sub-objectives to ensure that more detailed environmental considerations were made. These 13 objectives and their sub-objectives have been embraced within this review of the RoWIP Statement of Action for 2012-17 and form the environmental objectives for taking the RoWIP forward.

#### Environmental Objectives

**SEA1** Protect and enhance the natural character (landscapes, townscapes and the historic and natural environment) including the setting of heritage assets, of the whole plan area, with due regard to areas of environmental sensitivity.

<sup>1</sup> SEA is required for certain plans which include LTPs, under European Directive 2001/42/EC, which was transposed into English law through The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (Statutory Instrument 2004 no 1633). Habitats Regulations Assessment is required under European Directive 92/43/ECC and have been transposed in England by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.



- Maintain the transport asset for local travel to protect landscape character, sense of place and the natural and historic environment.
  - Reduce light pollution and help to preserve dark skies.
  - Avoid damage to the World Heritage Site and all heritage assets, including their setting.
  - Help preserve remoteness and tranquillity within the Peak District National Park and other areas of tranquil countryside.
  - Prevent damage to the landscape and biodiversity assets within it due to increases in recreational walking, cycling, motorcycling etc.
  - Reduce the visual impact of transport infrastructure.
- SEA2** Protect and enhance European Sites, legally protected species and national sites designated for their biodiversity and geological interests, ensuring that these receive the highest level of consideration at all times, and consider other local sites, habitats and species, including measures to reduce habitat fragmentation and enhance connectivity.
- SEA3** Support a resilient economy.
- SEA4** To reduce motorised traffic growth through a combination of demand management measures, land-use planning and encouragement of the use of more sustainable transport modes.
- Promote behavioural change to encourage healthier, more sustainable travel habits.
  - Support sustainable tourism.
  - Improve access to key services and facilities using sustainable travel modes of transport.
  - Improve health by encouraging walking and cycling, reducing pollution and reducing health inequalities.
  - Influence the location of development to make efficient use of existing physical infrastructure and to help reduce the need to travel.
- SEA5** Minimise noise and vibration impacts.
- SEA6** Ensure the provision of transport and services considers the needs of elderly people, particularly in rural areas.
- SEA7** Improve road safety through targeted interventions and make travel feel safer, particularly by non-car modes.
- SEA8** Improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.
- SEA9** Enhance well-being and sense of community by reducing traffic impacts, creating more opportunities for social contact and better access to leisure facilities and the natural environment.
- SEA10** Reduce transport's emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases with the desired outcome of tackling climate change.
- SEA11** Reduce the emission of air pollutants from transport in declared Air Quality Management Areas which relate to local traffic.
- SEA12** Enhance the network's resilience to climate change, eg reduce the risk of flooding.
- SEA13** Minimise the use of environmental resources.
- Minimise energy usage and reduce dependency on non-renewable resources.
  - Increase the proportion of re-used and recycled materials used in roads and rights of way construction and maintenance.
  - Use locally sourced materials wherever feasible.

## Environmental Effects

The SEA and HRA identified that there should be no significant negative effects of the Derbyshire LTP3 Strategy. In addition it was likely that there would be significant positive effects.

## Predicted effects of the Derbyshire LTP3 Strategy

|  |  |                  |  |                  | Timescale of impact |                  |      |             |  |
|--|--|------------------|--|------------------|---------------------|------------------|------|-------------|--|
|  |  |                  |  |                  | Short               | Medium           | Long |             |  |
| SEA 1 Protect and enhance the landscape character (landscapes, townscapes and the historic and natural environment), including the setting of heritage assets, of the whole plan area, with due regard to areas of multiple environmental sensitivity. |  |                  |  |                  | -                   | 0                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 2 Protect and enhance nature (biodiversity, geodiversity, wildlife flora and fauna) and take measures to reduce habitat fragmentation and enhance connectivity.  |  |                  |  |                  | 0/+                 | +                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 3 Support a resilient economy.   |  |                  |  |                  | 0                   | +                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 4 To reduce motorised traffic growth through a combination of demand management measures, land use planning and encouragement of the use of more sustainable transport modes (also climatic).  |  |                  |  |                  | +                   | +                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 5 Minimise noise and vibration impacts.  |  |                  |  |                  | ?                   | +                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 6 Ensure the provision of transport and services considers the needs of elderly people, particularly in rural areas.   |  |                  |  |                  | +                   | +                | ++   |             |  |
| SEA 7 Improve road safety through targeted interventions and make travel feel safer, particularly by non-car modes.  |  |                  |  |                  | +                   | +                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 8 Improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.  |  |                  |  |                  | +                   | +                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 9 Enhance well-being and sense of community by reducing traffic impacts, creating more opportunities for social contact and better access to leisure activities and the natural environment.   |  |                  |  |                  | +                   | +                | ++   |             |  |
| SEA 10 Reduce transport's emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, with the desired outcome of tackling climate change.   |  |                  |  |                  | 0                   | +                | ++   |             |  |
| SEA 11 Reduce the emission of air pollutants from transport in declared Air Quality Management Areas which relate to local traffic.  |  |                  |  |                  | 0                   | 0                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 12 Enhance the network's resilience to climate, change e.g. reduce the risk of flooding.   |  |                  |  |                  | 0                   | 0                | +    |             |  |
| SEA 13 Minimise the use of environmental resources.  |  |                  |  |                  | +                   | +                | ++   |             |  |
| Key  |  |                  |  |                  |                     |                  |      |             |  |
| ++ Significant Positive  |  | + Minor Positive |  | 0 Neutral effect |                     | - Minor negative |      | ? Uncertain |  |

In coming to this conclusion, we recognised that this assessment was based upon a number of uncertainties in what would actually be delivered. Therefore, there was a degree of risk of negative impacts from the Plan's

implementation. To help minimise this risk, as part of the development of the RoWIP Statement of Action, we reviewed the relevant actions contained within the Derbyshire LTP3 related to rights of way against the SEA and HRA environmental considerations required to mitigate any negative effects and to accentuate the positive effects.

### **Minimising Negative Effects**

The key actions to minimise negative effects are:

- Minimising visual impact arising from transport assets, e.g. new rights of way or Green Infrastructure.
- Minimising the potential for increased traffic and its associated effects by people accessing rights of way and Greenways, e.g. visual intrusion from traffic and parking, localised congestion, carbon emissions, noise and air pollution, including nitrogen deposition on habitats.
- Minimising energy usage, carbon emissions and light pollution from street lighting on new or existing rights of way or Greenways.
- Minimising the impact on habitats and species (particularly European sites and species), from an increase in recreational activity e.g. disturbance of species, damage to habitats or deaths of protected species.
- Minimising damage to landscapes, historical assets, geological interests and biodiversity, particularly from motorised vehicles in the countryside.
- Minimising the use of primary materials through new infrastructure or maintenance regimes.

### **Taking Opportunities for Positive Effects**

The key opportunities for significant positive effects are:

- Ensuring that rights of way and Greenway provision considers the needs of elderly people, particularly in rural areas, e.g. improving and promoting their use for accessing services.
- Enhance well-being and sense of community by promoting smarter choices to reduce traffic impacts, creating more opportunities for social contact and better access to leisure activities and the natural environment, e.g. increasing access to green space.
- Contribute to reducing transport's emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, e.g. by promoting smarter choices.
- Re-use materials and use recycled materials through new infrastructure or maintenance regimes.

Other opportunities for positive effects are:

- Use of appropriate materials and good design principles to enhance landscapes, townscapes and historic environments.
- Improve health by providing rights of way and Greenways to be used for physical exercise and to promote healthier lifestyles.
- Using rights of way and Greenway corridors to provide habitats or link up habitats, e.g. Green Infrastructure.
- Improving and promoting rights of way and Greenways to support local economies, access local services and to support sustainable tourism.
- Reduce the number and risk of vulnerable road users being killed or seriously injured in road collisions.
- Reduce crime/fear of crime for people using rights of way and Greenways.
- Enhance resilience to climate change and consider flood risk.

## **Appendix D - Extract from LTP3 Investment Protocol (2011) relevant to the RoWIP**

The following is a summary of the LTP3 Investment Policies which are most relevant to the RoWIP.

Further details and documentation about the LTP and Investment Protocol can be found at [www.derbyshire.gov.uk/localtransportplan](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/localtransportplan).

### **SUPPORT**

- IP1 Carriageway maintenance
- IP2b Footway maintenance key routes
- IP3 Bridges, structures, retaining walls and highway boundary structures maintenance
- IP4 Gully and drain management
- IP5 Asset replacement/removal
- IP6 Lighting
  - IP6a Switching off streetlights
  - IP6b Removing unnecessary lighting
- IP7 Rights of way
  - IP7a Access for All
  - IP7b Rights of Way Structural Integrity
  - IP7c Protection and restoration of habitats and species alongside Public Rights of Way in accordance with the findings of the statutory Environmental Assessments
- IP10 Highway maintenance environmental checklist
  - IP10a Listed highway structures
  - IP10b Road verge reserves
  - IP10c Conservation of character
  - IP10d Waste management
- IP23 An evidence based approach to transport network management
- IP26 Route Management Planning
- IP31 Enhancing the street scene
- IP33 Parking management
- IP34 Incident management and emergency responses
- IP36 Securing developer funding
- IP47 Schemes to reduce animal deaths – protected species
- IP48 Schemes to minimise water pollution
- IP51a Pedestrian quality networks
- IP52a Cycling networks
- IP53 Bus
- IP54c Local travel to and from rail stations (by bus, walk and cycle)
- IP56 Travel Planning

IP59a Transport information  
IP59b Personalised travel marketing project  
IP59c Transport provision mapping  
IP62d Equality impact analysis  
IP74 Evidence-based casualty reduction initiatives  
IP75 Road Safety Partnership working  
IP76 Road safety audit procedures  
IP78 Safer routes to school  
IP82 Community Safety improvement measures  
IP91 Complete routes for healthy cycle networks  
IP92 New pedestrian networks  
IP94 High quality network of (access to) green spaces  
IP95 Transport infrastructure and new developments  
IP96 Transport and spatial planning liaison  
IP97 Developer contributions  
IP98 Environmental assessment, mitigation and enhancement (new infrastructure)  
IP102 Environmental mitigation and enhancement (overarching)  
IP105 Smarter travel packages of measures for targeted locations  
IP106 Sustainable Drainage Systems

**USE SPARINGLY – NOT LIKELY TO BE WIDESPREAD**

IP14 Renewable energy (to increase from current levels)  
IP15 Noise reduction  
IP67 New footways or bridges  
IP72 Quiet lanes  
IP83 New infrastructure which creates a net increase for the authority to maintain  
IP99 New assets

**NO SUPPORT (UNLESS EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES)**

**IP16 Porous surfacing**  
**IP20 Hard surfacing of low frequency footway networks**  
**IP50 Park and Ride (permanent schemes)**  
**IP84 Remedial measures where there is no evidence of a casualty problem**  
**IP103 New street lighting**  
**IP104 Provision of (new) parking facilities**

## **Appendix E - Rights of Way Charter 2011**

# **Rights of Way Charter**

Derbyshire County Council

A guide to the level of service you can expect from  
the Council's Rights of Way Service

Ian Stephenson  
Strategic Director – Environmental Services

June 2011

## **1. Introduction**

This Charter complements the County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. It explains how we will prioritise enquiries we receive from our customers. This Charter is not intended to describe the way in which the Council carries out its duties.

The Rights of Way Team implements the Council's statutory duties and policies in respect of the protection and management of the public rights of way network. The Council manages 3,200 miles (5176 km) of public paths, approximately 9,311 paths.

The Council has a duty to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway for which it is the highway authority (Section 130 Highways Act 1980). This includes public rights of way. In addition to this the Council has powers which are available to it to manage the rights of way network. The Council recognises that it is important to balance the resources it needs to exercise its powers, for example making public path orders, against its duties prescribed in the legislation. The Council will therefore continue to use its powers in order to provide a service to the landowning community and the visitors to the county.

Public rights of way provide opportunities for recreation as well as providing an intricate transport network for access to schools, businesses as well as the day to day movement of people. In addition, the Council seeks opportunities to create and enhance public access to the countryside where ever possible. To this end we will work with landowners and their tenants to ensure that paths are maintained free of obstruction.

We will also continue to work closely with local voluntary and community groups, parish councils and other stakeholders utilising existing and, where appropriate, external funding to deliver an enhanced Service.

This Charter will be made available as a download on the Council's web site. It will also be published as a leaflet in an abbreviated form and made available at libraries and a selection of public places including Tourist Information Centres.

## **2. How we will deal with your enquiry**

The Council receives enquiries in 4 different ways:

- Telephone.
- Letter (including FAX).
- Email (including online web forms).
- In person.



All enquiries are logged into a Customer Management System. This ensures all enquiries are traceable. You may request a reference number to assist you with any follow up enquiries.

### **2.1. *Resolving your enquiry***

Enquiries vary in complexity and response times may be influenced by the volume of work. Furthermore we will forward enquires that cannot be resolved by the Rights of Way Team to the correct body but we cannot guarantee in those circumstances that your enquiry will be resolved in line with the time-scales in this Charter. We will explain this to you when we respond.

- We will acknowledge the receipt of your letter within 10 working days and your email within 24 hours or the nearest working day.
- We will programme your enquiry and then advise you when we intend to investigate your enquiry within 10 days of receipt.
- Public safety reports will be inspected within 2 working days.
- Non-rights of way matters will be passed to the appropriate body within 10 workings days of receipt.
- We shall notify you when we have resolved your enquiry.

Our response will include one or more of the following elements:

- A full response to your enquiry.
- An indication when your enquiry will be resolved if it requires further research.
- If you have reported a maintenance issue you will be advised when or if the work will be carried out. If you have reported a missing signpost you will be advised when it will erected.
- If you have requested a Public Path Order you will be advised of charges that apply, when the process will commence and the anticipated timescale to completion.
- Some issues are the responsibility of other bodies in which case we will inform you who will be dealing with your query.

Reported problems on paths are investigated in line with their severity and all reports will be dealt with in line with our scheme of priorities. Lower priority reports may be investigated at the same time as reports of a higher priority provided they are in the same locality. The current work programme will be made available on the Council's web site.

## **3. Prioritising Enquiries**

The Rights of Way Team receives a large number of enquiries each year. This inevitably impacts on our ability to resolve every reported issue in a timely way. It is important therefore that we prioritise enquiries. By prioritising enquiries we are better able to program our work. We take into account the level of danger to the public and the effect a reported problem may have on access. This is then used as the basis for placing your enquiry into one of 4 priorities.

For information on how we deal with Public Path Orders and Definitive Map Modification Orders please refer to our policy framework for action<sup>1</sup>.

The four priority categories are listed below with examples of the types of reports that fall into each category. Please note, this list is not exhaustive and is intended to provide an indication of the types of work which will fall into each category.

### **3.1. Priority A Enquiries**

Definition: Emergencies, public safety, non-rights of way issues. Examples include:

- Public Safety
- Harassment and intimidating behaviour or notices
- Potentially dangerous bridge or structure on a right of way
- Unauthorised use by motorised vehicles/horses/bicycles
- Not within the power of the Public Rights of Way Team to resolve. These will be passed to responsible agency for action. Some examples given below:
  - Abandoned vehicles on paths
  - Fly-tipping
  - Litter
  - Dog fouling

**Target: Resolve within 10 working days of receipt except Public Safety which will be investigated and/or resolved within 2 working days which will include appropriate and immediate action to minimise further risk.**

### **3.2. Priority B Enquiries**

Definition: Issues directly affecting or limiting access. Examples include:

- Drainage and flooding issue
- Obstruction and encroachment
- Surface damage, vegetation preventing use by public
- Ploughed path or obstruction by crops
- Stile or gate fault
- Electric fencing
- Erection of a signpost
- Commence processing Public Path Order applications

**Target: Resolve within 14 weeks from receipt**

---

<sup>1</sup> To be published in 2011

### **3.3. *Priority C Enquiries***

Definition: Issues that do not affect access to a significant degree.

Examples include:

- Request for Barriers
- Handrail repairs
- Willful removal of a signpost in order to mislead the public
- Waymarking.

**Target: Resolve within 28 weeks from receipt**

### **3.4. *Priority D Enquiries***

Definition: A group of issues which will be dealt with as soon as practicable.

Examples include:

- Misleading Notices
- Path improvement requests not covered by higher priorities
- Minor obstruction/encroachment with alternative route
- Major works funded by capital bids
- Enquiries relating to non-definitive paths.

**Target: Dealt with as soon as practicable but not as a priority**

## **4. Dealing with complaints**

If you wish to complain about our services you may do so in writing, by fax, email or via the Council's web site – [www.derbyshire.gov.uk](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk).

## **5. Freedom of Information**

The Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations creates significant rights of access to recorded information held by public authorities.

The Council will strive to make as much information about rights of way available to the public as reasonably practicable. Full use will be made of the Council's web site as well as more traditional means of distributing information such as libraries and tourist information centres.

## Appendix F - Greenways Delivered and Proposed Schemes

### A. Greenway delivery 2007-2012

The following list provides details of the 65km of Greenways that have been developed on the ground during the period covered by the first Statement of Action:

| Greenway Routes completed<br>Nov 2007/2012   | Km           | On<br>Road | Comments   |
|--|--------------|------------|--|
| <b>East Derbyshire Greenway Strategy<br/>(Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Erewash and North East Derbyshire)</b> |              |            |  |
| Killamarsh   | 2.80         |            | Killamarsh Greenway + connections to Half Way and Rother Valley via Sustrans Connect 2 scheme  |
| Eckington Bridleway  | 1.85         |            | Bridleways 119 and 147. Safe routes to school  |
| Chesterfield Canal   | 0.60         |            | Renishaw   |
| Shirebrook Colliery  | 4.80         |            | Mineral restoration site UK Coal   |
| Phoenix Greenways  | 2.90         |            | Newton Link + Temple Normanton Link + Pleasley Trails (continues in Nottinghamshire) and Hilcote Community Link                              |
| Archaeological Way   | 2.90         |            | Pleasley County Park + New Houghton link + Poulter Country Park station link, contribution towards HLF Limestone Journeys project            |
| Wingerworth Setts  | 0.35         |            |  |
| Chesterfield Cycle Network   | 3.20         |            | Hipper Valley to Rother Washlands + Spital to Station Link housing development + Royal Hospital Link + A61 Corridor (includes planning gain) |
| Midshires Way  | 4.90         |            | Long Horse Bridge Shardlow Greenway (British Waterways Partnership Project and 6C's funding) and Hopwell to Dale Abbey                       |
| Erewash Valley Trail   | 3.50         |            | Partnership project – 6C's funding   |
| Great Northern Greenway  | 2.90         |            | Breadsall and Links to Breadsall (including grant from emda)   |
| Sandiacre Canal  | 1.30         |            |  |
| Swanwick Greenway  | 0.40         |            | Crays Hill. In partnership with Amber Valley BC  |
| <b>South Derbyshire Greenway Strategy (South Derbyshire)</b>   |              |            |  |
| Great Northern Greenway  | 2.60         | 0.50       | Hilton (from Housing Development) and Etwall   |
| Trent Valley Greenway  | 0.50         |            | Barge Bridge and Cranfleet Lock link   |
| Conkers Circuit  | 1.90         |            | Heart of the National Forest   |
| Swadlincote Church Gresley   | 1.70         |            | Planning gain linked to housing development  |
| Swadlincote NCN63  | 2.60         | 2.10       | 0.2km planning gain Rink Drive to Highfields Road.   |
| <b>West Derbyshire Greenway Strategy (Derbyshire Dales and High Peak)</b>  |              |            |  |
| Peak Forest Canal  | 6.00         |            | Partnership project with British Waterways   |
| Peak Forest Tramway  | 2.25         |            | Bugsworth to Chinley   |
| Pennine Bridleway National Trail   | 4.10         |            | Glossop section. Funded by Natural England   |
| Sett Valley Trail  | 0.50         |            | Links into the Torrs, New Mills  |
| Monsal Trail   | 9.10         |            | Delivered by Peak District National Park Authority   |
| Shallcross Incline   | 1.10         |            | In conjunction with Whaley Bridge Town Council   |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>64.75</b> |            |  |

## **B. Proposed Greenway Schemes 2013-2017**

Three Greenway Strategies have been developed to set out the proposed opportunities for Greenway development. These are:

- East Derbyshire Greenway Strategy 1998,
- South Derbyshire Greenway Strategy 2006
- West Derbyshire and High Peak Greenway Strategy 2008.

Each of the Strategies contain proposal maps which suggest a series of recommended Greenway routes for further investigation, together with a series of tables providing information about the proposed routes. Collectively, at the time of writing, 660km of proposed network has been identified that could be achieved across Derbyshire.

The routes represent the best known opportunities at the times of writing but are constantly updated as new opportunities arise. Many routes have fixed locations awaiting development whilst numerous community links and network connections require further site investigation or development opportunity.

The proposed Greenway routes are listed in the three individual Derbyshire Greenway Strategies which can be viewed separately at:

<http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/leisure/countryside/access/greenways/strategies/default.asp>

It should be recognised that the projects suggested in the Greenway Strategies reflect a snap shot at the time of writing and do not represent a definitive list. New opportunities arise all the time and alignment options change.

Whilst any of the routes listed in the Greenway strategies could be developed if the right opportunities present themselves, our priority will be to fill in gaps in the existing network. In accordance with the LTP3 Investment Protocol, new routes will only be developed if they have a strategic importance and/ or likelihood of related planning gain or funding becoming available. The following list provides our best indication of the routes most likely to be developed over the next 5 years:

| Projected Greenway Projects 2013-2017  | Comments   |
|--|--|
| <b>East Derbyshire Greenway Strategy<br/>(Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Erewash and North East Derbyshire)</b> |  |
| Phoenix Greenways  | Planning gain Blackwell Trail 2.25km: Westhouse sidings: Alfreton Station Link: Batley Lane Bridge |
| Chesterfield Cycle Network   | Somersall to Holymoorside 1km: Station Link  |
| Bolsover - Castle Fields Greenway  | Safe route to school 0.7km   |
| Arkwright Open Cast Site   | Planning gain UK Coal Restoration 5.6km  |
| Archaeological Way   | Langwith Branch Line 1.6km: Creswell Link: Shirebrook to Pleasley Vale: Pleasley Village           |
| Bolsover Loop  | Clowne Branch Line acquisition and development   |
| Park Brook to Woodall  | UK Coal restoration site and link to Rotherham   |
| Holmebrook Valley to Linacre   | In partnership with Severn Trent Water   |
| Great Northern Greenway  | Broomfield to Morley 1.8km: Morley to Stanley  |
| Aldercar to Ironville  | UK Coal Restoration Forge and Monument 4.4km   |
| Little Eaton Branch Line   | Acquisition and development, route spans both Erewash and Amber Valley                             |
| Golden Valley-Swanwick Junction, Butterley   | In partnership with Midland Railway Centre   |
| Bentley Plantation, Shipley to Erewash Canal   | Link between Shipley Country Park and Erewash Canal/Erewash Valley Trail                           |
| <b>South Derbyshire Greenway Strategy (South Derbyshire)</b>   |  |
| Trent and Mersey Canal   | In Partnership with Canal and River Trust  |
| Rosliston Greenway from Swadlincote  | In partnership with Heart of the Forest Forum  |
| Newhall Greenway, Swadlincote  | Former railway   |
| <b>West Derbyshire Greenway Strategy (Derbyshire Dales and High Peak)</b>  |  |
| White Peak Loop - Matlock to Buxton  | Matlock to Oaker 2.5km: Oaker to Rowsley: Rowsley to Bakewell: Wyedale to Buxton                   |
| Pennine Bridleway National Trail   | High Lane to Green Lane and Dinting Wood 4.7km: Bottoms Reservoir to Etherow                       |
| Ambergate – Lockwoods  | Land sale condition 0.7km  |
| Peak Forest Tramway  | Possible link to planning gain opportunity Chinley to Dove Holes Quarry                            |
| Hathersage to Brough   | Route to Hope College  |

**Appendix G - Management of Green Lanes 2012-2017**

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
COUNTRYSIDE SERVICE

Management of Green Lanes

2012 - 2017

# 1 Introduction

In 2003 Derbyshire County Council published its first policy dealing with the management of motorised vehicles in the countryside. Since that point in time not only have there been key legislative changes but there has also been an increase in public awareness of the use of vehicles in the countryside.

In 2007 the County Council published the first Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). Aim 3f identified steps required to improve the management of recreational motor vehicles in the countryside.

This revised policy takes on board lessons learned over the past years including the ongoing period of implementation of the ROWIP. It sets down the Council's strategy for managing motorised vehicular use of routes throughout the County. The County Council has worked closely with the Peak District National Park Authority on issues relating to the management of motorised vehicles and recognises that National Park has a key role to play in the management of motorised vehicles in the countryside. Indeed this refreshed Policy will compliment that of the National Park. The County Council shall, at all times, have proper regard for the functions of the National Park.

This policy supersedes the previous Policy for the Management of Motorised Vehicles in the Countryside Policy.

This policy does not impact upon private rights of way and therefore references to rights of way and motorised vehicular access in this document are intended to refer to public rights.

## 2 Terminology

This policy covers carriageway highways that are mainly un-sealed. These are generally routes that should be recorded in the definitive map and statement as Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT). The policy may also be applied to any mainly unsealed ways that are not currently so recorded which Council may consider at any time to be more likely than not to be carriageway highways.

The following words and acronyms [and phrases] are generally used in this Policy as abbreviations, as follows:

- **Byway/BOAT** – Byway Open to All Traffic as defined in the W&CA 1981.



- **Definitive Map** - The definitive maps & statements kept by the Council pursuant to Part III of the W&CA 1981.
- **Mechanically propelled vehicle** (MPV) - All motorised vehicles excluding mobility scooters as defined in The Use of Invalid Carriages on Highways Regulations 1988 (Statutory Instrument 1988 No. 2268).
- **Non Classified Highway** (NCH) - A highway maintainable at the public expense which is not classified as an A, B or C class road or as any other type of road.
- **Recreational driving** covers the driving or riding of mechanically propelled vehicles as a recreational pursuit on BOAT's and other unsealed NCH routes to which this policy applies. It does not include the driving of horse drawn carriages.
- **Stakeholders** refers to anyone who has an interest in the management and maintenance of BOAT's and other unsealed NCH routes and includes user groups, landowners and local authorities.
- **The network** covers the highways to which this policy applies and those carriageway highways not covered by the policy which connect them.
- **TRO** covers any type of Traffic Regulation Order made pursuant to sections 1 or 14 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

### 3 Our Aim

Throughout the process of developing this revised policy we have been acutely aware of the need to consider the legal rights of passage for all types of use. The Council listens to the many views expressed by local communities and all user groups including those groups representing recreational drivers. A balance often has to be struck between enjoyment of vehicular use rights over a route and the impacts that continued enjoyment of those rights could have on amenity for the local community, the environment, and other types of use.

Our dialogue with representatives of recreational driving groups has highlighted their desire to pursue and promote only lawful and responsible activity. However it has also served to underline the need at many levels for effective communication to users about precisely which rights can be assumed to exist over a particular route and which cannot be used.

**Policy Statement 1**

The Council aims to protect opportunities for recreational driving where conflict with other types of use is kept to a minimum and where this activity does not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment or communities.

To pursue this aim, the County Council will continue to invite and take advice via the Local Access Fora and to liaise with representatives of recreational driving vehicle groups.

## **4 Recording of Public Rights**

The Definitive Map should show all public rights of way which existed at the Relevant Date<sup>1</sup>. It is amended by order where the Council considers from evidence available that an additional way exists as a right of way or that a way should be shown as a different kind of highway. Consequently some routes are upgraded to a “higher” status on the Definitive Map, and others are added to it as new routes. Less commonly, routes can be removed or down-graded.

This policy applies to Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT) and unsealed NCH's other than any NCH over which the Council considers public vehicular rights do not exist. For any NCH over which the Council considers public vehicular rights do not exist, it will generally seek to maintain signs at the relevant junctions to that NCH to indicate highway users that public vehicular rights do not exist over it.

The List of Streets is the record of highways maintainable at public expense, including NCH's, which the Highways Act 1980 requires the Council to keep. This data for Derbyshire is available from the Council's website, which includes depictions of the relevant streets in map form. The List does not record the level of public rights for any street.

Some routes which are recorded on the List of Streets as NCH are also shown in the Definitive Map and Statement, e.g. as a Public Bridleway. These routes are sometimes called “Dual Status”. Although some of them have been the subject of claims for BOAT rights, it appears that the Natural and Rural Communities Act 2006 (the NERC Act) has extinguished rights for driving MPV's over many others. This means that the route cannot be a BOAT even where it could previously have been recognised as one. In other cases the route may be exempt from extinguishment of rights by the NERC Act, e.g. because when it was on the List of Streets and not in the definitive map and statement.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Relevant Date is a term used to state the date that the rights of way shown on the Definitive Map legally existed.

Numerous claims for BOAT's to be recorded on the definitive map and statement were received by the County Council following the introduction of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. A substantial number of these are currently being processed. The County Council website will provide updated information about these claims.

## **5 Sustainability**

The County Council's duty to keep in repair highways which are publicly maintainable includes most public rights of way and the great majority of the routes which are of interest to vehicle users<sup>2</sup>.

The County Council, acting in the public interest, strives to maintain highways in a condition in keeping with their designations and importance. However resources are limited. In practice, maintenance varies widely according to the differing characteristics of the highways concerned. In contrast to other carriageways, BOAT's which are publicly maintainable are not generally maintained so as to promote ease of use by vehicles. This is reflected in the W&CA 1981 (as amended by C&RoWA 2000). Under s55(7) of the Act, certain ways previously shown as roads used as public paths and subject to certain types of modification orders also become highways maintainable at the public expense. However, s.55(8) states that s55(7) "does not oblige a highway authority to provide, on a way shown in a definitive map and statement as a BOAT, a metalled carriage-way or a carriage-way which is by any other means provided with a surface suitable for the passage of vehicles". Where a sealed carriageway is unsuitable for general MPV use this can be marked by 'Unsuitable for Motors' warning signs. The unsuitability of unsealed BOAT's for general MPV driving (as opposed to use by recreational drivers with MPV's with some 'off-road' capability) is generally self-evident from their appearance.

Failure to keep a route in repair is neither a ground for seeking to extinguish a route nor for making a TRO. Nevertheless, for some BOAT routes, no realistic maintenance specification to can be found to secure its establishment as a suitable facility for bridleway and/or footpath uses as well for as vehicular types of use. This may be due to a combination of factors such as climate, topography, deterioration over many years exacerbated by inclement weather, and in some instances erosion from use by vehicles. In some cases more robust standards of repair may provide a solution. For instance, sustainability surveys by the Peak District National Park Authority have recommended investment in the infrastructure of several routes.

---

<sup>2</sup> Some highways are privately maintainable. That is, there is a public right to pass and re-pass over the highway but the landowner has the duty to maintain the highway.

Nevertheless, in the County Council's experience, challenging situations can arise where the only physically sustainable maintenance solution compatible with unrestricted vehicular access would be to introduce tarmac as a preventative measure against continued erosion. This change to the character of a route may be considered to be unacceptable on amenity or environmental grounds.

The County Council will therefore take a pragmatic approach to the management of these routes, which strives to ensure that the use of the route by vehicles is preserved without having a damaging impact, and distinguishes those cases where this is not practicable.

A combination of positive and well publicised management is a key to the preservation of these routes for the enjoyment of all. This encompasses restricting, as and when necessary, those routes that are enjoyed for recreational driving. This may be by TRO, which may entirely prohibit MPV traffic on routes, or impose particular limitations e.g. to particular times.

The following measures that could be introduced to ensure that BOAT's which are identified as being acceptable for recreational driving remain suitable for continued BOAT use:

- Encouraging local groups to watch-over routes and report problems to the County Council.
- Encouraging user-groups to "adopt" a route and maintain it on behalf of the County Council, the Council providing expert advice and materials
- Ensuring that routes are included in formal County Council inspection regimes. Ensuring that any reported localised damage is repaired immediately to reduce higher levels of expenditure in the future.

Some BOAT's will have to be brought up to a reasonable standard before any long-term management will bear dividend. To this end the County Council will need to commit to long-term progressive investment in the network to ensure that the basic requirements of users are met. Regular inspection and clearance of drainage channels, combined with a scheduled programme of maintenance, is the key to preserving these routes in a serviceable condition. The days when a "lengthsman" was employed with the specific task of inspecting these routes have passed however the Council will commit itself to a yearly inspection of those routes which have been improved as well as an inspection following adverse weather conditions in order to avoid failure of the route. Immediate repairs should be brought forward to avoid more costly

intervention in the future e.g. to avoid catastrophic failure of the surface of the route due to the cumulative effects of failed drains, scoured surfaces etc.

The County Council is also under a duty as stipulated in S40 NERC which requires every public authority to have regard to conserving biodiversity.

#### **Policy Statement 2**

2a) In recognition of the necessity to improve some routes the County Council will invest over the next 5 years to improve the off-road vehicular routes.

2b) The County Council will encourage and support voluntary management schemes to assist with the management of off-road vehicular routes.

2c) The County Council will commit to a yearly inspection of routes where improvements have been made.

## **6 Management of Vehicular Use**

The County Council recognises the importance of ensuring that BOAT's are understood for what they are. To this end the County Council will ensure that routes are signed appropriately and where practical, include a destination. Furthermore, we will reduce any misunderstanding that may exist over what public rights exist by making information widely available.

#### **Policy Statement 3**

3a) The County Council will publish and maintain a list of vehicular routes that contains sufficient information to allow all users to exercise their judgement whether a route is useable.

3b) Whenever possible this shall include information about suitability throughout the year.

### **6.1 Control Measures**

It is regrettable that in some instances it may be necessary to introduce a TRO. This may be to preserve the character of the route or to ensure that the route is not damaged when at its most vulnerable. Any request to consider traffic control will be judged against those criteria that allow regulation. The current relevant criteria are under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

## **6.2 Voluntary Restraint**

“Voluntary restraint” is another potential method for seeking to reduce impact on particular routes. The practice involves liaison with user groups to ensure that conditions stipulated within voluntary restraint agreements are respected. These agreements are not legally binding however their adoption may cause sensitive routes to be used in a way so as to minimise impact on the surface; for example, during periods of adverse weather, a voluntary one way system may counteract damage caused by up-hill acceleration. Where a voluntary restraint agreement is reached but does not succeed in changing the use of the way, it may be necessary to introduce more robust management measures (e.g. by TRO).

### **Policy Statement 4**

4a) Derbyshire County Council will support voluntary restraint wherever it considers this to be appropriate and workable temporary solution.

4b) Voluntary restraint will not over-ride or preclude any form of management the Council may wish to implement.

## **6.3 Traffic Regulation Orders**

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 empowers the Council to restrict, prohibit or regulate the use of roads open to the public, including rights of way. The Council has used these Traffic Regulation Order powers effectively to manage routes.

A TRO can provide an immediate solution to a traffic problem or combination of traffic problems arising on any type of road. However, there are a number of symptoms that often simulate requests for a TRO. These include:

- The persistent misuse of a route by ignoring the status.
- The deterioration of the surface.
- Conflict between different types of use.
- Damaged surface causing users to veer off the route.
- Imminent danger to users.

This is non-exhaustive list but serves to demonstrate the range of issues often presented to the County Council. The County Council will consider every case on its merits. It will consider whether a TRO is appropriate for a specific situation. It will have regard to official advice currently in the guidance set out in the revised version of ‘Making the Best of Byways’ and Guidance document entitled ‘Regulating the Use of

Motor Vehicles on Public Rights of Way and Off-Road”. The County Council however cannot be expected to follow Government advice in every case.

The County Council will not unreasonably impose a TRO. Where a problem cannot be resolved by other reasonable means, the County Council may be expected to impose one expeditiously. In other situations consultation will be carried out and the responses analysed to ensure that a TRO is appropriate. This may result in:

- A TRO restricting all MPV traffic.
- A TRO restricting use to certain class or classes of MPV traffic.
- A seasonal TRO to protect the environment and character of the route for example.
- A TRO restricting access at certain times of the day and/or year
- Identification of another method to resolve the problem.

**Policy Statement 5**

Traffic Regulation Orders shall be considered where

5a) No other reasonable solution exists to resolve conflict between types of use.

5b) There is a clear danger to vehicle users.

5c) The safety of other users is compromised through continued use by vehicles.

5b) Any other relevant legal criterion is satisfied.

## 7 Barriers

The County Council has powers to erect structures within the highway to protect the safety of users. It is likely that it will be necessary to erect barriers where there is unlawful use of bridleways for example by motorised vehicles. In these circumstances the County Council will consider erecting a suitable structure to either prevent or frustrate attempts to use a way.

Continued use of some routes by motorised vehicles has lead to a gradual deterioration in the quality of the route. Where this occurs, to the extent that the safety of lawful users is prejudiced, then a barrier may be erected to prevent use.

**Policy Statement 6**

The use of barriers or similar structures will be considered for use on routes not carrying public motorised vehicular rights where the safety of the public is at risk.

The Council will ensure that any structure that is erected does not impede access for other users.

## **8 Monitoring**

It is important that the County Council is able to make informed decisions in respect of the management of routes subject to recreational vehicular use. To this end the County Council will carry out monitoring of traffic (e.g. by placing vehicle loggers (devices that monitor the volume and type of vehicular traffic)) on routes.

## **9 Misuse of non vehicular highways**

Many routes that are recorded as being other than BOAT's or other public carriageways are still in use by motorised vehicles. These include Restricted Byways and Bridleways. This misuse is regrettable, and may be perceived to discredit legitimate recreational driving. The Council will work in an advisory capacity with the Police and where possible, vehicle user groups, to discourage this activity. Consideration may also be given to imposition of TRO's on such routes.

### **Policy Statement 7**

7a) Use of non-vehicular routes by motorised vehicles will be referred to the Police.

7b) The County Council will erect appropriate notices on such routes with the aim of reducing use by motorised vehicles.

## **10 Motorised Vehicle Trials**

On 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009 the County Council approved a guideline for motor vehicle trials. This advisory document is currently under review and will be published in due course. It will aim to support well organised trials.

### **Policy Statement 8**

The County Council will support efficiently organised Motor Trial events where organisers can demonstrate that liaison with the Police, local communities, landowners and conservation bodies has been carried out.

## **11 Consultation**

Throughout the production of this document the Council has listened to



many issues relating to motorised vehicular access in the countryside. It is inevitable that this Policy will not satisfy the wishes of every person however the County Council will review this Policy every 5 years and where necessary make amendments based on experience and comment from the public, stakeholders and partners.

## **12 Policy Summary**

For convenience a summary of the policy statements is provided below.

### **Policy Statement 1**

The Council aims to protect opportunities for recreational driving where conflict with other types of use is kept to a minimum and where this activity does not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the environment or communities.

### **Policy Statement 2**

2a) In recognition of the necessity to improve some routes the County Council will invest over the next 5 years improve the off-road vehicular routes.

2b) The County Council will encourage and support voluntary management schemes to assist with the management of off-road vehicular routes.

2c) The County Council will commit to a yearly inspection of routes where improvements have been made.

### **Policy Statement 3**

3a) The County Council will publish and maintain a list of vehicular routes that contains sufficient information to allow all users to exercise their judgement whether a route is useable.

3b) Whenever possible this shall include information about suitability throughout the year.

### **Policy Statement 4**

4a) Derbyshire County Council will support voluntary restraint wherever it considers this to be appropriate and workable temporary solution.

4b) Voluntary restraint will not over-ride or preclude any form of management the Council may wish to implement.

### **Policy Statement 5**

Traffic Regulation Orders shall be considered where:

5a) No other reasonable solution exists to resolve conflict between types of use and there is a clear danger to vehicle users the safety of other users is compromised through continued use by vehicles or

5b) any other relevant legal criterion is satisfied.

**Policy Statement 6**

The use of barriers or similar structures will be considered for use on routes not carrying public motorised vehicular rights where the safety of the public is at risk.

**Policy Statement 7**

7a) Use of non-vehicular routes by motorised vehicles will be referred to the Police.

7b) The County Council will erect appropriate notices on such routes with the aim of reducing use by motorised vehicles.

**Policy Statement 8**

The County Council will support efficiently organised Motor Trial events where organisers can demonstrate that liaison with the Police, local communities, landowners and conservation bodies has been carried out.

## **Appendix H - Equality Analysis**

### **Derbyshire County Council Equality Analysis on the new Statement of Action 2013-2017 Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Derbyshire**

#### **Introduction**

This Equality Analysis has helped to inform the preparation and priorities of the new Statement of Action for Derbyshire's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) to cover the period from 2013-2017.

#### **Background to the RoWIP and Statement of Action**

The RoWIP, produced in 2007, is a strategic document which sets out how we intend to improve the management, provision and promotion of the rights of way and access network in the County. Within this, the Statement of Action identifies the steps we propose to take for managing the network and securing an improvements based on assessments of existing provision and the needs of different types of users.

The RoWIP was based on extensive consultations to help assess the extent to which local rights of way meet the needs of the public and identified a series of key themes and aims which form the basis for the production of both the first Statement of Action (2007-2012) and the second Statement of Action (2013-2017).

The three key themes are:

- Theme A – Seek to preserve Derbyshire's heritage, landscape and wildlife
- Theme B – Promote the sustainable use of the present and future network, encouraging healthier and more sustainable travel choices
- Theme C – Encourage and create routes that support the local economy and boost tourism

The Statement of Action is organised around five aims as follows:

- Aim 1 - Ensure that the public rights of way network is open and available for use
- Aim 2 - Provide an up-to-date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement
- Aim 3 - Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users
- Aim 4 - Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network
- Aim 5 - Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way

The RoWIP with its Statement of Action has an important role to play in providing the physical resources and messages to encourage active healthy lifestyles and

physical wellbeing for all ages. It has significant benefits for all of the Protected Characteristic Groups as defined by the Equality Act 2010.

The Statement of Action for the RoWIP (2013-2017) was developed in consultation with the Peak District and Derby and Derbyshire Local Access Forums, each with a statutory role to provide advice on the improvement of public access for the purpose of open air recreation and enjoyment of the area. The document was the subject of a 12 week public consultation exercise from 6 August 2012 to 29 October 2012.

## **Equality Analysis**

### **The Assessment Team:**

The core assessment team involved the following staff:

- Wayne Bexton (Greenways & Countryside Officer) – Divisional representative for equalities and diversity with expertise in equality assessments. Chair of Assessment Team
- Gill Millward (Countryside Access Improvement Officer – job share) – expertise in public rights of way, improving access to the countryside and diversity issues and joint lead for the production of the RoWIP
- Claire O'Reilly (Countryside Access Improvement Officer – job share) – expertise in public rights of way, improving access to the countryside and diversity issues and joint lead for the production of the RoWIP
- Alan Marsden (Project Engineer – Transport Projects) – expertise in transport planning and equality, health and mental wellbeing assessments

### **The Scope of the Analysis**

This report considers the proposed actions that are in the new Statement of Action and assesses:

- What impact the actions will have on any of the Protected Characteristic Groups (throughout the process consideration was also given to groups classed as 'social deprivation'), how well they meet the needs, requirements and expectations of the different groups?
- If there are any potential barriers whether there is scope to mitigate their effects?
- Are resources available to facilitate the proposed changes?

Because the document is a Strategic Plan, the assessment is relatively broad in nature and scope.

## Additional data

The following sources of data have been referred to as they are relevant to this assessment:

| Source  | Reasons for using   |
|---|---|
| RoWIP for Derbyshire 2007-2012  | Background document for the revised Statement of Action.  |
| Consultation and Assessment of Needs Report for the RoWIP (Appendix B of the RoWIP)                         | This was a full analysis of the consultations that were carried out prior to the production of the RoWIP. |
| DCC Equality Impact Assessment for the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) 2011                                   | The RoWIP is identified as a linked Plan within the LTP and forms a distinctive strand within it.         |
| DCC Countryside Service - Equality Impact Assessment for Cycle Hire, Cycle Routes and Health Promotion 2009 | These assessments have contributed to the actions identified in the Statement of Action                   |

## What impact will the actions have on any of the Protected Characteristic Groups and what scope is there to mitigate their effects?

### Religion/Belief:

Traditionally groups from ethnic minority communities are under-represented in the countryside and levels of participation in countryside access are significantly lower than other groups<sup>1</sup>. Potential barriers faced by these groups include a lack of awareness of opportunities, language, cultural differences and a lack of confidence.<sup>2</sup>

Actions under Aims 3 and 4 within the proposed Statement of Action will try and address some of these potential barriers by providing clearer information about what is available in terms of the access network and other facilities. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

In providing improved levels of information we need to be aware of the need to ensure that the information is available in different languages if required and that any imagery used dispels the perception that the countryside is mainly for white/middle class groups. Since the majority of people within this Protected Characteristic Group live in larger urban areas and visit more urban areas<sup>1</sup>, we need to make sure that any information that is produced is available in these areas and provides information about opportunities to use paths and trails within the urban/urban fringe area. Within Derbyshire this particularly applies to Derby City but the county is ringed by larger conurbations such as Greater Manchester, South Yorkshire and Nottingham so these locations need to be borne in mind.

**Gender:**

Women do have a fear of being alone when visiting the countryside and using paths and trails and there is a perception that the countryside can be unsafe<sup>2</sup>. There are also issues for men walking alone in the countryside.

When implementing new schemes such as the Greenway development under Aim 3 we take this into consideration at the design stage and make sure that we design new routes to be as wide and open as possible to minimise safety concerns. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

**Age:**

There are fewer people aged over 65 and in the 16-24 age range visiting the countryside, with the majority of the 16-24 year olds staying closer to urban areas<sup>1</sup>. Younger people tend to suffer from a lack of understanding about where they can go and what they can do, have less organised or appropriate activities for them to take part in and also have less access to a car and are therefore have a lower level of access to the wider rights of way network<sup>2</sup>. Older people tend to suffer from physical access problems (including difficult stiles or steep, uneven paths), anxiety about safety, distances from help and like to have more facilities available<sup>2</sup>.

There are many actions identified in the Statement of Action to help address these issues. Aim 1 includes a section on improving access furniture to promote a least restrictive option of gaps and gates with stiles as a last resort. Aim 3 has a whole section on making provision for easy access opportunities. Aim 4 has several actions about improving information about what is available, the nature of the paths and also making more use of modern technology such as bluetooth hubs on sites, use of audio trails that can be downloaded and making much more use of the web pages and internet (including twitter and facebook) to attract younger users. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group as well as encouraging greater involvement through volunteering opportunities.

**Race:**

Traditionally groups from black and ethnic minority communities are under-represented in the countryside and levels of participation in countryside access are significantly lower than other groups<sup>1</sup>. Potential barriers faced by these groups include a lack of awareness of opportunities, language, cultural differences and a lack of confidence.<sup>2</sup>

Actions under Aims 4 and 5 within the proposed Statement of Action will try and address some of these potential barriers by providing clearer information about what is available in terms of the access network and other facilities as well as encouraging greater involvement through volunteering opportunities. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

In providing improved levels of information we need to be aware of the need to ensure that the information is available in different languages if required and that any imagery used dispels the perception that the countryside is mainly for

white/middle class groups. Since the majority of people within this Protected Characteristic Group live in larger urban areas and visit more urban areas<sup>1</sup>, we need to make sure that any information that is produced is available in these areas and provides information about opportunities to use paths and trails within the urban/urban fringe area. Within Derbyshire this particularly applies to Derby City but the county is ringed by larger conurbations such as Greater Manchester, South Yorkshire and Nottingham so these locations need to be borne in mind.

### **Disability:**

There are many potential barriers to disabled groups using paths and trails around the County whether it be people with physical disabilities, visual or hearing disabilities or learning difficulties. The barriers consist of physical access problems, including stiles, gates, bridges, steep, rough or uneven paths, distances to be covered, lack of shelter, resting points or support facilities such as changing facilities, obstructions, access to information, confidence and communication issues<sup>2</sup>.

The RoWIP is charged specifically within the government guidance to:

- Consider the needs of all users, both now and in the future
- The accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted people and those with limited mobility or other impairments

There are therefore many actions with the Statement of Action that try and address some of the barriers identified: Aim 1 includes a section on improving access furniture to promote a least restrictive option of gaps and gates with stiles as a last resort and provides for a programme of work to improve the surface condition of paths and trails. Aim 3 has a whole section on making provision for easy access opportunities and has a programme for developing the County's network of Greenways. Aim 4 has several actions about improving information about what is available, targeting that information to specific groups and also providing suitable events (with back up facilities such as changing places toilets and tramper disability scooters) to encourage more use and confidence within this Protected Characteristic Group. The topography of the county is such that there are many areas where access is difficult but it is recognised that we need to do more to identify projects that can make key paths and trails more accessible. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and mental wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

### **Sexual Orientation:**

No information is collected or is available in order to assess the impact of the RoWIP on this Protected Characteristic Group but it is not considered that there will be any adverse impacts on this group as a result of the actions identified in the Statement of Action for the RoWIP. Any improvements to access to the Countryside or information provision would benefit any of the Protected Characteristic Groups. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

**Social Deprivation:**

The Natural England MENE research has identified that people living in areas of greatest deprivation are least likely to have visited the natural environment and if they have they will stay within built up areas close to where they live<sup>1</sup>. The barriers to these people are largely connected to lack of money and transport and a perception that the countryside is dominated by white, middle class groups<sup>2</sup>. The Marmot Review<sup>3</sup> has found that there is a social gradient of health with a clear link between deprivation and poorer levels of health. Marmot also found that to reduce the social gradient of health that you should not focus solely on the most disadvantaged but that the actions should be universal which ties in well with the actions being proposed within the RoWIP Statement of Action.

There are several actions within the Statement of Action, particularly under Aim 4 that seek to promote the use of the countryside as a resource that is free and on people's doorstep and the use of which promotes health and wellbeing. There are also actions within Aim 4 that promote the need to improve links between the use of paths and trails and public transport. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

**Marriage and Civil Partnership:**

No information is collected or is available in order to assess the impact of the RoWIP on this Protected Characteristic Group but it is not considered that there will be any adverse impacts on this group as a result of the actions identified in the Statement of Action for the RoWIP. Any improvements to access to the Countryside or information provision would benefit any of the Protected Characteristic Groups. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

**Pregnancy and Maternity:**

Women do have a fear of being alone when visiting the countryside and using paths and trails and there is a perception that the countryside can be unsafe<sup>2</sup>. There are also considerations around the need for easy access for heavily pregnant women or for parents with pushchairs also requiring other facilities such as toilets/baby changing.

Actions with Aims 3 and 4 will help to provide more easily accessible paths and trails and better information for this Protected Characteristic Group. Actions under Aim 4 will also promote the health and wellbeing benefits of using the access network which will benefit this group.

**Social Relationships/Community Cohesion:**

There is robust evidence that good quality social relationships across the life course protect health and are associated with a wide range of other beneficial outcomes. Rights of way enhance the provision of public space where social interaction can take place and help to strengthen community cohesion which is why it was felt that this additional element warranted consideration.



Social relationships can be affected however where conflicts occur, particularly between visitors and residents. Residents could be affected through issues such as increased/ insensitive visitor parking in rural villages or through littering/ damage/ poor behaviour of others. Visitors could be affected through similar issues such as arguments over legal parking or legal use of rights of way etc.

There are several actions within the Statement of Action, particularly under Aims 1, 3 and 4 that seek to promote the use of the countryside that can encourage social interaction. Actions under Aims 1, 3 and 4 will encourage more people to access public space and social interaction helping to change communities for the better and increased social cohesion. Aim 5 includes actions that will help foster community relationships in delivering other actions. To reduce conflicts, Aim 4 includes actions to promote responsible use of the countryside and Aim 3 includes actions to reduce illegal activities. To reduce conflicts over parking, Aims 3 and 4 include actions to encourage more use of public transport, including linking circular walks etc into public transport.

### **Are resources available to facilitate this?**

We are producing the new Statement of Action during what is a very challenging time for local authorities as we are faced with significantly reduced budgets over the next five years. The delivery will be through costed Annual Work Programmes and be reported through Annual Monitoring Reports. However, it is anticipated that many of the actions that will benefit the Protected Characteristic Groups particularly around the need to improve the quality of information about the access network will still be able to be delivered.

### **Consultation and Feedback**

A list of potential actions was drafted as part of the Draft Equality Analysis to address the issues. These actions specific to the Equality Analysis, together with the original public consultation for the Statement of Action were the subject to a formal public consultation period which closed at the end of October 2012. In addition to a general public consultation, available on our website, the Equality Analysis consultation was targeted at forums and groups representing the Protected Characteristic Groups. Information was sent out to local Access Groups in the County; the BME, Youth and Over 50's Forum Groups and specific local ethnic community groups and Mental Health organisations. Press releases also accompanied the consultations.

One of the actions concerned the consultation exercise and identified the need to target Protected Characteristic Groups to be consulted on the draft Statement of Action 2012-2017 for the RoWIP, to make sure information about the consultation was available within the Derby City area and that it be made clear that it was available in different languages if required. All of this was carried out.

Most of the feedback related to the actions identified in the draft Statement of Action rather than in the Equality Analysis. Comments received on the Equality Analysis were largely positive saying that the document provided a balanced and

comprehensive view. Another comment considered that we had achieved our objective of being broad enough in nature and scope for a strategic plan but providing a considered enough review to encourage and promote better utilisation by groups within the protected characteristics.

There were no comments specifically relating to the proposed actions so apart from removing the one relating to the consultation process these actions are identified below:

### **Identified Actions**

| <b>Actions</b>  | <b>Lead Officer</b>            | <b>Timescale</b>              |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Target Protected Characteristic Groups to be consulted on specific actions as appropriate during the delivery of the RoWIP   | Claire O'Reilly/ Gill Millward | 2013-2017 as required         |
| 2. Large scale projects within the RoWIP Statement of Action should have their own Equality Analysis if appropriate   | Claire O'Reilly/ Gill Millward | 2013-2017 as required         |
| 3. Carry out a periodic review of how we are engaging with the Protected Characteristic Groups and include a section on Equalities within the RoWIP Annual Monitoring Reports to ensure that this work remains high profile | Claire O'Reilly/ Gill Millward | Annually throughout 2013-2017 |

### **Implementation**

The findings from this Equality Analysis will be incorporated into the final Statement of Action 2013 – 2017 for the RoWIP and be reflected in the Annual Work Programmes for delivery of the RoWIP. Progress on delivery of the Equality Analysis and the annual work programmes for the RoWIP will be reported to the two Local Access Forums for the County and published on our website.

## RoWIP Statement of Action 2012-2017 – Response to public consultation Autumn 2012

### Appendix A – Q1 Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?

#### ‘No’ responses made the following comments:

| Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?<br>Comments:  | Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?<br>Response:   |
|---|--|
| If you want to make footpath accessible to all then you need to be prepared to make massive investment, which as far as I can see you aren't able to do in the current climate, and why have a list of target groups all should mean all with no preferences.   | It will not be possible to make the widespread investment to open up the network more widely but the RoWIP will allow targeted investment in response to where there is a demonstrable need identified.  |
| The aims are fine but there is no commitment to providing sufficient resources (at a time of financial difficulty) to ensure that it is delivered.  | Annual targets will be set and outcomes will be reported and published in Annual Monitoring Reports. Progress will also be monitored via the Local Access Forums (statutory bodies set up to provide advice on such matters).  |
| I don't believe it was ever intended that aims or identified needs in the RoWIP should be listed in the RoWIP in order of priority, so I don't see why this questionnaire implies that to be the case. The proposed 2012-17 RoWIP is almost completely lacking in ambitious (or even any) targets.  | In Aims were listed in order of priority in the original document so these have remained the same. The identified needs set out under each aim have been prioritised in light of the current economic climate but those which have been assigned a high priority will not be ignored and the Council will try to deliver them all. |
| The prioritisation of the various identified needs" for each aim seems rather artificial - the "needs" are of equal priority.   | See comment above.   |
| The Ramblers' were disappointed that the identified needs" have been put in order of priority which was not the case with the original RoWIP. Our concern is that low priority items will not be addressed. We recommend that the "identified needs" are not considered in order of importance but should all be treated the same. However if priorities must be allocated we suggest the amendments shown above are incorporated in the next RoWIP.  | See comment above.   |
| I have changed the order of a few priorities as they seemed to be in an order which was considered from a council / official point of view eg Aim 1 is open, that is ok but Aim 2 is about providing an up to date definitive map. This might be a council legal requirement but as a user I don't care about that and I suspect that a lot of users don't know anything about definitive maps. How easy to use and find the route, paths etc, is more important. Not being able to find the route or path is the main reason why people don't use paths ie the fear of 'getting lost'. | Noted but the majority of respondents favoured keeping the priorities in the order presented in the draft document.  |

| Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?<br>Comments:   | Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?<br>Response:  |
|--|---|
| A don't know" button would have been useful this is far too long and complex a document to read on screen. The impression though is that not enough thought is being given to people who live near rights of way. There have been numerous complaints about the effect of opening the Monsal Trail tunnels. There should be recognition throughout the document that local people will be consulted and their concerns taken into account as decisions are taken."   | Noted. Any legal orders or planning applications affecting public rights of way and improvement projects are subject to public consultation, including local communities.   |
| It is discrimination against one set of users in favour of another. We all should have the right to use these rights of way.   | Noted.  |
| Certain areas should be left as they are. It's all well and good to have access for all etc but high moorland should be left as natural as possible.   | Theme A within the document seeks to preserve Derbyshire's heritage, landscape and wildlife. Any actions within the RoWIP will be carried out in a way that will not be detrimental to this Theme. This is something that is also an important thread within the Environmental Statement in Appendix C. |
| I support the aims of the RoWIP but hope that a sensible balance can be struck between access for all and people's enjoyment of the last few bits of 'wilderness' left in the country. There is a need to protect wildlife and creating sustainable drainage & row but hopefully this can be done without losing the enjoyment that many of us gain from enjoying the rugged paths and bridleways across the county.   | See comment above.  |
| It's not true to say that I don't support the policy but I feel it's largely unnecessary. I enjoy using the PRoW network and being in the countryside because I feel that I'm in relatively unspoiled environment. I do support a ploughing and cropping policy, good visible waymarkers and keeping paths passable (eg enforcement action where paths are blocked or overgrown.) But words in the RoWIP worry me - surfacing, access and safety. I feel that artificial surfaces, clanky gates (even when painted green), health and safety signs etc spoil the countryside and are intrusions. In the statement of action section I am going to give lower priority to Aim 3. This is because I object to increased management, man-made things, signage and surfacing. But I do support 'connected' if that means more paths joining up existing ones. I do want to see the paths 'accessible' where this means not overgrown or blocked. | See comment above about the principle behind Theme A. The concerns about the network becoming overly managed are noted but the suggestion is that there is room to provide for both users who prefer the wider less managed feel and those who rely on the more managed trails and routes.              |
| By making every path accessible so 'no-one is excluded' - some may have to be closed. One could be opened near the village - but won't because of the cost of gates and paving for wheelchair access. Some in the village cannot be made wheelchair friendly. Has to be a balance.   | Noted.  |

| Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?<br>Comments:   | Do you support the RoWIP and what we are trying to achieve?<br>Response:  |
|--|---|
| In my answers to the text below assume my answers assume that users includes individuals with disabilities but excludes travellers in or on motorised vehicles | We have a duty to uphold the needs of all legal users which includes those driving motorised vehicles. The RoWIP has tried to make clear the need to defend legitimate use but tackle illegal use of the network by motorised vehicles. |

## Appendix B: Aim 1 – Ensure that the public rights of way network is open and available for use

### Q3b – Do you think any additional actions should be included?

#### ‘Yes’ responses – further information

| Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br>Comments:  | Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br>Response:   |
|---|--|
| <b>General</b>  |  |
| To make sure the funds are available to support these aims.   | Noted  |
| I think there's too much intervention here. Please limit actions to keeping paths passable and well waymarked. No additional 'furniture' please, no artificial surfacing. | The concerns about the network becoming overly managed are noted. The Environmental Statement in the Appendix provides safeguards that any surfacing work will include use of sympathetic materials. |
| Ensure the safe use of the network.   | This is covered in Aim 3.  |
| <b>Aim 1a) Efficient Management and Maintenance of existing network of public rights of way</b>   |  |
| Adopt an enforcement protocol/policy which contains a robust use of the legal powers available to the council.  | This is covered by the Rights of Way Charter referred to in Aim 1a).   |
| More manpower at ground level to sort out blocked rights of way and inaccessible paths. I have a few in my area that have been out of bounds for a number of years!       | Any problems found on public rights of way should be reported and we are committed to tackling the issues through the Rights of Way Charter.   |

| <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| <p>Give extra priority to urban/town routes which require higher level of usage, often making walking more attractive, shorter and quicker than using a car if well maintained, kept free of weeds, litter, adjacent vegetation, managed, surfaced and well lit if required.</p>  | <p>This comment is reflected in the detail provided in the Investment Protocol for Local Transport Plan where priority is given to improving those paths most in need of surface improvement or which benefit the most users.</p>   |
| <p>Aim 1 – the %age of paths passing the ease of use test is not especially ambitious (72.5%) and, unless I am misreading, seems to be a reduction from what was achieved in 2011/12 (75.7%) – can a more challenging target be set and should this not increase over time as more paths are brought up to a satisfactory standard rather than left at a minimum for the length of the plan?</p>  | <p>We have been reporting year on year improvements over the past 6-7 years. In light of the current climate we are suggesting that the target should be maintained as a constant figure but that we will undertake to review the results and targets each year and strive for year on year improvements.</p> |
| <p>Should be a more ambitious target for row ease of use.</p>   | <p>See comment above.</p>   |
| <p>Action 1a) ii sets too low a target; the current figure is 75.7%. The council should not be satisfied with a lower figure than 80%.</p>  | <p>See comment above.</p>   |
| <p>Clarify which organisation should prosecute when businesses routinely park on verges of bridleways or BOATs.</p>   | <p>This is covered by legislation.</p>  |
| <p>Set up a designated repair team.</p>   | <p>Noted.</p>   |
| <p>The efficient management and maintenance of the existing network by providing regular inspection and rectification</p>   | <p>This is covered by the Rights of Way Charter</p>   |
| <p>Ensuring that vegetation , when blocking the row is kept under control (eg fallen trees)</p>   | <p>This is covered by the Rights of Way Charter</p>   |
| <p>Posters showing stiles etc blocked off barbed wire.</p>  | <p>Noted.</p>   |
| <p>Adequate provision for legal proceedings when required.</p>  | <p>This is covered by the Rights of Way Charter and existing legislation.</p>   |
| <p>Ensure only legal users are able to access a route.</p>  | <p>This is carried out in negotiation with landowners and land managers.</p>  |
| <p>Ensure all routes are clear, as I know of at least one public right of way that is blocked off by a resident who lives beside it</p>   | <p>This is an enforcement job and should be reported to the PRoW team.</p>  |
| <p>DCC and the rights of way unit need to stop using knowledge as power. They must be more open with information, and more responsive. They fail to recognise that they are servants of the public, not masters. Information they have was paid for by the public and should be easily and freely available. It is pointless having a charter for users if the public know nothing about it (even if it's been partially operational for over a year) and it must be fully implemented including confirming when issues raised are 'closed' and how that has been</p> | <p>This is covered by the Rights of Way Charter.</p>  |

| <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>     |
|--|--|
| <p>achieved.</p>   |  |
| <p>I live in South Derbyshire and use a lot of the paths and tracks around my area (Linton, Swadlincote). A lot of the public rights of way seem to suffer access problems, possibly because of the locality of Rosliston Forestry and the new woodlands which we also enjoy. It seems a pity that quiet paths that I used to use; mainly for running in the case of two of them. Are no longer usable without a fight. Another point of note is the continuation from one county to another. Say Derbyshire into Staffordshire or Leicestershire. The maintenance or lack of it at some of these points is very obvious. Thank you.</p> | <p>Any specific problems encountered need to be reported to the PRoW team.</p>                 |
| <p>There need to be easy to deliver powers to quickly stop illegal use of these roads/paths. Clear rules would mean that there would be no need for a long drawn out process when contraventions happen. Eg: no parking of vehicles is allowed except in marked laybys. If this was broken it would be easy to write the person illegally using the verge and tell them to stop. The current system is woolly to say the least and open to interpretation which costs tax payers money to sort out!</p>  | <p>The parking of vehicles on road verges is not covered within the remit of the RoWIP.</p>    |
| <p>Enforce laws on farmers/landowners ploughing up footpaths that cross or on boundaries of fields also plant crops on them. Enforcement of the re-instatement of routes for repeat offenders needs to be more vigorous.</p>   | <p>This is covered by the Rights of Way Charter.</p>   |
| <p>The NFU will, of course, publicise ploughing and cropping campaign information to farmers to ensure the current network is, as far as possible, not affected by farming operations.</p>   | <p>This offer of help is welcomed.</p>   |
| <p>I much appreciate the feedback I have had in the past from the row officers and in particular the present one.</p>  | <p>Thank you.</p>  |
| <p>As a cyclist and pedestrian I really value anything that makes getting across the county without needing to get a lift or nearly get run over. Safety is really important to me and much as I love the plants (I am a biological science student!) I find it frustrating when footpaths are heftily over hanging with plants to the extent that I don't feel safe. (an example of this is best demonstrated in derby city where the riverside path, which would be the most ideal way for me to get into town, is at points so overhung that I don't feel safe in the daytime let alone at night).</p>                                | <p>Problems such as this need to be reported to the County Council for action to be taken.</p> |
| <p>The track in question by us is at Heathcote, SK17 0AY my bit of track is well maintained but my neighbours is totally ruined with churned up verges, large tractors operating on it and big pot holes. If you want to use this track as a test case then please contact me! 01298 687062/ Richard Mason. We have lots of photographic evidence of how the road is abused and emails form highways</p>   | <p>This will be reported to the PRoW team and investigated.</p>                                |

| <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>  |
|--|---|
| proving that there is a lack of clarity about the matter. I want to help!  |   |
| Report of overgrown paths in the Swadlincote area.   | This has been passed on to officers in the PRoW team.   |
| Regular cutting back pruning of bushes brambles nettles etc most paths around kenning park clay cross are impassable some being part of Chesterfield South Way – get public involved.                                    | This has been passed to officers in the PRoW and Area Ranger teams.   |
| Yes – publicise clearly and widely a policy on verges their maintenance and protection.  | This is not within the remit of the RoWIP but the comment will be passed to the relevant officers within the organisation.  |
| The council have ignored the condition and maintenance of verges.  | This is not within the general remit of the RoWIP apart from to work with colleagues in highways to identify and encourage use of the verges that provide specific key links between promoted public rights of way. |
| <b>Aim 1b) Signposting</b>   |   |
| Aim 1 should include long term consistency of signage  | Noted   |
| Add to 1b 'and with the designation of the route clearly stated'   | This is a statutory requirement so is already included  |
| Include a statement on how the routes will be 'policed' (e.g. management of recreational motorised vehicles).  | This is included in Aim 3.  |
| Aim 1b(ii) should be moved to aim 4 and replaced with action of improved waymarking on route""   | Aim 1b) will be altered to cover the need for adequate waymarking along a route.  |
| Most waymarks signs are covered with overgrown hedges  | Noted.  |
| 1b appears to focus on roadside signage – often the real need is to ensure that paths are well-signed across fields etc. A poorly signed path is not really a useable path.  | A new action has been included to cover waymarking along a route.   |
| On popular paths where difficulty has been noted with the route, use of the yellow arrow" system should be more widely available."   | See comment above.  |
| It should be a high priority to resign routes affected by legal changes (Point 1 b i). This is particularly important in the small number of cases each year where NCHs are re-graded as bridleways or public footpaths. | All routes that are affected by motor vehicles are signposted as a priority but the signposts get vandalised regularly.   |
| Waymarking along routes needs to be improved; there should be "line of site" navigation (like that provided by Leicestershire yellow topped signs) wherever possible.  | Noted   |



| <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|---|--|
| The local signage heritage should be preserved wherever possible.   | We have made a commitment to respect local heritage through the themes within the RoWIP.   |
| <b>Aim 1c) Improve path furniture</b>   |  |
| Easy access through stiles should be available. Many public footpaths are 'out of bounds for people with minimal physical disability.   | This is why we are working to a "Gaps, gates and stiles" policy of working towards the least restrictive option when working with landowners to carry out repairs and improvements to path furniture.  |
| Use improved stile positions and make them suitable for older or incapacitated persons by replacing high stiles with gates or squeezers.  | See comment above.   |
| To ensure that usage matches the nature of the trail. There should be a clear commitment to consider TROs and other measures eg bollards etc to prevent misuse.   | This is covered in the Green Lanes Policy.   |
| Action 1c) i fails to mention landowners as partners - their input is critical  | This is now included in Aim 5c)  |
| There should be reference to other structures (e.g. bridges and boardwalks) that may be necessary to make paths useable   | We will make sure that these other structures are mentioned in monitoring reports.   |
| The Disabled Ramblers would specifically like to support the word accessibility in priority 1c. Kissing gates, stiles, and other obstacles can stop someone in a chair or scooter when the route is otherwise accessible. Similarly large planks placed to stop motor cycles can also stop electric scooters. | See comments above about least restrictive option and the comments about restrictions for electric scooters are noted.   |
| <b>Aim 1d) Surface condition</b>  |  |
| Many rights of way are now in a very poor condition due to abuse by drivers of motor vehicles. They also constitute a danger to bicyclists, equestrians and walkers. Banning motor vehicles from the fells would enable the routes to be maintained as well as improving the quality of the environment.      | The Council has a duty defend the rights of any users to use routes that they are legally entitled to use.   |
| TROs need to be imposed to stop off roading on green lanes and destroying the surfaces and making them dangerous to other users ie: walkers, cyclists, and horse riders   | This is covered in the Green Lanes Policy in Aim 3f).  |
| If repairs are made do it sympathetically and don't just throw hardcore at it and pack it down.   | This issue is covered by the Environmental Statement and we have a good track record in delivering surfacing that is sympathetic to the environment and to all users. We will keep up to date with any new techniques to ensure that the most suitable methods and materials are used. |

| <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 1 - Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|---|--|
| <p>Ensure that materials and techniques used for maintenance are suitable for as many user groups as possible.</p>  | <p>See comments above.</p>   |
| <p>Certain surface areas do not need to be urbanised and made like footpaths, such as the work that has been carried out to Chapel Gate (Rushup Edge to Edale) this takes away the character of the areas within the Peak District, drainage work is required where erosion is an ongoing issue but not to make areas like canal tow paths. Work should be carried out to maintain the character of the areas not to refurbish them giving the whole area a complete more urbanised feel.</p>       | <p>See comments above. Any major improvement works carried out within the National Park are done with the agreement of the Peak District National Park Authority and in line with the Green Lanes Action Plan.</p> |
| <p>The "repairs" recently on Chapel Gate are not the way to go. The path should have been repaired giving it a more natural look instead of making it look like a forest fire track. I fear we're going to end up with more Chapel Gates and less natural (albeit eroded) trails. All this does is force some of the biking (and motor vehicles) onto other routes</p>  | <p>See comments above.</p>   |
| <p>Paths should be maintained at a width ,wherever possible, so that there are not problems for multi users to pass e.g. cyclists, powered wheelchairs, pushchairs and horse riders.</p>  | <p>This is carried out where the circumstances permit.</p>   |
| <p>Avoid large expenditure on the High Peak for paved ways - focus on badly eroded or very wet areas - example new path west of Brown Knoll is a white elephant, and must have cost a fortune, where passage of boggy areas would have sufficed 4. In my area of the High Peak (Hayfield) i know of half a dozen small footpath gaps, which would make a big improvement if we fix them. In addition, there are still large areas, with no access, some of it National Trust with little access</p> | <p>Noted.</p>  |
| <p>Improve the surface of the footpath between Kestrel Close and Tulla Close in Stenson Fields. Seems to be a 'boundary issue' as to who is responsible, so the surface and drainage of this path is very poor now. Needs resurfacing / re-profiling at the Kestrel Close end to avoid flooding in wet weather.</p>   | <p>Reported and in system for investigation.</p>   |

## Appendix C: Aim 2 – Provide a more up-to-date and widely available Definitive Map and Statement

### Q4b – Do you think any additional actions should be included?

#### ‘Yes’ responses:

| Aim 2 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br>Comments:   | Aim 2 –Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br>Response:   |
|--|---|
| <b>Aim 2a) Process to clarify legal status of routes</b>   |   |
| Action 2a) iii is not clear - does this mean prioritise the resolution of definitive map anomalies? If not, it should do and the word resolution" needs adding.  | The word "anomaly" was included in an earlier draft but was removed because it was not well understood.   |
| I feel legislation should be changed so claims to upgrade/ modify to bridleway should be statutory, especially where there are severe safety issues on highways which users have to use whilst trying to access & enjoy using the trail.   | This is outside of our control.   |
| The classification of routes needs to be more clearly defined and more emphasis given to control of motorised vehicles in our countryside and especially to classification of UCRs to prevent motorised vehicles which are running riot in the countryside and are imposing cost for reparation astronomically to residents and taxpayers in Derbyshire. | The development of a priority framework for dealing with legal orders which will include more information about all routes including those affected by motorised vehicles is identified as an action. |
| The priority for clarifying the legal status of routes should depend on the potential use of the route. For example, green lanes which connect bridleways and form a circular route should take priority over the claiming of dead end footpath routes.  | See comment above.  |
| Focus on the identification of all routes as for use by non-motorised" traffic".   | See comment above.  |
| Include an indication of backlog of orders and anticipated time to clear   | More information has been provided in the report in relation to processing of applications for legal orders.  |
| Commit necessary staff to this and get it resolved once and for all. It will reduce costly disputes in the long term and clarify those issues which generate all the emotion.  | Noted.  |
| There should be some prioritising for sorting claims for the upgrading and reinstatement of lanes and tracks that were at one time multiuser vehicle routes.   | See comment above about priority framework.   |
| Maximise efforts to capture statements from older members of the community where these would support re-opening routes and direct evidence of past use   | See comment above about priority framework.   |

| <b>Aim 2 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 2 –Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>   |
|--|---|
| may be lost.   |   |
| Speed up the process for modification applications.  | Extra resources have been deployed over the past 2-3 years.   |
| I believe the whole process of classification of UCRs or BOATs has a requirement to be addressed more quickly than at present. With a resolute purpose of preventing motorised vehicles in our countryside the noise and intrusion by these vehicles has increased exponentially in the past ten years. The loss of amenity to residents particularly in small villages is beyond any sense of normality and needs to be addressed urgently. | See comments above about priority framework and resources.  |
| A “Lost Paths” working party/group should be formed to research evidence for lost routes. This group should enable additions to be made to the DM before the cut off date of 2026.   | There are no plans to tackle this as a separate subject at the moment.  |
| DMMOs. The claiming of new access based on historical documents is well understood by many in user groups but not at all by landowners and occupiers who usually only come across the process once in their lives. Derbyshire County Council should prioritise their historical claims according to strength of evidence and the improvement to the rights of way network.   | Noted.  |
| <b>Aim 2b) Improve the availability of information about Definitive Map and Statement</b>  |   |
| Ensure that the definitive map is easily accessible to the local communities with information about complaints and claims easily available.  | We are improving our web pages to provide this information and need to investigate other avenues.                                 |
| Advertise on the trail the availability for users to access the DCC mapping portal to help them plan routes /navigate to where they would like to go. Many people now have mobile phones with mapping apps, the council could encourage users to make use of such a facility & make it an interactive up to date experience for those who want to.   | This will be investigated as an option.   |
| Maybe include details of where to find the definitive map" on signs near walks".   | See comment above.  |
| It should be available in alternative formats.   | Noted.  |
| Make it readily available and easily accessible.   | This is what the action is aimed at doing.  |
| Make the maps available to parish councils and bookshops.  | This information is being made available on line rather than through maps which become out of date immediately they are produced. |
| Provide paper information for people who do not use digital machines.  | See comment above and there are problems with Ordnance Survey copyright.  |

| <b>Aim 2 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 2 –Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|---|---|
| To have the definitive map freely accessible through the web.   | Information about PRoW across the whole County is now available on our web site.  |
| At the point where it seems one can access the definitive map on line the copyright statement implies that it is not freely available for reference use by individual members of the public. This would exclude any responsible individual who simply wishes to ensure that they remain compliant with the law. There should be a declaration statement and tick box to enable such people to check their compliance without fear of copyright infringement. For example it should be possible, by ticking the box, to declare that you are viewing the map as an individual user purely for the purpose of checking your own legal compliance, otherwise the definitive map is not a definition freely and reasonably available to all and the issue of legal confusion will prevail across users, authorities and the police. | We are constrained by Ordnance Survey copyright and have to work within the limitations of the law. We are looking to improve our service within these limitations. |
| Better digital map with open copying (e.g. see Hampshire).  | See comments above.   |
| Use of electronic mapping on website in a downloadable format.  | See comments above.   |
| Parish councils, user groups and local volunteer groups should be provided with copies of the DM on DVD/CD at the cost of the materials (as in Leicestershire).   | See comments above.   |
| Derbyshire mapping portal at highest scale should show routes of paths especially where proximity to farm buildings is concerned.   | There are current limitations at the largest scale but we are trying to redress this.   |
| It would be useful if the definitive map identified the access points to open access land.  | Not required on Definitive Map but we can look at adding information about open access land and access points as an additional layer as a future action.            |
| Add to the Definitive Map locations of particularly significant pieces of historic road furniture e.g. milestones.  | We will look at this as a future action.  |
| Ensure routes are correct on OS maps.   | We provide Ordnance Survey with up to date information.   |
| Good promotion of the availability of the map.  | Noted.  |
| Publicity to all homes will be crucial.   | Noted.  |
| There is a tension between simply carrying out the need to publish information for Derbyshire, and the people's needs for information when planning rambles which are not likely to respect administrative boundaries. The Disabled Ramblers do support the existing approach, that of having a Derbyshire mapping portal, but would wish the DCC to consider extending their publication of digital data. In this era of Open Data Initiatives, Environmental Information Regulations and the recent planned extension of FOI/EIR to Spatial Data, we would ask that the DCC considers further publishing its electronic data via the OpenStreetMap.org  | We will look at this as a future action.  |

| <b>Aim 2 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 2 –Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>  |
|--|--|
| initiative (think Wikipedia for maps) where other public authorities already contribute their definitive rights of way data.   |  |
| Applications for any amendments to the DM should be available online. The status of all applications should be available to the public online.   | We have set up on-line registers to provide this information.  |
| Improve the availability of applications for variation of routes described by the Definitive Map and Statement for people without access to the internet.  | We are looking for ways to improve this service.   |
| <b>Aim 2 c) Produce and maintain up-to-date digital Definitive Map and Statement</b>   |  |
| Campaigning for the digital map to be recognised as the legal version – assuming it is accurate of course!   | Ongoing.   |
| Under Aim 2c the ability to print from the mapping portal  | We are looking at ways to improve the information provided through the mapping portal.                                       |
| Action 2c) iii needs to include targets for making the necessary legal event modification orders and it should also be an action to make combined public path and legal event orders"  | This was included as an action within the first Statement of Action.   |
| Provide a means of rectifying obvious errors in the definitive plan without having to go through the expensive process of diverting a specified but non-existent right of way.   | This would involve a change in the legislation which is outside of our control.  |
| Update definitive statements to include all the rights of way shown on the digital mapping portal, eg Glossop on the digital map has over 200 rights of way, some thirty more than the current definitive statement.   | We are currently working on publishing the Definitive Statements online.   |
| We are looking forward to footpath mapping for Amber Valley.   | This is now available on the web site  |
| Aim 2: digitisation of the definitive map: the word "accurately" is used. This is not the case and much more checking and investigation will have to be carried out before the digitised map can be used as a basis for a consolidated definitive map.   | This is an ongoing process.  |
| Action 2c) iii production of a consolidated definitive map - does the proposed time scale of 2012-14 allow sufficient time for the making of all the necessary legal event modification orders?  | This is an ongoing action and we will report progress annually.  |
| Back in 2007 Chesterfield BC expressed its particular concern that work to digitise and update the Definitive Map and Statement should be given the most priority. It is good that the rights of way in Chesterfield Borough have finally been digitised and can be viewed through the mapping portal, but there appears to be incorrect plotting and a large number of discrepancies. The lack of an accurate Definitive digital map has an adverse impact on the work that Chesterfield BC needs to undertake to promote sustainable transport and get | The actions relating to producing a definitive map for Chesterfield have been re-organised to accord this a higher priority. |

| <b>Aim 2 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 2 –Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b> |
|--|---|
| improvements to the network of routes for walking, cycling and horse riding. Since it is a statutory requirement to provide and make available a Definitive Map, it is essential that DCC prioritises this particular piece of work. Once the Definitive Map for Chesterfield has been completed, it needs to be made clear what the next part of the process is. For example, how will the map be verified and will there be public consultation. Suggested an additional action to indicate how the work to the Definitive Map will be verified and what public involvement there will be. |   |

## **Appendix D: Aim 3 – Provide a more connected, safe and accessible network suitable for all users**

### **Q5b Do you think any additional actions should be included?**

#### **‘Yes’ responses:**

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| <b>General</b>  |   |
| Users should be identified as non-motorised”. If seen essential to provide for the needs of “off roading” motor vehicles these should be financed by these single interest groups and in the interests of safety and maintenance kept well away from all footpaths and bridleways.” | We have a duty to uphold the rights of all legitimate users and will also work to tackle illegal use of the network.                        |
| Ensure there is access for all not just cyclist, horse riders and walkers the network should also be available to motorised vehicular access.   | We have a duty to uphold the rights of all legitimate users.  |
| Ban motorised vehicles and improve facilities for people with disabilities.   | We have a duty to uphold the rights of all legitimate users but we are continually striving to improve access for people with disabilities. |
| Sticking to your plans not doing nothing after preparing a plan as you seem to have done in Pinxton.  | We have a commitment to produced annual progress reports to monitor delivery of the Plan.   |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| Closer liaison with user groups   | This is covered in Aim 5.   |
| <b>Aim 3 a) Routes for bridleway users</b>  |   |
| A number of footpaths at present could be upgraded to bridleways a very little cost or inconvenience. This is a simple and easy way to achieve Aim 1. It would also be worth allowing all footpaths outside 30mph area's to be used by cyclists. It is much safer than using the road in many cases.  | We do have limitations on following a due process in relation to these matters.   |
| Make the process of creating new bridleways simpler and quicker.  | The County Council does work with landowners to support Creation Agreements for new bridleways. Any other simplification to the process would require changes in legislation which is outside the scope of this document and DCC. |
| Make parking free or reasonable for all users, little or no charge for horseboxes / trailers as infrequent use does not merit a £15 parking charge and does not encourage people to ride on the trails when motorists use the spaces for free. Only people who have livery nearby and have easy access will use facility.   | We have developed a horse box parking system for our car parks in the north east of the county that do not currently incur these higher charges.  |
| As well as the existing network more urgent work is required to promote joined up circular routes accessible to both horse riders and mountain bikers. This is turn will create greater opportunities for tourism in both these activities.   | Much of the publicity surrounding promoting circular routes is carried out by other people. We do look for opportunities to improve connections to join up existing routes.   |
| Stop illegal use of bridleways  | We do tackle illegal use of public rights of way.   |
| Make more access routes available on to the trail for horse riders to help avoid country lanes and heavy traffic.   | We have identified this as an action.   |
| Whilst being in overall agreement with what you are trying to achieve, I would ask you to please recognise that improvements that are made to bridleways are often to the detriment of horse riders. Putting down a tarmac or compacted surface often leads to a surface that is too hard or slippery, and putting down stone often leads to a surface that will cause bruising to the horse's sole and be unrideable. Whilst these measures may improve accessibility to other groups, they will not do so for horses. | We do recognise this matter and have made a commitment to keep up to date with any new techniques to ensure that the most suitable surfacing methods and materials are used.  |
| Perhaps have some special, and safe, areas set aside for horse-riders only. In particular to give the opportunity for riders to let their horses 'stretch their legs' and go at a faster pace than just walk or trot. These should obviously be well signposted as such so as to give fair warnings to other users.   | We have introduced one of these routes on the Five Pits Trail.  |
| Ensure cycle access is good   | This is something we try to do.   |



| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>          |
|---|---|
| <p>I am a horse rider and have been riding the trail for many years, ever since I was young. I find the trail a fantastic and safe ride and fun for all ages and abilities. However I find access onto the trail can sometimes be difficult and sometime dangerous. I have friends and family members involved in incidents and accidents on the road between horseriders and motorised vehicles. I definitely do not enjoy riding on the road and am looking forward to easier access onto the trail to cut out the dangerous roads.</p>   | <p>We have identified an action to improve access onto the trails.</p>                              |
| <p>Provision needs to be improved for horse riders and walkers. This would be achieved by restricting use by motorised vehicles in the countryside Qed!</p>   | <p>Our Greenway programme helps to deliver improvements for horse riders, cyclists and walkers.</p> |
| <p>Under 3a – I feel it is imperative that motorway bridges have high enough barriers. The bridge half a mile down Saw Pit Lane at Tibshelf cannot be avoided by any rider joining the trail at that end but the barrier is way too low and very dangerous!</p>   | <p>This will be investigated separately.</p>  |
| <p>I have an interest in all categories of users of the rights of way network. I particularly support the expansion of the bridleway network across Derbyshire and the need to enable horse riders to minimise their use of fast trafficked highways on safety grounds. An improved network, using existing, unclassified highways, creation of riding margins within the highway, (via the Highways Act 1980) and the excellent development of multi-user greenways. I am also concerned that the construction of footways in areas near to bridleway access makes it illegal for the horse rider to get off the carriageway (where verges are removed). Whilst I support the general principle of multi use – off road vehicles/trail motorbikes can cause difficulties for horse riders – who are looking for safer places than metalled public highways to escape fast moving traffic. All these aspects should be considered in relation to each other to improve the network.</p> | <p>We do consider all of these matters when delivering our Greenways programme.</p>                 |
| <p>Look at improving access to bridle ways which are often reached via busy roads.</p>  | <p>See comment above.</p>   |
| <p>I have been horse riding &amp; cycling the 5 Pits Trail for 18yrs &amp; it is a beautiful place to ride &amp; passing people &amp; saying hello is a lovely experience &amp; I think it is very well managed, however getting to the trail from various locations I have stabled my horse at over the years has been the down side to riding the trail as many of the roads are quiet frankly dangerous &amp; it is a far from an ideal situation for us to have to be on these roads. I feel you should be doing all you can to provide as many off road routes for horses as is possible. I feel horse riding is as popular as it has ever been and it now forms a significant part of the user group.</p>   | <p>We are always looking for opportunities to improve access to our trails and Greenways.</p>       |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|--|--|
| <p>Only to stress earlier comments to improve accessibility in a more joined up way. I am pleased to see emphasis on improving the Derbyshire bridleway network, which is not as well or evenly distributed as our rights on foot. I have spent the majority of my riding life in a suburban environment and had greater access to bridleways than the last 14 years in a truly rural one. My experiences of both my horse and myself lying on tarmac amongst traffic have occurred more times than I wish to repeat</p> | <p>See comment above.</p>  |
| <b>Aim 3 b) Circular/connected routes</b>  |  |
| <p>To link the networks to provide safer and greater accessibility, as much as possible free from roads and traffic</p>  | <p>This is an action that is fundamental to the RoWIP.</p>   |
| <p>Improve links to railway stations.</p>  | <p>Our Greenways programme aims to provide links with transport interchanges, particularly stations. We are currently working on a new link into Chesterfield Station.</p> |
| <p>I support more paths connecting existing ones, but please keep artificial and man-made stuff to a minimum.</p>  | <p>We have made a commitment to this in our Environmental Statement and through the Themes that underpin the RoWIP.</p>  |
| <p>To look carefully at those areas where there are gaps in the accessible routes in order to link up</p>  | <p>Links to Aim 3d)</p>  |
| <p>We consider that providing practical routes that link people's homes, local facilities, public transport and places of interest as well as creating circular routes for leisure as the highest priority.</p>  | <p>This agrees with the links to the Investment Protocol within the Local Transport Plan.</p>  |
| <p>Please don't forget the south of the county the National Forest is a wonderful thing but some of the paths leave a lot to be desired. If I remember correctly the aim was to link each forest site to another but there is no link from tunnel woods Castle Gresley to Badger Wood Coton Park. You can walk from Conkers to Swains Park Wood you then have no footpath that is accessible to people with mobility problems or people with pushchairs</p>  | <p>We are currently supporting a project to provide a multi user link through Tunnel Woods.</p>  |
| <p>As pressure builds for housing development on greenfield sites, ensure that the RoW team is pro-active in fully consulting local councils and residents prior to the finalisation of plans, to ensure that access issues are addressed, and the opportunity taken to enhance local routes, in cooperation with the developers.</p>  | <p>We do this whenever possible.</p>   |
| <p>The aims and actions do not mention the use of public path orders to improve the PProW network (apart from publishing a register of applications); if much greater priority were given to making orders in the interests of the public rather than landowners much more could be achieved.</p>  | <p>The wording has been changed to reflect this comment.</p>   |
| <p>Work to develop much better 'connectivity' in the networks, identifying the extent</p>  | <p>We are working towards this and feel that this is already covered in</p>  |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|--|---|
| <p>to which paths link, or ought to link together should be progressed under Aim 3, where objectives currently underplay the importance of improving the network. It is suggested that an extra action be included: 'To improve the network's usability by adding new links or concessionary routes where appropriate.'</p>  | <p>the existing actions.</p>  |
| <p>Local people know the real missing links in local routes - areas of the countryside that are not accessible, or are not used, because one stage is on a busy road, or you can not make the walk circular - locals should be consulted in a pro-active way, for ideas locally that would enhance the network.</p>  | <p>We are always open to suggestions from local people for improvements to the network and are looking to work more closely with local councils within Aim 5.</p>                                 |
| <p>Will DCC be opening some of the land they own to open access land, especially as quite a lot is in lowland areas where there is little open access land?</p>  | <p>This is something that we can consider over the next 5 years.</p>  |
| <p>There are many foot paths in the Heanor/Loscoe/Aldercar/Codnor area which, if restored would enable more people to explore and learn about what we have in the Erewash Bailey Brook valleys.</p>  | <p>This is something we can look at over the next 5 years.</p>  |
| <p>Melbourne Footpaths Group is working towards the restoration of the lost path from the Sustrans Trail at Kings Newton to Path 20 north of Ramsley (linking Melbourne with Castle Donington); the creation of a safe and convenient pedestrian alternative to Swarkestone Bridge by joining existing paths with new lengths of path where appropriate (linking Swarkestone and Derby to Melbourne and South Derbyshire); and a Greenway between Swadlincote and Melbourne.</p> | <p>This links in to Aim 3c) Greenways and Aim 3d) Safety.</p>   |
| <b>Aim 3 c) Greenways programme</b>  |   |
| <p>Liaise with neighbouring authorities to improve connections</p>   | <p>We do have close links with several neighbouring authorities and welcome the opportunity to work with them.</p>  |
| <p>Work closely with neighbouring authorities and agencies (Sustrans, waterways, etc) to ensure that routes crossing local authority boundaries are developed in a fully coordinated way.</p>  | <p>See comment above.</p>   |
| <p>Work (with others such as Sustrans), to provide more long distance cycle routes using both offroad &amp; suitable quiet on-road routes. E.g. a north – south route by linking existing Killamarsh/Chesterfield to 5 Pits network and then on to Nutbrook/Erewash Valley. Also possible east – west links from Cromford/High Peak Junction to Blackwell/Silverhill.</p>  | <p>We already have a good working relationship with Sustrans and will investigate ways of working more closely in the future.</p>   |
| <p>A clear vision for the after care of the trails network needs to be agreed and funded or why bother.</p>  | <p>We are currently working on a management programme for our Greenway network.</p>   |
| <p>These special routes are invaluable in terms of recreation. But they also provide means for more people to participate in safe horse-riding and cycling. These activities, if encouraged, not only improve the lives of the participants, but benefit</p>   | <p>It is good to recognise the contribution that the Greenway network can make to supporting the local economy, benefiting tourism and providing a sustainable transport and leisure network.</p> |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|--|---|
| indirectly all the local trades such as feed merchants, saddlers, farriers, farmers, cycle shops. Derbyshire is a rural county and needs all these activities.   |   |
| The emphasis should be taken off developing cycle ways and concentrated on greenways. At the moment there is a considerable safety problem in that some cyclists travel too quickly and aggressively on the trails. In some areas and in particular tunnels, cyclists and walkers should be segregated as has been done on other trails. Where greenway projects have been identified but have stalled because of lack of funding then stepwise development should be undertaken by first establishing footpaths ready for development at a later stage.           | We do work to provide routes that can be used and enjoyed by all users.   |
| There needs to be a focus on using routes for utility/commuting by bike, currently there is too much focus on the paths as recreational routes, they could form a highly effective commuting network, these need to be circular routes just fast straight, no access gates and go to places of employment eg town centres, retail or industrial parks. Get rid of anti motorbike A frame gates, they just block or hinder genuine users, get police to target the source of the problem ie the motorbike riders rather than protecting the receptors ie the paths. | See comment above about benefits of Greenways for sustainable use. We will investigate the use of path furniture on these routes.   |
| Something should be done about the cross county bike traffic on roads between the peak district trails, following the extension of the Monsal Trail. There will be a serious accident soon.  | We have made a commitment to develop the White Peak Cycle Loop to address this.   |
| Missing from the greenway section is any reference to connecting Buxton to the north end of the High Peak Trail.   | We have made a commitment to develop the White Peak Cycle Loop which includes this section but we have stated that the priority will be to develop the route between Buxton and Matlock via the Monsal Trail. |
| Multi user trails need to be wide enough to support 2-way usage of mixed types of users (not all existing trails can currently do this).   | We do work to provide a width of 3m for new Greenway development.   |
| Greenway links to railway stations are essential to encourage motorists to leave their cars at home and to avoid disturbance to residents by parking outside local homes.  | We do identify the need to connect the Greenway network to public transport nodes, particularly railway stations. We are currently delivering a new link into Chesterfield Station.                           |
| Funding priority in the High Peak should be given to the extension of the multi user greenway trail linking the southern end of the new Shallcross Incline greenway with the area at the northern end of the Fernilee Reservoir using the route of the former Cromford & High Peak railway as much as is practicable. The recreational, economic and health benefits of such a project are clear and well known.   | We will look at this option in association with High Peak Borough Council.  |
| The greatest problem is the access controls, these block genuine users, and are useless at preventing illegal motorbike use. Good quality well drained surfaces even tarmac'd as the off road bike users don't like this, will help speed up the paths for cyclists turning them into a viable commuting network join them up,   | We are always looking for opportunities to develop safe off road cycle routes whilst trying to accommodate other users.   |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| <p>especially the bridleways this may mean turning footpaths into bridleways.</p>   |   |
| <p>With reference to multi-user routes in Derby City, ensure that these have continuous links into surrounding routes in the rural hinterland.</p>  | <p>We will work closely with Derby City to investigate good links between the City and County.</p>                                  |
| <p>We really need as a matter of urgency to open access via Seanor Lane, Lower Pilsley to the 5 Pits Trail using other routes especially Locko Road is increasingly dangerous two horses have been hit by cars in the last year.</p>  | <p>We are always looking for opportunities to improve links onto our trails and Greenway networks.</p>                              |
| <p>An update regarding the review of the East Derbyshire Greenway Strategy needs to be made available.</p>  | <p>This has been identified as an action to be delivered.</p>   |
| <b>Aim 3 d) Easy access routes</b>  |   |
| <p>There needs to be more seating, benches available on the routes for those who have a disability and for the older generation</p>   | <p>Noted.</p>   |
| <p>Improve specific routes for disabled users</p>   | <p>We always welcome suggestions for specific improvements from disabled users.</p>   |
| <p>Derbyshire is a large county with a considerable footpath mileage. It has to be accepted that many miles cannot be made accessible to anyone other than walkers as the terrain makes it impossible for disabled users (wheelchair) to access. Nevertheless every effort needs to be made to continue expanding disabled access to the countryside wherever possible. As a very regular user of the footpaths and rights of ways across Derbyshire the only great issue I have is with signage and stiles. Although it's costly this issue is one that needs constant surveillance and action (sometimes costly).</p>   | <p>Signage and improving stiles and gates is a priority for us under Aim 1.</p>   |
| <p>If funding is available I would prioritise making more paths accessible to wheelchairs and for people with mobility difficulties. Fortunately I am currently fit and healthy, but in future years I might need such access to beautiful places (but not by motorised vehicles - they stop becoming beautiful).</p>   | <p>We have stated that we will look for opportunities to improve the network for users of wheelchairs and pushchairs.</p>           |
| <p>Whilst we support Aim 3 as described the Disabled Ramblers have a concern about its effects on accessible route(s) provision. Our members do not want to end up inadvertently restricted to a few safe places in Derbyshire as the DCC focuses its efforts on providing only Tissington Trail like facilities. Note – we are grateful for this style of provision, and make use of it. Long may it continue. However, when one is disabled one notices a risk averse approach amongst authorities. Derbyshire and Staffordshire have superb areas of countryside which using a Tramper or similar specialist scooter are physically available with suitable planning. After all it is our risk when we choose to visit and enjoy the</p> | <p>We are always open to working with groups such as the Disabled Ramblers and would welcome the opportunity to work with them.</p> |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| challenge of the countryside.   |   |
| <b>Aim 3 e) Safer network</b>   |   |
| Add use of vehicle barriers on bridleways to keep horse riders safe from illegal use by offroad vehicles.   | Noted.  |
| That the rights of way are logical and correctly linked – where they currently require people to walk down busy roads – this needs to be safe.  | Noted.  |
| Include the development of new concessionary footpaths where presently walkers are forced to use dangerous roads that are without pavements. Also the establishment of new circular routes which would benefit tourists to the area.  | We welcome suggestions where this action could be delivered.  |
| To link the networks to provide safer and greater accessibility, as much as possible free from roads and traffic.   | See comments above.   |
| Action 3e) iii the use of collision/casualty data on its own is not a reliable method of identifying dangerous roads/crossings since most people avoid such crossings if they are perceived to be dangerous.  | Noted.  |
| The Council is asked to recognise that there can be real problems of safety where footpaths cross fields containing livestock. Consideration should be given to this and possible solutions recommended   | We will work closely with landowning organisations to ensure that the correct messages are given out about this issue to educate users. |
| Residents in Breadsall feel very strongly about the ability to utilise the local rights of way. The main problem for the residents is the fact that the village is almost completely surrounded by very busy highways. Many pathways are not accessible because of the danger of trying to cross the busy roads. For many years residents have campaigned to get a crossing on the A61 to enable them to cycle or walk to the neighbouring village of Little Eaton and beyond. Residents feel that they wouldn't dare take a wheelchair, pushchair or small child across the road to reach the pathways on the other side because of the speed and number of vehicles using the road. Whilst it is understood that highways are not within your remit the inclusivity of the rights of way close to Breadsall is diminished by the issues highlighted above. Many residents would love to lead a more environmentally-friendly lifestyle but don't feel safe to do so. It is hoped that the issues faced by the residents of Breadsall Village can be investigated and that maybe the need for a road crossing could be included in the plans for future rights of way. | We are aware of these issues and do look for opportunities to improve the linkages to and from Breadsall.                               |

| <p><b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br/><b>Comments:</b></p>   | <p><b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br/><b>Response:</b></p>   |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Aim 3 f) Management of motorised vehicles</b></p>  |  |
| <p>I'd like to see 'improve the provision of routes for vehicle users' included in the aims (or an agreement not to pursue further reduction in the routes available if the former is not possible)</p>  | <p>The Green Lanes Policy does provide a commitment to uphold the rights of vehicle users.</p>   |
| <p>Identified need number '3f' is inconsistent with the use of the word 'management' it implies that recreational motorised vehicles in the country side are treated differently to all other groups. Why would you widely declare and publish on one hand that you are a non discriminatory organisation and then produce a document that clearly indicates that any group is being treated differently to others by using different language pertaining to that group. There is no reason for using the words improve the management of" instead of using the words "improve provision of" used for other groups included in the list. Additionally discrimination against an individual group by stating that it being singled out for management rather than provision is at odds with the very wording of Aim 3. "provide a more connected safe and accessible network suitable for all users".</p> | <p>Different phrases have been used for different groups depending on what is required and it is considered that the important factor is that all the different users of the PRoW network have sections within the RoWIP that have actions to help them.</p> |
| <p>Ensure that if managing 'access for all' that it should not be just for cyclists, horse riders and walkers. The network should also be available to motorised vehicular access.</p>   | <p>The Green Lanes Policy does address motorised vehicle use.</p>  |
| <p>You state continue the development of greenway multi user trails, but when you read the PDNP proposals for closing 29 green lanes through out the Peak District these are blatantly biased against motor users and are currently planning to close two green lanes Roych Clough and the Long Causeway two routes that are mainly rock surfaced tracks are under consideration for closing. Chapel Gate has been closed again another rock surfaced track and this has passed the deadline for the temporary 18month proposal and remains closed to motor users.</p>   | <p>We cannot comment on the work being delivered by the Peak District National Park Authority.</p>   |
| <p>I agree with motorised vehicles such as 4x4's on the same land/route as horse riders.</p>   | <p>Noted.</p>  |
| <p>I am seeing an increasing amount of routes been closed to recreational vehicle users for no apparently good reason. If it is your stated aim to make routes available to all? Then don't close them to certain groups unless there is very good reason and reopen the routes to those users asap. Don't bow to minority public pressure.</p>  | <p>The Green Lanes Policy attempts to provide a balanced approach to the management of green lanes.</p>  |
| <p>End the closure of rights of way to recreational vehicle users and promote it as a legitimate recreational use/ resource.</p>   | <p>See comment above.</p>  |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|---|--|
| <p>Have lived in the Peak District all my life and so have the previous 6 generations of my family throughout this time we have all used trails to: travel to and from work to enjoy the area we live and cherish. Get to trial riding competitions in certain areas of the Peak District such as Bill Wrights Farm Fernilee but the green lane from Taxal to Buxton Road was closed and never reopened so was the trail running from Taxal to Fernilee Reservoir past Knipe and Madscar Farms throughout this time we have seen lanes being closed making routes that used to link lanes together allowing a safe days riding rather than riding on roads where road users travel at faster speeds than trail bikes are geared for. The proposals are biased against motor users and the PDNPA are using the banning of motor vehicles as a knee jerk reaction instead of using other ways such as involving all users who have the rights to be able to enjoy these trails and maintain the routes, instead of taking away the rights of the users and the trade from local businesses due to the banning of users of certain routes, deterring people from coming to the area and going elsewhere to use trails where they have alternative ways of managing their routes without removing access to any groups of users</p> | <p>See comments above about management of specific routes in the Peak District National Park.</p>  |
| <p>Ensure footpaths and rights of way are not hijacked by the selfish interests of motorised vehicles.</p>  | <p>The County Council is committed to tackling illegal use of the network whilst defending the rights of all legal users.</p>  |
| <p>Ensure motorised vehicles are kept to only their allowed routes, these should be limited.</p>  | <p>The Management of Green Lanes Policy attempts to provide a balanced approach to the management of green lanes in the County.</p>  |
| <p>Delete Aim 3f) and ban motorised vehicles and improve facilities for people with disabilities.</p>   | <p>Noted.</p>  |
| <p>Continue with your efforts to prevent destruction of some of these routes by heavy motorised vehicles.</p>   | <p>See comment above about the Management of Green Lanes Policy.</p>   |
| <p>Further restrictions to motorised vehicles to by way routes.</p>   | <p>See comment above about the Management of Green Lanes Policy.</p>   |
| <p>Ban motorised vehicles from BOATS in the national park.</p>  | <p>See comment above about the Green Lanes Policy, although the Peak District National Park Authority also has their own policy on the management of Motorised Vehicles.</p> |
| <p>I feel motorised vehicles should never be allowed to tear up our public rights of way, many of these ancient rights of way were never designed for that type of abuse. 4 x 4 lovers should join clubs &amp; take part in rallies where they can destroy private land &amp; not public land.</p>  | <p>See comment above about the Management of Green Lanes Policy.</p>   |
| <p>In the interests of promoting physical activity and safety our paths and bridleways should not be allowed to be used by motorised off roading" groups. Use by this type of activity increases degradation of the environment</p>   | <p>We have a duty to uphold the rights of all legitimate users and will also work to tackle illegal use of the network.</p>  |



| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| maintenance and reduces safety."  |   |
| My immediate concern is the use of 'green lanes' by motor bikes, land rovers and quad bikes. I hope you will do all within your powers, and make yourself some more powers, to stop motorised vehicles (with the obvious exception of farm tractors) using footpaths and un-metalled tracks. They might have been used by horse and carts, but are certainly not meant for use of motorised vehicles. I am aware that resources are tight at the moment and in the foreseeable future. They should certainly not be spent on repairing paths wrecked by such vehicles. I have observed most come from outside the area and contribute next to nothing to the local economy. | We have a duty to uphold the rights of all legitimate users and will also work to tackle illegal use of the network.                |
| Closing rights of way to vehicular traffic will cause them to become overgrown through lack of use, thereby losing them for all.  | It is our duty to prevent paths from becoming too overgrown. Regular use by any users will help keep paths from becoming overgrown. |
| Many of these roads are used by 4x4s etc which is dangerous for people and dogs and makes a noise nuisance and ruins the surface which would ordinarily be fine for many years.   | We have a duty to uphold the rights of all legitimate users and will also work to tackle illegal use of the network.                |
| Aim should include making sure the public rights of way network is safe for users and an additional action should be carrying out safety surveys of routes where pedestrians and horse riders complain repeatedly of danger from off-road vehicles  | See comment above.  |
| Recognise that the safety and accessibility needs of horses and pedestrians and cyclists are profoundly different to vehicular users. To keep the majority of users safe and to minimise damage and costly repairs, vehicles need to be kept off most routes.   | See comment above.  |
| There is no mention of how the plan supports traffic regulation orders on footpaths and bridleways to make it safe for walkers and horse riders to use these green lanes.   | This is covered in the Management of Green Lanes Policy.  |
| Vehicle barriers should be installed on footpaths and bridleways to ensure horse riders and walkers are not at risk from illegal use of bridleways by motorised vehicles.   | Although this is an option we will look at each case on its own merit.  |
| Provide substantial physical barriers to prevent 4x4s and motor bikes from illegal access to FPs and BWs. Ensure much more rigorous enforcement – including heavy fines.  | See comment above.  |
| Targeting illegal use, eg motorbikes and other antisocial behaviour.  | We will always work to tackle illegal use of the PRow network.  |
| BOATs that have TROs should be clearly marked including partial bans. Overriding everything in the RoWIP is the need to get a grip on unlawful use by motorbikes and 4x4s. The destruction they cause is criminal and spoils the  | Information about TROs is provided in an online register on our web site.   |

| <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 3 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b> |
|--|--|
| pleasure of 1000's of other users.   |  |
| Include a statement on how the routes will be 'policed' (e.g. management of recreational motorised vehicles).  | This is covered in the Green Lanes Policy  |
| The County Council should help landowners and occupiers and others who are suffering from the illegal use of rights of way by vehicles by putting traffic regulation orders on paths where necessary | This is covered in the Green Lanes Policy  |
| <b>Aim 3 g) Investment in the access network</b>   |  |
| Action should be to secure funding as well as report funding   | This alteration has been made.   |

## **Appendix E: Aim 4 –Improve the promotion, understanding and use of the network**

### **Q6b Do you think any additional actions should be included?**

#### **‘Yes’ responses**

| <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>  |
|--|---|
| <b>Aim 4 a) Path/route signage</b>   |   |
| The countryside doesn't need more signage just better map readers.   | Noted.  |
| It would be helpful if finger posts carried their OS grid reference.   | We will look at this as an option.  |
| Please keep signage to a minimum, ie a visible post with arrows. Derbyshire are very good at this compared with neighbouring authorities, thank you. But please don't start going beyond this. | We have made a commitment in the document to prevent the countryside from looking over-managed in the underlying themes and in the Environment Statement. |
| Should 4a not be in Aim 1 – or vice versa (there is something ostensibly similar there).   | We have combined the actions relating to signposting and waymarking into Aim 1.   |

| <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>                                |
|--|---|
| Include an action relating to providing additional information on signposts such as destination and distance, moved from Aim 1.  | See comment above.  |
| To be consistent with OS maps, I would like to see the distance on the signposts marked in kms. Alongside the mileage, this would be useful to overseas visitors and route planners alike.   | At present all distances on highway signs are recorded in miles.  |
| Ensure users are fully aware if they should not be using a route. E.g. motorised vehicles on non boats   | We have been improving the information that we provide on signposts for different users.                            |
| <b>Aim 4 b) Promote health, sustainable, tourism and economic benefits</b>   |   |
| Drop 4b it isn't necessary to tell people they need to take exercise.  | Improving messages about healthy living are seen as very important at this time.                                    |
| Discourage and not promote use of rights of way which does not promote healthy lifestyles or impedes pursuit of healthy lifestyles by others.  | Noted.  |
| Identify opportunities for low key camping sites throughout the area, this again would allow for much better exploration of the area and wider connections, while building on the tourism opportunities for mountain bike and horse rider holidays.  | We carry out this type of work in conjunction with Visit Derbyshire.  |
| Ashbourne represents an excellent focal point for circular walks and cycling which would be usefully incorporated into the renovation of Ashbourne Park and Memorial Gardens and, once finally established, into walks along the Henmore in the lee of the eclectic townscape. Further, we were attracted to the ideas of audio walks, which might usefully dovetail with heritage projects we are working on. Focussing on the health side, we would also like to see how Community Transport can be incorporated into schemes to give groups from villages around Ashbourne access to the network of the footpaths you identify. | We would welcome the opportunity to investigate working with groups to help deliver some of the actions identified. |
| More Derbyshire towns and villages should be encouraged and supported by DCC to work towards "Walkers are Welcome Town" status. (Melbourne is expecting accreditation in the Spring of 2013.)  | See comment above.  |
| We want to encourage the use of public transport to the start and from the finish of walks. Bus companies should be encouraged to publicise walks that can be made from stops on their routes – circular and linear walks. Leaflets could be available on buses and information placed on bus stops. Special offers could be made for walkers such as special fares, ramblers tickets/passes.  | As an authority we are continually looking to see how we can work more closely with public transport operatives.    |

| <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|---|--|
| <b>Aim 4 c) Availability and quality of information</b>   |  |
| Target schools  | We do work closely with the Safe Routes to Schools team.   |
| Provide walks” in particular into places that are “at risk” from being destroyed by inappropriate building plans so people can see what they are about to loose”  | This would be for local communities to promote rather than the County Council  |
| Provide a detailed map of those routes available to recreational motorised vehicles and keep routes open to these users.  | We have identified that this information does need to be provided on our web pages.  |
| Provide app-type facilities online or for the mobile phone to allow users to navigate the trail.  | We will investigate this suggestion.   |
| The identification of trails” on the 1:50000 and 1:25000 maps is very poor. This is obviously a long term problem but should be given priority as time is important. As a user I find working with RoWs easy but trails very difficult.”  | Not all trails are promoted by ourselves which is why it is difficult for Ordnance Survey to collect the information.                                    |
| Ensure that there is agreement between OS maps and the situation on the ground i.e. mapped paths do not cease at parish boundaries. All definitive paths appear on maps.  | We do work closely with Ordnance Survey to provide accurate information.   |
| In practice we all use maps - a connection to OS and Harvey's maps etc to be definitive.  | See comment above.   |
| Ensure that the information under 4c is non digitally available. Also publish local maps.   | Our priority is to provide digital information but we are looking at how to make information available in non digital formats.                           |
| The maps referred to at 4 c) vi should exclude the boats which have a TRO banning motor vehicles throughout the year and should identify clearly partial bans. NCHs should be excluded as who has rights to use these are not known.  | Information about current TRO is already provided on our web pages. We will only promote routes for vehicle use where the legal rights have been proven. |
| There needs to be a very clear understanding about the use of green lanes, accommodation roads and BOATs which have footpaths on them. The road is marked on some maps as a normal road and others as an accommodation road”. There is a street light at our end but still no-one will maintain it or stop the farm next door destroying its surface. We have an accommodation road with a footpath on it next to our farm which is used by a busy plant hire firm to operate from causing a dreadful surface danger to the public through lack of care when loading/unloading equipment etc. Highways department refuse to have anything to do with it!” | We will only promote routes for vehicle use where the legal rights have been proven.   |
| Highways must have a very clear understanding of what these roads/tracks can be used for. David Chapman our local district councillor has tried to get an answer but it is so difficult as the budget drives the answer rather than the   | See comment above.   |

| <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>  |
|---|---|
| needs of the area.  |   |
| Publicity campaign to promote use of PRow.  | This has been identified as an action.  |
| Easy information on routes suitable for pram users please!  | We are working to improve this information on our web pages and through our Access Derbyshire Leaflet.  |
| Could publish a cheap but profitable book containing maps and rights of way information.  | We are concentrating at providing more of our information on line.  |
| Provide contact information for the network (e.g. if I wanted to run a sponsored walk who can I contact for information on routes/restrictions/ suggestions/ facilities etc).   | We will look to provide this type of information on our web pages.  |
| Tapping in to the national opportunities of advertising to promote the routes available& liaise with neighbouring counties to merge information so people browsing the web can see cross border route opportunities to horse ride over longer distances/horsey tourism. | We will investigate this as an action.  |
| Greater publicity of RoW including display of local maps where appropriate.   | This information will be promoted through our suite of leaflets promoting cycling, horse riding and easy access opportunities.  |
| Ensure local maps are produced and provided - making a charge if necessary (not just digitally).  | We are limited with copyright from Ordnance Survey.   |
| Facilities need to be provided for users of the network, and information on where these facilities are.   | We are continually looking to improve the quality of information that we provide both in our leaflets and on our web pages.   |
| Excellent process but suggest increased public awareness....I came upon this information via council contact. Suggest library and local media publicity.  | Noted.  |
| Using inspectors to give talks to local groups to give two-way information. To make any printed walking matter clear and give accessibility star.   | We will investigate this as an action.  |
| Develop the website further showing helpful information; eg availability of seating on RoWs, nearest toilets, car parks with disabled facilities, bus routes and historical information.  | We are continually looking to improve the quality of information that we provide both in our leaflets and on our web pages and will look to provide this information. |
| I would like to see notices around the county detailing how the public can assist by calling a certain number to report any issues. The public can be a good eyes and ears".  | We will investigate this as an action.  |
| There should be a continued installation of information boards relating to the flora & fauna, geology, history, industrial archeology, etc. These are much enjoyed by walkers and tourists.   | We will investigate this as an action.  |
| Aim 4c The Disabled Ramblers would wish to support the present initiative that is underway to grade all rights of way in the DCC area and to make this information available via the DCC mapping portal. We also would wish to  | We would welcome the opportunity to work with the Disabled ramblers to deliver this action.   |

| <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>   |
|---|--|
| commend the recent DCC publication of the Access Derbyshire map   |  |
| Parish Councils should be encouraged to produce Public Footpath maps for display. These could be to a standard format agreed with DCC. An excellent example can be seen at Findern provided by the Parish Council. DCC should encourage the production of local footpath maps/guides (perhaps to a uniform standard). These guides should include “health walks”, which might be specifically waymarked locally. These should be available in print or by download. Podcasts of walks (for mp3 players) could be produced and available for download. | We will investigate this as an action. Links to Aim 5.   |
| DCC should encourage more <u>long distance routes</u> through the county to encourage longer visits to the county. It also needs to improve the quality of signing on present routes.   | We will provided support for others to develop routes but in the current climate we cannot take on new long distance routes ourselves. |
| Community interest should be fostered by emphasising the historical development consequent upon a principal highway route (latterly the A6) with feeders off; for example: Goyt Valley, Highway Travel –Livestock – Coal - Water Power - Cotton Carding - Limestone Quarry - Gunpowder Railway (Cromford & High Peak Railway) – Manchester, Liverpool and North West Railway.   | Links to Aim 5   |
| <b>Aim 4 d) Encourage responsible use and develop confidence</b>  |  |
| I feel there needs to be more emphasis on responsible use of the rights of way, for the benefit of other users, nature and land-owners.   | Encouraging responsible use is very important.   |
| Ensure that the public/users are aware and encouraged to be responsible for the respect and care when using the rights of way.  | See comment above.   |
| Clear guidance for users.   | We are continually looking to improve both promotion of the network and responsible use.   |
| Encourage children to do organised walks over the areas, they will continue to use them as adults and take future generations the same routes.  | See comment above.   |
| More education about responsible use of the countryside and respect for the rights and privacy of people who live and work there.   | See comment above.   |
| Perhaps there should be more communication about the special needs of different user types. For example, at times horse-riders and cyclists will obviously need to go at different speeds from ordinary walkers with or without children and this should be made clear to those 'slower' users. We also need to educate the 'faster' users in their consideration for all other users.  | This has been identified as an action point to improve the messages that we provide for all users.                                     |

| <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 4 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b> |
|---|--|
| <p>Would be good to encourage understanding of each user groups needs where multiple-use occurs. Horse riders to always walk past more vulnerable users. Cyclists approaching horse riders silently directly from behind to shout hello – “bike”. Motorised vehicles/bikes to be prepared to stop to allow the rider to pass - much safer. Compulsory speaking to fellow users!</p>   | <p>See comment above.</p>  |
| <p>Better facilities for dog owners, more bins, access to sites and places of public interest.</p>  | <p>We will look into this suggestion.</p>  |
| <p>Make it lawful for cyclists to have and use a bell.</p>  | <p>See comment above about providing messages for all users.</p>                           |
| <p>Clearer statements of what users can use what paths. Enforce more strictly restrictions on motor vehicles.</p>   | <p>See comment above.</p>  |
| <p>Respect the rights and opinions of the people who live and/or work on the land affected by rights of way.</p>  | <p>We have strengthened the wording in the RoWIP to reflect this.</p>                      |
| <p>Greater education within the community to encourage safe use and respect to other users.</p>   | <p>See comments above about responsible use and respecting other users.</p>                |
| <p>As a regular walker on multi-user routes i often find the sudden quiet approach of cyclists startling and potentially dangerous to children and the elderly. This could easily be avoided if the use of bells was encouraged or recommended. .</p>   | <p>See comment above about providing messages for all users.</p>                           |
| <p>How about more meetings of all three groups together to discuss the issues. Also, how about using social media for more immediate feedback on the use/misuse, and management/mismanagement of these precious routes.</p>   | <p>This is why Local Access Forums were set up.</p>  |
| <p>One of my concerns with allowing easier and greater access to the countryside is the apparent lack of respect that the general public seem to have for the landscape, nature and the property of the landowners. I fear litter, dog mess sealed in plastic bags and left by the wayside, damaged field boundaries, stressed livestock and disturbed ecosystems as a result of greater use. I also fear the loss of some of our beautiful stiles, including the sometimes challenging squeezer stiles. I do not feel that dog poo bins, litter bins, wide gates, surfaced paths etc are the answer - that is bringing the urban 'comfort' to the countryside. What those of us who appreciate the countryside love is some of the challenge, the wildness, the lack of litter and crowds, and the peace - the fact it's not in any way 'urban' or 'popular'. Rather than bending the countryside to the requirements of the general public, I feel that the general public need to better understand the countryside, how it's managed, it's 'laws' and that it requires respect.</p> | <p>See comments above about responsible use and respecting other users.</p>                |

## Appendix F: Aim 5 – Encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way

### Q7b - Do you think any additional actions should be included?

#### ‘Yes’ responses

| Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br>Comments:   | Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br>Response:            |
|--|---|
| All are important  | Noted.  |
| Make greater use of volunteers to participate in the management of rights of way: eg waymarking, provision of seats and interpretation boards, keeping obstructive vegetation and dog fouling under control. Liaise with DALC (Derbyshire Association of Local Councils) and Civic Voice (the successor to the Civic Trust) to help engagement with Town and Parish Councils (through DALC) and community groups (through Civic Voice) | We have added in DALC and Civic Voice to the list of Key Partners in the Action tables  |
| Ashbourne Town Council is working on a Neighbourhood Plan which the Ashbourne Partnership intend to actively contribute to. We therefore see the period covered by your RoWIP as being encapsulated into the Neighbourhood Plan and would like to feel that there will be a dialogue between all the parties to achieve that.  | We are fully prepared to enter into such a dialogue.                                    |
| <b>Aim 5 a) Involvement of user groups and individual volunteers</b>   |   |
| Encouragement could be given to members of the general public to volunteer to do some minor maintenance of paths etc.  | We are currently producing a Volunteer Policy to help clarify how we support volunteers |
| Provide an online forum for registered local volunteer groups - facilitate annual conference for invited local community/volunteer groups. Progress report and network opportunities.  | See comment above.  |
| Local communities need to be empowered so there should be regular up date meetings with PRoW officers and local communities. Local communities be able to take on basic PRoW activities like completing section 147/8s in agreement with ranger service and PRoW officer set up service level agreements with groups like the Ramblers. Clearly there is a training need for PRoW officers to be developed.                            | We will investigate this as an action.  |
| The use of community groups for information and work related voluntary help.   | Noted.  |



| <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>   |
|--|--|
| Contact local walking groups who at this moment are not aware that they can make a contribution to the management of rights of way.  | We will look at this as an action once we have a suitable support network in place.  |
| Aim 5 – our community group's biggest issues related to insurance and to getting the landowner to sign-off the work; provision of a set of suitable tools (ours came via BTCV) would be an issue for a group setting up. Does Aim 5 adequately reflect the level of practical support required if local community involvement is to be increased?  | We have recently established a Volunteer Project Officer post to help provide advice and support to local groups.  |
| In urban areas local people and community groups needs to be involved in basic maintenance especially vegetation clearance.  | This type of work is covered by the Parishes that are signed up to the existing Minor Maintenance Agreements. However this does leave many paths not covered and this comment will be noted when developing work with volunteers covered in Aim 5a). |
| Part of Aim 5a - could work with local or user groups to bid for funding such as Natural England's 'paths for the future' scheme.  | We are happy to offer support to local groups who want to carry out improvements to their local paths.   |
| Ensure that local action groups who are only concerned with their own group usually to the exclusion of other groups do not get a large say in what's happening.   | Noted.   |
| Ensure that all local user groups are involved and not just one section of users.  | Noted.   |
| Consult users of trails through organised federations for the help and use of the users 4x4 drivers may be willing to move materials up certain trails requiring repair the same as trail bike users, and members may be willing to volunteer to repair certain areas of concern instead of just closing them to users instead of involving them to keep activities that have been carried out in the peak district for decades. | We are happy to offer support to local groups who want to carry out improvements to their local paths.   |
| There needs to be a point about education. It's great getting people involved but you need to make sure understanding is embedded.   | This links to the actions in Aim 4.  |
| There needs to be greater communication between the PRow team, the RoWIP and local communities. Identified and properly trained local community volunteers can add considerable value and be an asset to the service.  | See comment above about support from Volunteer Officer post.   |
| Clarify who is responsible for maintaining and improving pathways. Codnor Castle Heritage Trust wants to encourage increased access to Codnor Castle which can only be reached via public footpaths. It has been both confusing and frustrating for my organisation to establish which body is responsible for maintenance and improvements to paths and bridleways.   | We will contact Codnor Castle Heritage Trust to investigate opportunities to work together.  |
| Mobilise the services of a frequent users of a particular section of RoW to monitor its use, to report on any blockages, and to make periodic endeavours to clear and clean. OAPs might be willing to help here.   | See comments above.  |

| <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?</b><br><b>Response:</b>   |
|---|--|
| <p>Aim 5 seeks to encourage greater community involvement in managing local rights of way. If this means giving local councils and volunteer groups more responsibility, I agree entirely. Shared ownership of, and responsibility for, managing local rights of way is to everyone's advantage. However, as an RA volunteer and member of our Parish Council Footpaths Group, I have found that this is very definitely <u>not</u> what is happening at the moment. Everything is tightly controlled by the centre. Local communities are not allowed to maintain or improve anything without central authorisation. We are aware of lots of problems but are not allowed to resolve any of them ourselves. All we can do is report them, but the centre is hopelessly overloaded so acts as a huge bottleneck and in some cases a black hole. This causes chronic intense frustration and cynicism. It is very demoralising. I want to help, but am frequently tempted to become an ex-volunteer.</p> | <p>We have recently established a Volunteer Project Officer post to help provide advice and support to local groups.</p>   |
| <p>The establishment of local volunteer groups should be encouraged. These need help with training and with funding for their Public Indemnity insurance. DCC should look at providing this or at least negotiating reduced rates for such groups. Volunteer groups should be helped to network by "face-to-face meetings" and by the use of new technologies.</p>  | <p>See comment above.</p>  |
| <b>Aim 5 b) Involvement of local councils</b>   |  |
| <p>In rural parishes a path warden" could be used to walk the paths and carry out surveys which could then be passed to the paths officer for comment. In small parishes this could be one person and for bigger ones 2 or 3 may be needed. It would lend itself ideally to retired people."</p>  | <p>We have recently established a Volunteer Project Officer post to help provide advice and support to local groups.</p>   |
| <p>Local council / communities should be involved as early as possible in dealing with row management issues and local interests given more weight in the management and control of local routes.</p>   | <p>We are always prepared to listen to suggestions for improvements from local council.</p>  |
| <p>Set up and support local parish adopt a path schemes.</p>  | <p>This action is supported in Aim 5a) when working with volunteers and local parish groups.</p>   |
| <p>More parish council involvement in meeting aims.</p>   | <p>We are always prepared to listen to suggestions for improvements from local council.</p>  |
| <p>Give local councils adequate grants to carry out maintenance work in their local area.</p>   | <p>We have explained in the Statement of Action that we currently do not have the budget to expand the Minor Maintenance work programme with local councils but we are looking to provide support to local councils in other ways.</p> |

| <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>   | <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b>  |
|--|---|
| It's high time you increased the maintenance grant to reflect that prices have risen since it was introduced. Make more resources available to local organisations.  | See comment above   |
| The parish council is pleased that the county council will honour minor maintenance agreements that are currently in place. The scheme has operated in our parish since the mid 1980's and is well received in our community and goes a long way to improve the local path network for its residents and visitors to the area. | Noted.  |
| In order to achieve 5a) relax present strictures on parish council annual grant toward upkeep of parish paths eg allow payment for stile kits  | We will discuss individual cases with Parish Councils for such requests but there are existing legal procedures to be followed when authorising stiles and gates. |
| Aim 5: progress since 2007: has a report been produced which concludes that MMAs are not cost effective? Convincing evidence is needed to justify the abandonment of this scheme which can work very well both in terms of cost savings and increased local participation.   | We are continuing with the Minor Maintenance Scheme but we do not have the budget to expand it (see note above).  |
| Local/parish councils need, in some cases, to take more interest in looking after their local paths. Some landowners/farmers do not seem to realise that if walkers can follow a well waymarked path they are likely to do less damage than if they wander all over the place looking for that path.                           | Noted   |
| <b>Aim 5 c) Involvement of land managers</b>   |   |
| The council needs to consider proposals from farmers diverting routes away from busy farmyards.  | We are prepared to discuss suggestions from farmers for changes to the network.   |
| Give land managers the chance to improve the network giving them control in budgets & incentives to make it possible to join up broken routes & create a better network of access especially in order to get horses off the road & onto headland, disused land or any other opportunities available.                           | We will look into this suggestion and will welcome any approaches from landowners to improve access.  |
| Promote a better line of communication between land owners and land managers to help provide off road access to trails.  | See comment above.  |
| Give local community and land managers more authority over providing more access routes to join up the currently fragmented network.   | See comment above.  |
| It will be a balance to ensure that the increased involvement of user groups does not adversely affect landowners and farmers.   | Agreed.   |
| Open days to launch revitalised scheme.  | Noted.  |
| Landowners and occupiers need to be fully consulted and incentivised where access improvements are proposed. They are the only group who suffer from   | The action points in the RoWIP do recognise this.   |

| <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Comments:</b>  | <b>Aim 5 – Do you think any additional actions should be included?<br/>Response:</b> |
|---|--|
| improved access and many of them do not benefit from it, yet they are expected to accept it without compensation for the effects on their business. |  |

## Appendix G: Responses to Q8 – Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

| <b>Further comments or suggestions:</b>   | <b>Responses to further comments or suggestions:</b>   |
|---|--|
| 1. This is a good initiative. 2. Money - as I am sure money is limited, expect it drives a lot or your prioritisation - these decisions should be driven by local people, by consultation, rather than from central requirements or guidelines.   | Noted. We are always open to suggestions from local people and groups for improvements to the network. |
| The plan needs to contain a resource commitment (human and financial) to ensure that it can be delivered.   | Noted.   |
| The plan looks very good and, as a vehicle user, I very much appreciate its fair-minded approach towards this group of users.   | Noted – thank you.   |
| This is a really good idea, it has given me hope as there are several builds (one on my own back door) that has several public rights of way over it, and is well used, but it is surprising how many people do not walk, this may well encourage them to start! It may also pay to get this questionnaire out to schools!  | Noted – thank you.   |
| Please keep up the good work, continue to challenge robustly land owners who block rights of way. Once definitive map has been finalised please sign appropriately and it will all drop into place. Well done and thank you.  | Noted.   |
| More emphasis on the effect on wildlife of heavy numbers of users and more on habitat protection.   | These matters have been addressed in the themes and Environmental Statement and are important to us.   |
| Some information should be provided on NCHs. The length and distribution of NCHs in the county should be included (as in current plan).   | This has been included in the final report.  |
| We need access laws similar to the ones in Scotland. All the CRoW Act did was cause conflict and confusion. There's still a "them and us" culture between bikers/equestrians and walkers.   | This is outside of our control.  |
| Keep up the good work! Recent improvements to areas such as the recent Blackamoor dig days have been a great success from my point of view. The more people can get involved with helping maintain the trails then the more people will (hopefully) use and encourage the responsible use of trails as when you've put some hard work in then people don't want to see it trashed/abused. | Noted.   |

| Further comments or suggestions:  | Responses to further comments or suggestions:  |
|---|--|
| As a parish council we are grateful for the excellent service we receive from Environmental Services staff to enable us to keep our footpaths accessible and in good condition.   | Noted – thank you.   |
| Please be mindful that some user groups are politically and financially more powerful and influential than others.  | Noted.   |
| I agree with the aims and actions put forward. Thanks for the consultation opportunity.   | Noted.   |
| We strongly support the statement of action and the ongoing work of the county in maintaining and enhancing the rights of way network. We look forward to continuing to work with colleagues at the County Council on delivering our joint aims such as greenways in South Derbyshire and the development of a long-distance trail for the National Forest.   | The Council regards the opportunities for joint working as very important.   |
| Thank you for including Cheshire East Council in the consultation on your draft Statement of Action for Derbyshire's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. It appears that the identified aims and needs within the Statement of Action are broadly complimentary of the policies and objectives of Cheshire East's Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2011-2026. Therefore, we would be supportive of this Statement of Action and would welcome any opportunities which arise for joint working in projects which affect or cross our boundaries.               | See comment above.   |
| Although the plan correctly identifies the fact that Derbyshire, especially Chesterfield Borough, is significantly lacking in relation to bridlepaths, there appears to be little interest from the council to build/enhance this shortfall. In fact, it actively encourages its staff/officials to walk away from addressing dangerous issues, such as dogs off leads that regularly attack/chase horses, on its land, thus pushing them onto the roads. This appears to be in direct contravention to the RoWIP's ideals. Much more needs to be done. | This issue of educating users and encouraging responsible use is an important one.   |
| There is a need for an executive summary explaining what it means. There should be a definition for the paths covered by this plan (including concessionary paths and open access land).  | This has been provided   |
| Monitoring and review should be made available to public – as a group we welcome the time and effort that has gone into the report. Particularly responsibilities to support the PRow network. We look forward to seeing results from implementation – RoW charter is key document and should be included in policy context or section 2.   | We intend to continue to produce annual work programmes and monitoring reviews. These and the RoW Charter will be published on our web site. The Charter is fundamental to Aim 1 and is described in that section rather than Section 2 which is relates to external policy. |

---

## **Appendix H – Q13 Analysis with Q1 to Q8**

The number of responses to Q13 relating to disabled respondents was very small i.e. 17 people responded which represents around 10% of all respondents. It was felt that an analysis of the questionnaire based on the responses of those indicating a disability would be unrepresentative and statistically invalid and as a result is not presented here. If however there is a need to access this level of information the analysis will be made available on request via a request to the author.