

# Appendix I

---

## Analysis of Results from Draft RoWIP Consultation

## Summary of Responses to Draft Rights of Way and Countryside Access Improvement Plan

The Tyne and Wear Authorities received 114 responses (listed below) to the Draft Rights of Way and Countryside Access Improvement Plan by August 3rd 2007.

Name/ Organisation	Summary	Tyne and Wear Authorities Response
A. Dodd (CTC Member)	<p>Accessibility I hope you can broaden the designation of routes available to cyclists. Provide practical restraints where necessary but please limit outright prohibition of cycling and encourage the principle of 'sharing'.</p> <p>As a cyclist who has suffered injury and damage due to irresponsible dog owners, I am encouraged by the inclusion of education and publicity on dog control. Hopefully this can be complemented by leaflets and information boards requiring dogs to be kept on a short lead (as set out in rule 42 of the Highway Code) on paths shared with cyclists.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
A. Huntley (Sunderland Conservation Rangers)	<p>Public Transport is a very big issue as people are experiencing a deterioration of services generally as the bus companies run buses where profit is the defining purpose of routes not necessarily where a minority would like to go.</p>	<p>Noted. This issue is outside of the remit of the RoWIP but will be covered by the sister document – the LTP.</p>
A. Jewers (Private Individual)	<p>Stiles – my pet hate! – are they necessary? Reasons for – to stop motorcycles. Reasons against – difficult to negotiate for pram/pushchairs/push bikes/mobility vehicles and horses. Older horses find stiles awkward as they tend to get arthritis and are not as agile as a younger animal – still need exercise. Bridges – many used by horse riders are not horse friendly – an accident waiting to happen i.e. footbridge between EARSDON OVER BURN TO FENICK PIT AREA (NORTH TYNESIDE). This is impossible for a pram or mobility vehicle to negotiate. Many mishaps at this bridge!</p> <p>Grass verges along busy roads – possibly make cycle/horse/dog walker tracks on these – less grass to cut. The roads are a nightmare for cyclists and horse riders – I'm sure motorists have the same view about us.</p>	<p>The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a "case by case" basis in consultation with users/local communities.</p> <p>The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers and other key partners will continue to develop the access</p>

	<p>Therefore we do try to ride 'off road' as much as poss. Many areas of wasteland could be used as a link between footpaths. Grass verges cut down country lanes would soon become worn tracks if used regularly by horses, cyclists – very little maintenance needed and a lot safer for all.</p> <p>With new housing development in EARSDON AREA. Hope bridleways and paths will be protected.</p> <p>I would like to add – much improvement of some paths in North Tyneside area, especially the Waggonways with the 3-post system. Could we not have these on all footpaths? Much easier for all. Thank you.</p>	<p>network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.</p> <p>The plan partners will work with planning authorities to develop and safe guard access routes as part of the sustainable travel infrastructure. See Section 4.7 – Long Term Planning.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>A. Kerr – Councillor (South Tyneside Council)</p>	<p>Discourage or better still the use of countryside by "off roaders". They do tremendous harm.</p> <p>Encourage planting of hedgerows, creation of habitats for all forms of wildlife. Stop heather burning, friendlier means should be used. The countryside is for all of us, not just those who can afford it. People should live in towns and cities close to their place of work. There is no justification in out of town developments that increase commuting. If developments continue at the present rate there will be no countryside for my grandchildren to enjoy and no need for right of way.</p>	<p>The plan partners will carry out management of the network to balance the needs of legitimate use against illegitimate use.</p> <p>Noted. However, this is outside of the remit of the RoWIP guidance.</p>
<p>A. Macaulay (Private Individual)</p>	<p>When large "sterile" housing developments are allowed to be built right up to the edge of existing popular cycle routes/walkers paths etc then these routes/paths start to loose there appeal as recreational routes, and slowly start to function purely as commuter routes for cyclists and dog walking area's for local people.</p>	<p>The plan partners will work with planning authorities to develop and safe guard access routes as part of the sustainable travel infrastructure. See Section 4.7 – Long Term Planning.</p>

	<p>Their attractiveness for the longer distance cyclist or walker lessens over time as the increase in nearby developments takes place. Examples are housing construction taking place at Pelton, Stanley and Leadgate on the Sustrans Route from Consett and at Blackhill on the Derwent Way.</p>	
<p>A. Nicholson (BRAG)</p>	<p>As a horse rider I find bridleways are far and few between. Not clearly marked and maintained i.e. vegetation and paths are quite often overgrown or damaged. Signs for bridleways never seem to be clearly marked or even you are quite often not sure after starting a bridleway where exactly it goes.</p> <p>Roadways are a major hazard; cycle tracks would be an excellent addition for horse riders to use if signed for both.</p> <p>Quite often grass verges, if kept cut would also be an excellent off road addition for riders.</p>	<p>The plan partners will ensure that maintenance is carried out in accordance with the relevant legislation and deal with enquiries from the public as outlined in the priority guidelines in Appendix F of the RoWIP and detailed in the Tyne and Wear Equestrian Access Strategy. Any work to the access network will take into consideration the environmental and aesthetic impact whilst balancing the needs of users.</p> <p>Noted. However, the legislative framework does not allow highway authorities to carry out signage to promote equestrian access on cycle tracks.</p> <p>Noted. Plan Partners will work in partnership with Highway Engineers and support the work undertaken by the user groups to highlight the advantage of roadside verges in enhancing the access network, with a view of altering the cutting regime, taking in account road safety and biodiversity issues, on verges highlighted as part</p>

	<p>More circular bridle routes are desperately needed.</p>	<p>of the Tyne and Wear Equestrian Access Strategy development.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will look at ways of further enhancing the network where opportunities arise, concentrating on routes prioritised through the public consultation process and highlighted in Appendix J.</p>
<p>A. B. Dunk (Gateshead Countryside Volunteers)</p>	<p>There should be more accessible routes made available (preferably circular) for people with either physical or visual impairments with separate appropriate maps available at starting points and through appropriate organisations.</p> <p>Up keep of all routes should be maintained to the highest standard possible in accordance with usability.</p> <p>Provide priority signing and education on all multi user paths, with cyclists having to give way to all other users, unless they are on designated cycle routes only.</p>	<p>The plan partners recognise the benefit of people with physical or visual impairments in accessing the countryside. Some authorities have worked in partnership with other organisations to develop access to this sector of the community and will continue to assess the need/impact of these users in line with the DDA and the CROW Act in developing future schemes. Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all promotional material is accessible to all users.</p> <p>The plan partners will ensure that any work to the access network will take into consideration the needs of all users, following the priority guidelines in Appendix F.</p> <p>The plan partners will provide additional information to signage, where resources allow and</p>

		provide the greatest benefit to all users, in accordance with legislation. Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all information material is accessible to all users.
B. Darling (Port of Tyne Authority)	Though there is a presumption of a right of navigation for any craft over the entire Tyne, the safety aspects of promoting canoe use downstream of Newcastle should be properly assessed. Large vessels that may be encountered can produce significant waves which would not be a hazard to the usual craft that ply their trade in the lower reaches, but could easily swamp a kayak or similar. Also the harbour entrance can experience significant natural waves. Lack of knowledge of the "Rules of the Road" could endanger the uses of a small craft and furthermore render them liable to prosecution. In short the river below Newcastle is no place for inexperienced canoeists, but the risk to other more experienced rowers can be managed to an acceptable level with the provision of suitable information.	Noted. The relevant sections have been rewritten to take in account the points raised.
B. Pike (Recreation Officer, Environment Agency, Northumbria Area)	<p>Thank you for consulting me about this. I have been asked to respond to this on behalf of the whole Northumbria Area of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>I have viewed the draft plan and it all looks very sensible. We have no objections to proposed upgrades and missing links.</p> <p>We are interested in any footpath or multi user routes alongside water and usually work in partnership to increase access to waterside recreation where appropriate. This is already the case for a number of the improvements listed in your plan: We are partners on the Durham Heritage Coast for the missing link between Grangetown and Ryhope.</p> <p>We have also offered to help fund improvements to the links between Hendon and Ryhope through Back On The Map.</p>	Noted.

	<p>While I do not have a set budget to commit years in advance for access improvements, we can often contribute funding towards improving access for all near water. If any of the RoWIP partners would like to discuss particular sites with me they can contact me at address below.</p>	
<p>C. Cummins (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Present maps are very poor. Need to be more detailed and indicate where you can access and leave the paths.</p> <p>While most of the actions are good ideas they will quickly deteriorate into the usual vandalised rubbish dumps without some <u>form of maintenance</u>.</p> <p>Apart from the rubbish clearing, trees and planted areas need tending on a regular basis. Not when they are past saving. Sunderland Council is guilty of this neglect and I suspect it is because <u>no money budgeted</u> for maintenance has been set aside.</p> <p>They pay for various footpath areas to be landscaped then a few years later after neglecting the areas, come in and grub everything up. Recently they have uprooted, cut down, and destroyed perfectly healthy trees. Drastically cut back undergrowth because of someone that may be lurking behind a bush! It seems to me that they are more worried about being sued for something than preserving wildlife that lives in these areas.</p> <p>Footpaths without any form of vegetation are soul destroying and boring to walk or ride on.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The plan partners will ensure that maintenance is carried out in accordance with the relevant legislation and deal with enquiries from the public as outlined in the priority guidelines in Appendix F. Any work to the access network will take into consideration the environmental and aesthetic impact whilst balancing the needs of users.</p>
<p>C. Hall – JLAF Member (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Dear Roy and Kevin</p> <p>Here's some comments on "Rights of Way The Way Ahead" draft plan i.e. Tyne and Wear ROW Improvement Plan new draft.</p> <p>I'm annoyed that the Dudley Lane to Wideopen and Weetslade path is not included by North Tyneside Council. This path is the central link in the chain of off road cycle paths from Cramlington to Newcastle, for commuters mainly, as well as leisure users. It is legally a footpath and needs upgrading to bridleway. It is well used when this is possible but the farmer</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>keeps ploughing it up and not re-instating it. This has been reported by N.T. Cycling Forums over many years with no action being taken as the farmer will not co-operate! It's the cyclists' A1 Great North Road.</p> <p>Also NT have slipped up again – there's no mention of the Whitley Dome to Hartley sea side walks and the links. (Only in Appendix H, no paths mentioned). This is about 1 mile long &amp; 1/4 mile wide on average &amp; open public grassland.</p> <p>There is no mention of a shared use pavement from Pelaw Metro to Follingsby roundabout. This is often asked for in Cycling Forums. There is an off road path from the roundabout to Washington &amp; Shiney Row. This is an important missing link. The proposed Leam Lane is too far to the west.</p> <p>7.6.4 – many footpaths were regularly used by pitman on cycles over 100 years or so on their way to and from work. Theses should be upgraded to bridleways. The problem is most of these men are now dead, but their sons aren't. This should be mentioned.</p> <p>7.10.1 – Tynebikes regularly removes litter between Rowlands Gill and Dunston on that path, and would welcome a mention to encourage other groups to do the same in other areas.</p> <p>7.10.6 &amp; 10.4.3 – Opencast sites and quarries should be actively encouraged providing they only are worked for say five years. When they cease, the resultant countryside can be much more hilly with nice rock faces e.g. Whitley Golf Course and Marsden Quarry Park.</p> <p>9.5 &amp; 10.5.2 – The River Tyne from the Swing Bridge to the Metro Bridge is very dangerous to canoeists except at low tide and high tide. There are many contrary strong, currents and whirlpools here.</p>	<p>Missing Link NTC 1 covers this point.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. The partners feel this point is covered within the plan in Section 4.8.</p> <p>Noted. The partners will take advantage of development control and planning measures to maximise the opportunities through planning obligations for an improved functional and recreational network.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>11.6.3 – The disabled chair users really need their own access map. This only needs a short print run of say 500 and based on the background streets etc plan of the Access Map.</p> <p>Minor niggles – Appendix I is much too long.</p> <p>The whole plan is too long and some information is often repeated three times! There are too many spelling mistakes rendering some locations unrecognisable!</p> <p>Thank you all indeed, for all your hard work, it quite amazes me.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Tyne and Wear Equestrian Access Strategy is a key component of the Tyne and Wear RoWIP and will sit alongside the main RoWIP in a similar vein to authority based cycling strategies.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>C. Hall – JLAF Member (Cyclops and Gateway Wheelers – Disabled Cycling N.E.)</p>	<p>With the exception of the Derwent walk and nearby wide paths without impediments to wheelchairs, disabled bikes and prams and similar paths in the Royal Quays area, the facilities for disabled users are pathetic. However many disabled folk don't know what we have, so we need a local access map with only routes (off road) shown suitable for wheelchairs, disabled bikes and prams since the finest multi user map is quite complicated already. Also the Wylam to Newburn Walk is good, but the Blaydon to Hebburn (Keelmans Way) is difficult in places. The South Shields to Marsden Cliff top path is good. The Paradise to Walker Hadrian Riverside Walk is good generally but has difficult spots. The ferry to seafront new walk at South Shields is very good. Rockcliffe to Hartley paths (Whitley Bay) are good but have 3 steep gradients. The Battle Hill to Rising Sun and the Country Park itself – paths are good but the joining route from Percy Main and Backworth have wide locked gates!! The Bowes Railway Path is good but a carer is needed on the gradients, similarly the Tanfield Path and Blaydon Burn to a lesser extent, also the South Wylam to Blaydon west end riverside path has</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners recognise the benefit of people with physical or visual impairments in accessing the countryside. Some authorities have worked in partnership with other organisations to develop access to this sector of the community and will continue to assess the need/impact of these users in line with the DDA and the CROW Act in developing future schemes.</p>

	<p>some awkward bits. Too often an able bodied assistant is essential. A passer-by is often needed so a disabled person is not marooned overnight – with hypothermia a possibility.</p>	
<p>C. Hall – JLAF Member (Tynebikes)</p>	<p>There is a right of way (shared use) for cycles from Heaton to North Shields along the coast road pavement except for near the Rising Sun Public House. We need more of these on lightly used pavements along busy roads – such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bill Quay to Follingsby Roundabout</li> <li>2. Team Valley Central Road</li> <li>3. Blaydon to Scotswood</li> <li>4. Blaydon to Ryton</li> <li>5. Sunnyside to Burnopfield</li> <li>6. Tynemouth to Briardene</li> <li>7. Hillheads to Holystone (East) via New York</li> <li>8. Holystone (West) to Benton</li> <li>9. Earsdon to Holywell</li> <li>10. Grandstand Road (Gosforth)</li> <li>11. Ponteland Road</li> <li>12. Westerhope to Cowgate</li> <li>13. Boldon to Fulwell</li> <li>14. Washington to Boldon</li> <li>15. Grangetown to Ryhope</li> </ol> <p>Busy roads are no place for children cycling to school or leisure facilities and these also discourage touring cyclists.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners will look at these issues where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable. See Section 5.5 – The Wider Context.</p>
<p>C. McHatton – Councillor (Gateshead Council)</p>	<p>All footpaths around Path Head landfill site should be looked at. Some are overgrown and some have not been reinstated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>C. Pope (West Durham Land Management Team, Natural England)</p>	<p><b>Rights of Way Improvement Plan</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan. You should be congratulated on a document that looks at a wide range of issues and will provide and excellent framework for future access improvements in the Tyne and Wear area.</p>	

	<p>I submit the following comments for consideration.</p> <p><b>Structure</b> It may be worth considering renaming and restructuring the sections titled Core Activities, Recommended Practices and Potential Improvement Actions. They may be more understandable if called Policy, Action Points and Tasks respectively. The policy statement could then be written directly under the text it refers to, e.g. MAIN/1 could be put after paragraph 7.2.1. This will also ensure that the reason behind every policy is clear.</p> <p>It is unclear how the statements of action in section 11 relate to the statement of actions throughout the rest of the document I would recommend having policy statements in the document and using the action plan as a way of adding detail such as how these policies will be carried out (currently labelled recommended practices) and specific tasks needed to carry them out successfully (currently labelled soa).</p> <p>There is also an inconsistency as core activities are not always present.</p> <p><b>Page 3. This green and pleasant land</b> I feel this section could be more balanced in its view as it comes across as being negative about processes that are in place to protect biodiversity. In most cases access and nature conservation can co exist very successfully but proper assessments are vital to comply with legislation and to ensure any necessary mitigation measures can be put in place. The plan should include an overarching policy or 'way of working' that states that any suggested improvements will be subject to any necessary appropriate assessment and will be assessed for impact on habitat and landscape.</p> <p><b>Page 4. The Thelwell Experience</b> The title of this section may need some explanation.</p> <p><b>Page 6. Whitehall mandarins</b> This title comes across as a little derogatory.</p>	<p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made. The issue of carrying out appropriate assessments has been included in Section 5.5 – The Wider Context.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the title will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>I would suggest omitting the words ‘at national distribution’. The third paragraph could include the need to influence funding streams and new initiatives.</p> <p><b>Page 15.</b>  <b>Other specific legal duties and responsibilities</b>  This could also mention the Habitat Regulations and the NERC act and the authorities duties as an s28G authority under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p><b>Page 36. RUPPs</b>  As I understand it as a general rule a RUPP could not be upgraded to a BOAT post NERC. Paragraph 41 of the DEFRA guidance on Part 6 of NERC states  <i>41. Furthermore, the exceptions in sub-section 67(3) apply only to highways in respect of which there has been an application under section 53(5) of the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981. Therefore highways for which the local highway authority has made a definitive map modification order to show it as a byway open to all traffic as part of their duty to continuously review the definitive map and statement, or as part of their (former) duty to reclassify RUPPs under section 54 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, would not be excepted from the extinguishment of public rights of way for mechanically propelled vehicles. Such orders made under section 54 of the '81 Act cannot be confirmed as BOATs and will therefore not take effect. In these cases, the RUPP will already have been statutorily reclassified as a restricted byway by virtue of the effect of section 47(2) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (see paragraphs 80 to 85).</i></p> <p><b>Page 42. Third paragraph</b>  It may be better to omit or re-word this paragraph about authorities not being able to fully comply with the statutory duty to keep all paths in an easy to use condition. An acceptance that there needs to be an agreed list of priorities may be more prudent.</p>	<p>Noted. References to Statutory Duties are outlined in Appendix C and an amendment to the plan will be made to reflect this.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>
--	--	--

	<p><b>Page 61. Key Partner Organisations</b> It would be worth considering adding the Local Education Authority to the list and having a policy of looking at ways to use rights of way as an educational resource as well as looking to educate people on how they should behave in the countryside. This would also help address any landowner concerns about irresponsible behaviour.</p> <p><b>Page 64. What do people tell us they want?</b> Integrating the results of consultation into the text before policy statements may be a good way of illustrating why the Council intends to adopt that way of working, e.g. that waymarking is a priority for people should be used to explain policy/soaM6/1.</p> <p>Once again, congratulations on the work so far. I hope you have a good response to your consultation and I look forward to reading the final version.</p>	<p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. Amendments to the plan will be made where appropriate.</p>
C. A. Robson (Private Individual)	<p>Particularly important – integrate with public transport</p> <p>Countryside News from South Tyneside has some good examples of maps showing walks/sites etc.</p>	<p>Noted. In developing improvements outlined in the RoWIP the plan partners will consider the needs of integration with the public transport in line with the priorities of the LTP.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
D. Bulmer – JLAF Member (Wearside Field Club)	<p>Encourage Local Authorities to produce more local literature to promote tourism and education.</p>	<p>This is covered in Section 5.5 – The Wider Context.</p>
D. Hind (Wednesday Wobbly Walkers)	<p>Wednesday Wobbly Walkers were originally one of Gateshead’s Health Walks Group based at the H<sub>2</sub>O Gym, Dunston. We have walked all Gateshead Country parks and along the former railway Newburn to Wylam plus Chopwell Wood and Hedley Hall. The group is 34 strong and usually 22 to 25 meet, sometimes we are all there together.</p>	<p>Where joint agendas influence the RoWIP the plan partners will work with Country Park managers in improving access to a wide body of users.</p>

	<p>The general feeling is that the country parks need a little more work to improve them – easy access for disabled, patrols to prevent or advise cyclists on speeding because of safety to pedestrians. Horse riders over the last few years have, in my experience, ceased to gallop along footpaths particularly the Derwent Walk.</p> <p>Subsidence on one path in particular needs to be attended. This is between Ryton Golf Club and Wylam. Obviously ownership of the riverbank will need to be established. No doubt Roy Deane will take care of this. Having said that he has probably already taken care of the matter.</p> <p>The Butterfly Bridge at Winlaton Mill requires attention and I have given my groups support for this to the rangers responsible for the Derwent Valley.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
D. Houghton (Private Individual)	<p>The poor relation in rights of way is the urban network, with numerous at present gaps in continuity. I know competition is intensive but routes into shopping centres should be prioritised.</p>	<p>The plan partners value the asset that urban routes can provide in the development of an integrated access network and therefore will work in partnership with Highway Engineers in achieving the outcomes of the RoWIP.</p>
D. Johnson (Westoe Village Residents Association)	<p>Please don't forget about the rights of way in towns. Old streets and "cuts" add individuality. Also save commuters vital minutes while hurrying for public transport. Westoe Village has its own much loved "Salters Trod" which certainly adds to the charm of the place.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners value the asset that urban routes can provide in the development of an integrated access network.</p>
D. Rutter (Consett & Vale of Derwent Field Naturalists Club)	<p>I respond here on behalf of our club. I have no experience of blind/partially blind people who walk but answer on the basis that they would almost always have a "buddy" with them.</p> <p>Our club "recces" all walks and so we see the waymarking, the vegetation and stiles etc. If we come across anything that's in need of repair/upkeep we usually report it.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>However, various smaller groups from the club walk in County Durham, Northumberland and Tyne and Wear and these groups are not so good at map reading. Therefore more leaflets/information is needed – and these need to be circulated throughout the region – not just within the area in which they are published. I do think a great effort is made to promote walking, cycling and horseriding in the area but don't rest on your laurels – keep up the momentum forward as more and more people are leaving home and shopping malls for the open country.</p>	<p>Noted. Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all information material is accessible to all users.</p>
<p>D. Simonson (Private Individual)</p>	<p>How about putting more of those people ordered to do community service onto improving paths.</p> <p>Public Transport needs to improve – a number one priority.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p> <p>Noted. This issue is outside of the remit of the RoWIP but will be covered by the sister document – the LTP.</p>
<p>D. Walker (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Promote the use of Public Transport is more difficult with the decreasing public transport services to rural and semi rural areas.</p>	<p>Noted. This issue is outside of the remit of the RoWIP but will be covered by the sister document – the LTP.</p>
<p>D. W. Malcolm – Councillor (Newcastle City Council)</p>	<p>Many Q's in this survey "loaded".</p>	<p>Noted. The priority statements have derived from the consultation carried out in 2006 in assessing the network and the needs of different classes of users.</p>

<p>David Walker (Operations Director, Sunderland Arc)</p>	<p><b>Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Tyne and Wear</b></p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sunderland arc on the emerging Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Tyne and Wear.</p> <p>By definition, the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) is focused on the countryside areas of Tyne and Wear. By contrast, Sunderland arc's operations as the Urban Regeneration Company for Sunderland are focused on the inner urban area defined as 'Central Sunderland' in the City of Sunderland Redeposit UDP Alteration No 2: this encompasses the city centre and lower River Wear corridor, extending from the Port as far westwards as the former Grove Cranes site.</p> <p>Working in partnership with its founder members (Sunderland City Council, One NorthEast and English Partnerships), the Local Strategic Partnership and other key players, Sunderland arc's key business targets are to attract some 10,000 new jobs and regenerate over 200 hectares of brownfield development land over a 15-year Investment period. Sunderland arc's business plan can be viewed at <a href="http://www.sunderlandarc.co.uk">www.sunderlandarc.co.uk</a>.</p> <p>There is of course a very important relationship between Sunderland's urbanized river corridor and coastal zones, and the countryside areas to the west north and south. An extensive and developing network of pedestrian and cycle routes along the river valley and coast facilitates access between the Inner urban area and the countryside, also accommodating strategic routes of national significance such as the C2C route and National Cycle Route 1.</p> <p>Sunderland arc and the City Council are committed to securing the further Improvement of connectivity between the city centre, the riverside, coast and countryside, through the appropriate master-planning and implementation of major regeneration schemes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
---	--	---------------

	<p>Whilst we do not wish to submit detailed consultation responses, Sunderland arc welcomes the Daft RoWIP and agrees with 'Missing Links' identified in the Plan.</p>	
<p>Dr. D. Walton – Councillor (Derwentside District Council)</p>	<p>"Filling in the Gaps". In my view it is essential to employ some "joined up thinking". There are some routes, which have missing links, which are both dangerous and off-putting to users. An example would be the Stanley to Sunnyside route in the area of Causey / Tanfield Railway.</p> <p>"Maps". Many maps only include the latest routes to be upgraded. Maps must be comprehensive and integrated and must also show clearly the types of traffic permitted.</p>	<p>The plan partners will work with a range of external partners in seeking to provide a joined up network. The actions within the RoWIP would not be realised if partnership working were not undertaken.</p> <p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all information material is accessible to all users.</p>
<p>E.S. Moore (Private Individual)</p>	<p>I cannot support any moves to integrate public pedestrian ways with cyclists of any sort and/or horses. They cannot mix safely under any circumstances. Ways should be provided and maintained for one specific purpose i.e. pedestrian, horse riding or cycling. Stiles, gates, whatever should be fit for one purpose only.</p>	<p>Legislation stipulates the right that a particular user has on a particular Right of Way. The plan partners will work in collaboration with users to ensure that all needs are represented and accounted for in accordance with the status of the route and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10.</p>
<p>G. Dryden (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Fly tipping – being a volunteer ranger for Sustrans, an alarmed at the increase in the amount of fly tipping.</p> <p>Existing Bridleways – would put the promotion of these routes to allow off road cycling high on my list of priorities.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

<p>G. Hume (Cramlington Cycling Club)</p>	<p>In general local councils do a good job in trying to access countryside or leisure space for the population. These paths of access need a decent surface to attract cyclists as speeds on country roads (C and D class) is on the increase, and making even country cycling even more difficult.</p>	<p>Noted. All work in relation to surfacing will be undertaken in accordance with the status of the route and users needs.</p>
<p>H. Evans (Cyclists Touring Club, Tyneside)</p>	<p><b>Rights of Way, The Way Ahead Draft Tyne and Wear RoWIP</b></p> <p>General comment: <b>Cycleways.</b> Not a good word to use to describe a cycle route, plus the document needs to be consistent in how it refers to the various cycle facilities. As well as cycleways it mentions routes, paths, tracks, ways, trails.</p> <p>Contents 6.3. Cycleways. Change to <b>The Cycle Route Network.</b></p> <p>Tables 4. Change title to <b>The Tyne and Wear Cycle Route Network.</b></p> <p>Page 4. The Thelwell experience. This title doesn't mean anything to many people.</p> <p>Page 5. Able but Good – ...those using wheelchairs benefit from the replacement of stiles by gaps and gates. Problems – Gaps and gates can restrict those using disabled cycles or tricycles. Solutions – open up the network to legitimate users, and prevent abuse by increased police response.</p> <p>Page 9. 3.1. Authority Profiles. Gateshead, 3rd paragraph "Elsewhere in the borough, access to specific routes has been improved by the replacement of stiles with gates, or the removal of barriers altogether." Not my experience in Gateshead, where K frames are still going in.</p> <p>Page 10. 2nd paragraph Hadrian's Cycleway – it is ok to use Cycleway here, as it is the name of the actual cycle route.</p> <p>Page 18. Public transport This needs to point out the poor provision for the carriage of cycles on trains, the metro and buses, which means that many cycle journey's into the countryside start with a car trip.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>

	<p>Page 20. 6.3 Cycleways heading, change to <b>The Cycle Route Network</b> (page 18 has a heading The Highway Network). Change paragraph on Cycleways to: <b>The cycle route network is a network of recommended routes for cyclists. This consists of on and off-road provision. On-road provision can consist of cycle lanes, cycle/bus lanes/no car lanes and quieter roads and streets. Off-road provision includes cycle tracks and cycle paths. These are not classified as public rights of way and are not included on the definitive map. Public rights of way can also be part of the cycle route network (see 6.5. for those PROW's available to cyclists).</b></p> <p>Page 20. Table 4. Change the title to <b>The Tyne and Wear Cycle Route Network.</b> Cycle Lanes (km). Lanes that are substandard should not count Cycle/Bus lanes. What about "no car lanes"? Signed recommended routes. What is classed as a signed recommended route? Shared use paths. This doesn't appear to include cycle paths. None of the figures listed really prove anything. Can we re-think this table?</p> <p>Page 22. 1st paragraph Mentions cycle <b>trails</b>, so this word needs changing. On re-reading this paragraph I don't understand what it is trying to say.</p> <p>Page 35. 7.1.5. Sentence on Cycle Tracks Act. Cycle <b>tracks</b> need a separate heading somewhere in the document.</p> <p>Page 39. 7.2.3. Surfaces If space is available, two types of surface should be provided.</p> <p>Page 52. 7.6.4. This says cycle <b>paths</b>.</p> <p>Page 78. 9.3. Cyclists Consider re-writing as: <b>Cyclists are able to use the same rights of way as horse riders. Additionally, they also have access to cycle tracks and paths.</b></p>	<p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Cycling is a form of transport that is accessible to most people, and can have a significant role in enabling people to travel to school and to work, especially for journey's under 5 miles. However, many people will not cycle, perceiving it to be dangerous. To overcome this, as well as improving the cycle route network, there is also the need to increase the provision of cycle training, and to educate other road users.</p> <p>Cycling as a form of recreation is growing in popularity, and improved direct links from areas of population to the countryside could reduce the amount of car traffic in the countryside. Expanding the provision for the carriage of cycles on trains, and buses, and eventually on the Tyne &amp; Wear Metro could also cut down on the amount of car traffic.</p> <p>The LTP Cycling Strategy includes a continued commitment to further develop off-road cycling, although strong commitment will also be given to the development of on-road cycling.</p> <p>The Tyne and Wear authorities each have their own more detailed Cycling Strategy. These seek to ensure that cycling is considered during all transportation and policy decisions, enabling cycling to be encouraged as a genuine transport choice for all types of journeys. The authorities will also ensure that increased provision complies with best practice.</p> <p>Information available for cyclists consists of the CycleCity maps which cover most of Tyneside and Wearside, with the longer distance routes covered by the Sustrans NCN maps.</p> <p>Page 80. 9.7. Users with Limited Mobility and Disabilities. This section needs to mention disabled cyclists who could be using recumbent cycles, tricycles or tandems (e.g. with a child or a blind person</p>	<p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>as a stoker), and cyclists with limited mobility (e.g. the elderly, who can often cycle longer distances than they can walk). All need to be able to access the strategic cycle route network without the need to dismount, or having to stop too often. To enable them to do so access controls need to be removed. If there is the risk of motor vehicles using the route, then correctly spaced bollards could be installed.</p> <p>Page 83. 9.12, Recommended Practices These policies need re-writing to be more positive in opening up the countryside to users with limited mobility and disabilities, with specific mention of those using cycles.</p> <p>Page 87. 10.2. 3rd paragraph Developing a network of routes that end at roads which are impossible to cross is pointless. On busy roads where gaps in the traffic are rare, signalised crossings must be provided.</p> <p>Page 90. 10.4.1. The Statutory Development Plan This section needs simplifying.</p> <p>Page 91. 10.4.4. PLA/1 The wording recreational path and cycle track network needs changing. Recreational paths are not in the Glossary.</p> <p>Page 93. 10.5.4. COMM/4 add <b>suitable surface</b> to wide paths, well lit etc.</p> <p>Page 94. 10.6.1. Choosing Health. The health benefits of cycling could be emphasised more. What does the Choosing Health white paper say about cycling?</p> <p>Pages 97 &amp; 98. 10.9.3. Walking and Cycling Strategies This is a very mixed up section, and doesn't read well. It needs to be re-written and deal with the walking and cycling strategies separately.</p> <p>Page 113. 11.7.4. Current Work Change to: The LTP Cycling Strategy is mostly concerned with cycling as a means of transport. However, the Sustrans National Cycle Route Network provides a network of mainly off-road</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>routes which can be used for transport and for recreation. The JLAF have undertaken analysis which identifies gaps in the network.</p> <p>Glossary CTC Cyclists Touring Club. As the UK's largest national cyclists organisation, CTC has been protecting and promoting the rights of cyclists since 1878.</p> <p>Cycle Route A term used to describe a route that is promoted for cyclists. Such a route is likely to be made up of roads, some with cycle lanes, cycle tracks or cycle paths shared with pedestrians.</p> <p>Cycle Track – probably OK.</p> <p>Cycle Track Order – OK.</p> <p>Cycle path – needs an explanation.</p> <p>Cycle Trail – probably omit this and any mention of trail in the document.</p> <p>Cycleway – A generic term for a named cycle route e.g. Hadrian's Cycleway. Forget the other wording.</p> <p>Pegasus, Toucan crossings – is an explanation needed (Pegasus is in Horse Strategy p 15) Not sure if toucan's are mentioned anywhere.</p> <p>APPENDIX K – Missing Links Some are classed as multi-user links or recreational route etc which aren't in the Glossary. Wording could be much simpler and consistent e.g. upgrade footpath(s) to bridleway.</p> <p>Gateshead GC/3, GC/7, GC/9, GC/10, GC/11, GC/13 aren't clear as to the users.</p> <p>Newcastle NCC/2, NCC/8 - does upgrade mean improve surface, or upgrade to bridleway?</p> <p>North Tyneside NTC/2 DMMO project?, SV71?, NTC/13 – SV56?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This term will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>This term will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made where appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made where appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made where appropriate.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>South Tyneside STC/1 – PROW for which users?</p> <p>Sunderland SCC/2, SCC/3, SCC/5 – refers to commuter/recreational route/corridor/link.</p>	<p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made where appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made where appropriate.</p>
I. Millichamp (Private Individual)	<p>More shared cyclist/pedestrian footpaths are required running next to busy roads. Good examples where this is successful are the Felling Bypass from Gateshead to Felling and the road between Blaydon and Newburn. This would help provide safe linkages for commuting cyclists – in my particular case this would be implemented next to Whickham Highway (Dunston to Whickham), but there are many other busy roads in the area where cyclists have to use dangerous roads in the rush hour.</p>	<p>The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling officers in the development of an integrated access network.</p>
I. Simon (Executive Director, Tyne & Wear Sport)	<p>Thank you for providing Tyne &amp; Wear Sport with an opportunity to comment on your draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Tyne and Wear. One of Tyne &amp; Wear Sport’s key objectives is to develop partnerships to increase the percentage of the sub regional population that is taking part in sport and active recreation on a regular and frequent basis. Ideally we would like individuals to participate in three thirty minute sessions of moderate intensity sport/active recreation per week.</p> <p>Having high quality, easily accessible and well managed rights of way is a key component of enabling and encouraging more people to take part in sport and active recreation. Your consultation exercise has neatly coincided with the publication of Sport England’s Active Design document, copy attached, which is designed to promote new environments that offer opportunities for communities to be naturally active as part of their daily life. In promoting physical activity and walking and cycling (referred to as Active Travel) Active Design integrates with a number of converging agendas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Design Agenda -the promotion of high quality inclusive design of buildings and public spaces is a key principle of the planning system;</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made to incorporate this document.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Health Agenda – physical activity is fundamental to the overall health and wellbeing of the nation and is central to arresting increasing trends in obesity among adults and children;</li> <li>• The Transport Agenda – the promotion of active travel modes reflects Government transport policy seeking to promote more sustainable and environmentally friendly modes of transport.</li> </ul> <p>I would like to recommend this document to you, as it identifies the priorities and potential improvements from a sport and active recreation perspective. I hope that it proves to be helpful in developing the Tyne &amp; Wear RoWIP.</p> <p>Please don't hesitate to contact me if you require any additional information.</p>	
<p>I. Toxley (Tyne Velo Cycling Club)</p>	<p>Why not get the authorities to collect rubbish from the main routes and contact offenders.</p> <p>Cut grass more often</p> <p>Repair structures (riverside railings) using a sensible design (weld all joints) so vandals can't damage easily. Furniture – use steels seats and trellis work as wood is easily vandalised. Suggest you look at Derwent Park for this.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will continue to tackle problem areas. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p> <p>Noted. Section 4.1 amended.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a "case by case" basis.</p>

<p>J Taylor (Northumbria Area Ramblers' Association)</p>	<p>Northumbria Area of the Ramblers' Association attaches great importance to ROWIPs. It was felt that the form, The Way Ahead, placed undue constraints on constructive responses. We did not consider it practical, as part of our response, to indicate the level of priority to be given to the points raised. Indications of such priorities will have be made in the individual responses sent by many of our members. The comments below present the main areas of priority which, we feel, should be given full consideration when taking action to improve rights of way in Tyne &amp; Wear. It is also important that additional funding be sourced to ensure that the ROWIP achieves its objectives rather than remaining as a set of aspirations which may possibly be implemented at some future date.</p> <p>This is a rights of way improvement plan. The priority should be to get the existing network fully fit for purpose. All footpaths and rights of way should be clearly signposted and waymarked and should be accessible. All too often it is impossible to follow a route either because it is not clear or because it is overgrown.</p> <p>The second important consideration is the provision of links between rights of way where none exist at present so that there is a fully interconnected footpath network. Appropriate links should be provided to avoid walking along roads. This may involve the provision of paths running parallel to the roads.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The RoWIP does not distract from the statutory duties of highway authorities, who will continue to manage the network in the most cost effective way in line with legislation. The RoWIP can only enhance the network management by raising the issues of most concern to the public in a authority based strategy.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will look at ways of further enhancing the network where opportunities arise, concentrating on routes prioritised through the public consultation process and highlighted in Appendix J. In addition, plan partners will work in partnership with Highway Engineers and support the work undertaken by the</p>
--	---	--

	<p>A good quality rights of way network in urban areas and the urban fringe is essential for providing access, giving opportunities for healthy exercise and offering economic and tourism benefits.</p> <p>There is a need to co-ordinate with adjacent local authorities to resolve cross boundary issues such as change of status and paths stopping dead at an authority's boundary.</p> <p>Where stiles are to be replaced or installed, the possibility of putting in gates should be considered.</p> <p>The RA has considerable concerns about safe crossing of major roads. Grade separated crossings should be provided, otherwise signal controlled crossings. Where rights of way cross all roads at grade, advance warning signs should be provided to warn road users of the potential hazard.</p>	<p>user groups to highlight the advantage of roadside verges in enhancing the access network, with a view of altering the cutting regime, taking in account road safety and biodiversity issues.</p> <p>The plan partners value the asset that urban routes can provide in the development of an integrated access network and recognise the benefits of the access network to health, in reducing pollution and enhancing leisure activities and will continue to work with relevant partners within the remit of the RoWIP to support these benefits.</p> <p>The plan partners will work with a range of external partners in seeking to provide a joined up network. The actions within the RoWIP would not be realised if partnership working were not undertaken.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a "case by case" basis.</p> <p>The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers will continue to develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those</p>
--	---	--

	<p>It is important that existing rights of way are protected in new developments. All new footpaths should be user friendly.</p> <p>Good quality waymarking and sign posting of rights of way are important to encourage people to use them. Walking and cycling should be promoted as an alternative to using cars. The new countryside code should be promoted and the public educated in its provisions.</p> <p>SOA 5/1 Remove 'Concentrate on well-used paths'.</p> <p>SOA 5/15 This is unnecessary, especially if suitable surfacing is used and users are educated and encouraged to be aware of other users.</p> <p>SOA 6/10 Landowners should pay the full cost of maintenance and be responsible for all field edge paths that have been created at their request by diversion of cross field paths.</p> <p>Definitive maps should be bought and kept up to date. It is essential that properly qualified and experienced definitive map officers are employed at appropriate levels of remuneration.</p>	<p>features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.</p> <p>The plan partners will work with planning authorities to develop and safe guard access routes as part of the sustainable travel infrastructure. See Section 4.7 – Long Term Planning.</p> <p>Agree, the plan partners see the provision of relevant information is paramount to users of the network. In view of this the partners propose to make the provision of information as accessible to as wide a range of audience as possible.</p> <p>Noted. Text amended.</p> <p>Noted. The priority statements have derived from the public consultation carried out in 2006 in assessing the network and the needs of different classes of users.</p> <p>Noted. However, Public Rights of Way are “Public” and therefore the legislation does not allow for statutory compensation.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Section 8: Sufficient resources need to be provided to deal with obstructions. Policies to deal quickly and effectively with lack of reinstatement after ploughing and cropping should be a high priority. This should also include taking the necessary action to tackle problems encountered.</p> <p>We consider there would be considerable benefits in encouraging and training volunteers to help in improving the quality of the rights of way network.</p>	<p>The authorities will work within the remit of the legislation to ensure the public's right to use the access network is not hindered in any way. The authorities will tackle any complaints of obstruction by animals or other obstructions to use in line with the priority guideline in Appendix F and Policy NM3.</p> <p>Agree. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p>
<p>J. Barber (Private Individual)</p>	<p>More information on finger signs i.e. not just Public Bridleway but Public Bridleway to a place = 1 mile. More info to where you can go to.</p>	<p>The plan partners will provide additional information to signage, where resources allow and provide the greatest benefit to all users, in accordance with legislation.</p>
<p>J. Bennett (Private Individual)</p>	<p>I would like to see more litter bins, realistic enforced penalties for dropping non-biodegradable litter.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities.</p>

	<p>Instead of demonising dog owners consider using them as collaborators in eliminating anti social behaviour along the lines of neighbourhood watch.</p> <p>Clearance work along the footpath edges needs to be environmentally responsible. If walking on areas sprayed with herbicide makes dogs sick (and it does). What does it do to wildlife?</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p> <p>The plan partners will ensure that any work to the access network will take into consideration the environmental and aesthetic impact whilst balancing the needs of all users.</p>
<p>J. Burton (Private Individual)</p>	<p>I am a female with children. Many of my friends also have children. Most of us would like to cycle locally (in Low Fell). Some people I know would like to cycle to work/shops etc. <u>Nobody does</u> because the roads are too dangerous and cycle lanes as part of the roads in urban areas do not address the problem. Safety remains the biggest barrier – cars use bike lanes and even if they <u>do not</u>, perceived or potential, actual danger great, cars too fast, careless drivers etc. The majority of people I know will <u>never</u> be persuaded to use cycles on a day to day basis (on urban roads) until cycle lanes are provided on pavements away from the road. I accept this potentially causes conflict with pedestrians but I think only way cycling will ever replace car journeys. As an example, the other day I drove from Bolden Colliery (pictures) to Low Fell using a route of main roads but basically past Springwell Estate to Wrekington and then Old Durham Road, past QE hospital and ultimately</p>	<p>The plan partners acknowledge the development of the cycle network can be assisted by the use of Public Rights of Ways. In providing a joined up cycling network the plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling and road safety officers in the development of an integrated access network in line with authority based cycling strategy's.</p>

	<p>turning into Kells Lane, Low Fell – virtually (if not all of) the route had pavements wide enough to be divided into pedestrian / cycle sections similar to that at small parts of new development around Gateshead Stadium.</p>	
<p>J. Catchpole (Walkie Talkies and Simonside Strollers)</p>	<p>At present the Tyne provides many pleasant walks but can also be a barrier to land just on the other riverbank. If footbridges could be provided up river it would facilitate more circular walks of varying distances. I appreciate that bridges are expensive and are only practicable where the river is narrow and does not require great height restrictions. One in the stretch between Newburn Bridge and Wylam would help communication on both banks.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>J. Davies (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Better communication with neighbouring authorities – perhaps the current offering to take a lead role in view of the work to date (in comparison with E.C Newcastle).</p> <p>Standardisation of signage etc across the region and work towards National Standardisation e.g. cycleway / lanes, Bus lanes (differential and poorly marked with time of usage).</p> <p>More involvement with organisations such as CTC and Sustrans.</p> <p>Appreciate the position of Tyneside when viewed from the continent as an access point and region of interest particularly with regard to Nordic Countries.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The LTP partners are currently investigating the feasibility of standardisation to signage/bus lanes etc. across Tyne and Wear. This may include signage of Public Rights of Ways.</p> <p>The plan partners work with a number of external organisations and partners across Tyne and Wear and beyond. A list of relevant organisations involved in the production of this document can be found in Appendix L.</p> <p>The partners acknowledge your comment and have worked in partnership with other countries in the development of the North Sea Cycle Route that passes through each of the authority areas</p>

		and with DFDS in providing sustainable transport routes to passenger's to and from the ferry terminal.
J. Dormars (Private Individual)	As a dog owner and keen walker in the North East and Cumbria Area it would help if stiles that are put up over fences could be dog friendly.	Noted. Section 4.1 amended.
J. Jewers (Private Individual)	<p>Entering tracks – must be able to access footpaths with pram/buggie for parents. Any kind of horse stile if absolutely necessary must have clear visibility, set back from the road or any junctioning track. Must be able to be stepped safely by the smallest pony with young child rider. Also be of an acceptable width for horse and rider.</p> <p>Bridges should be high enough on bridleways for horses and rider to cross safely. Remember there is the width of the horse and rider's legs and stirrup irons to consider. Bridges should be able to take the largest of horses. No other stile for safety reasons. Jumping onto off bridge adds extra safety risks and weakens bridge (referring to bridge near Earsdon Church Yard, North Tyneside). A non-slip surface is required and regular maintenance checks.</p> <p>Would prefer to see horse stiles as a thing of the past. The potential injury to rider/horse from some stiles is great.</p> <p>Upgrade many footpaths to cycleways/bridleways – to allow access for all plus saves confrontation between users. Try to link circular routes.</p> <p>Where roads are crossed i.e. Shiremoor by Bluebell Pub. Some sort of crossing is needed either zebra or lights. Horses can't use track now because you cannot get over road traffic. Bridge over metro line also caused problems in past.</p>	<p>The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a "case by case" basis in consultation with users/local communities.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The plan partners will look at these issues where opportunities arise.</p> <p>The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers and other key partners will continue to develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.</p>

	<p>When using tracks most people seen using are dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders and occasionally joggers. Please do not treat these people as a pest to the minority, but help them to use open spaces with consideration for others. Leaflets explaining routes, country codes, dog bin use, what to do if meet horses, livestock, riding responsibly/cycling with care of speed (Horse riders often cannot hear cyclists/ joggers when being over taken).</p>	<p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all information material is accessible to all users.</p>
<p>J. Leeson (Living Streets – Northumbria Branch)</p>	<p>Walking is now recognised as a key objective for maintaining and improving mental and physical well-being for all sections of the community. It (and cycling) is a major means of reducing carbon emissions, congestion, pollution and community cohesion. 'Rights of Way' are not just for a minority interest 'hikes'. Everyone needs to use them, so they must be the easy option – attractive, well publicised, leading from where you are (where you live, or can get public transport to) to where you want to be, be it work, school the shops, open spaces, the sea side etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>J. North (Private Individual)</p>	<p>What I would like to say is that all footpaths and rights of ways should be clearly signposted and waymarked and should be accessible. All too often it is impossible to follow a route either because it is not clear (even with a 1:25,000 map) or because it is overgrown etc. The priority should be to get the existing network fully fit for purpose before commencing any other initiatives.</p>	<p>The RoWIP does not distract from the statutory duties of highway authorities, who will continue to manage the network in the most cost effective way in line with legislation. The RoWIP can only enhance the network management by raising the issues of most concern to the public in a authority based strategy.</p>
<p>J. Read (Private Individual)</p>	<p>I think Sustrans and good cycle routes are essential for encouraging people out of their cars and easily commuting to work and school. Leisure cycle paths indirectly encourage this too by getting families to experience the pleasure of cycling.</p> <p>NB one problem I encounter using a child seat or trailer is gaining access to the cycle paths –</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will ensure that any</p>

	<p>– anti motorbike steps or narrow rails can rule my family out too. This seems short sighted, as it is important to get families and kids into the habit of cycling early in life.</p> <p>Re footpaths: as far as I can see the main requirement is for them to be kept passable and clear and to be mapped on OS maps so we know where to find them. Signs and special maps/booklets are always nice, but probably not a high priority for expenditure. As a walker I am happy to carry out and use an OS map – as a cyclist I greatly appreciate signage.</p>	<p>structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a “case by case” basis.</p> <p>Disagree; the provision of information should be accessible to as wide a range of audience as possible. The partners will ensure that all signage and other promotional material are accessible to all users in accordance with Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9.</p>
J. Thompson (Chopwell Wood Horse Riding Association)	I hope that the authorities carry out this action plan.	Agreed. The plan partners will monitor the plan in accordance with legislative guidelines and seek to work with key partners in achieving the outcomes and actions derived from the public consultations.
J. Walker – Councillor (North Tyneside Council)	<p>Use of more volunteer groups to improve paths, which would otherwise be outside existing maintenance resources.</p> <p>This way of working has been highly successful in North Tyneside especially where large firms are involved such as Proctor and Gamble or the Department of Works and Pensions.</p> <p>Here employers use a working day (that is paid working day) and give up a normal 7 hour working day to improve a particular a path or hedgerow.</p> <p>Takes a lot of organising and collaboration with a firm but employees really enjoy it and find the experience highly fulfilling.</p> <p>Cost implications is that firms loses a full working day i.e. 7 hours for each employee involved – but a lot of good publicity for the firm involved – media photo opportunity for use in firm publicity and local newspapers.</p> <p><u>Does Work Well.</u></p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners value the importance of volunteercommunity work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network.</p> <p>The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p>

<p>J.R. Cook (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Having been out filming disabled people using countryside routes their main suggestions were that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wheelchair access should be piloted by disabled groups making sure all types of motorised chairs could be used (gateways).</li> <li>• Signs should be at the right height.</li> <li>• For disabled knowing where the next toilet/ facilities would be handy.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Found at one countryside park centre toilet provisions were almost out of reach to disabled.</li> <li>• Toilet door opening was a problem.</li> <li>• Where access is to public facilities such as pubs, liaison with Highways Dept to reduce high kerb problems with ramping.</li> </ul> <p>Gateshead Council should be congratulated on the work they do in this field and the amenities they provide. Very Impressive!</p>	<p>Noted, Most of the plan partners utilise local disability contacts in developing schemes where mobility problems have been highlighted as an issue.</p> <p>The guidance for RoWIP stipulates that the final RoWIP for an authority area, amongst other criteria, contain an assessment of the needs to access local Rights of Way by blind, partially sighted persons and others with impaired mobility. The partners will ensure that all signage and other promotional material are accessible to all users in accordance with Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9.</p> <p>Noted. However, this is outside of the remit of the RoWIP guidance.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>J. W. Taylor (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Although there are cycle ways, they are not joined up and you have to cycle through busy/ dangerous areas to get from one to another. It would also be useful to have circular cycle routes, well signed with mileage indicators that you can get to without having to drive and without having to negotiate obstacles and litter.</p>	<p>The development of the cycle network, although not outside of the remit of the RoWIP, is carried out by authority based highway teams as part of the overall highway</p>

		<p>network development, funded through the LTP and outlined within authority based cycling strategy's. The partners will support schemes that have a common interest and are contained in the Missing Links prioritised through public consultation in Appendix J.</p>
<p>K. Atkinson (Bridleways Officer, British Horse Society)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the Draft Document I would ask that the following changes be made.</p> <p>Page 2. Healthy Bodies Healthy Minds (please include horse riding in this paragraph – after all walkers cyclists &amp; horse riders.</p> <p>Page 4. Defending Public Rights of Way. Persistent objectors may present problems but objections on legal technicalities actually protect the public's rights i.e. incorrect legal procedures would not withstand challenges or stand up to scrutiny in the future as is evident from incorrect Legal procedures from the past (Tyne &amp; Wear era) which have surfaced and rights of way have been lost due to incorrect Legal technicalities. If someone had objected to these incorrect legal technicalities at the time, we would most likely have several more rights of way on the Definitive Map.</p> <p>Page 7. 2nd Paragraph – There is a small percentage of Rights of Way that are obstructed not by development but by incorrect signage, pedestrian access controls on bridleway and RUPPs which are listed as footpaths. Plus those, as stated, which have not been dealt with in development programmes.</p> <p>Page 9/10. Authorities profiles. Newcastle. Please add 'the bridleway network has doubled in the last 10 – 15 years'. North Tyneside Please add 'the bridleway network has doubled in the last 10 – 15 years'.</p>	<p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p>

	<p>Page 20. 6.4. Roadside Verges Please insert 'Section 130 of the Highway Act 1980 requires a highway authority to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any roadside waste which forms part of it. The highway Authority has a duty to provide special margins for the safety of pedestrians HA act S66 and ridden Horses S71 alongside dangerous roads.</p> <p>Page 41. Recommended Practice, MAIN 4 This should be prioritised.</p> <p>Page 46. New Access Rights Please add The Authorities will have the responsibility of ensuring that Higher rights on common land (?section 15 land) will not be overlooked and obstructions removed which at present deny the legal right of access to horse riders.</p> <p>Page 47. first paragraph – The Forestry commission also allows access to Spen Bank Woods on foot and is to shortly open a permissive bridleway which together with a route on council land will provide a strategic link to the Derwent Walk</p> <p>Page 54. Managing Public Access – please add 'distribute to user groups and LAF members'</p> <p>Page 58. DEFRA Schemes – please add Hack Hall Farm, Newcastle Permissive bridleway</p> <p>I don't think ELS is linked to SFP. A landowner can enter ELS HLS or OEL even if none of his land is under the SFP scheme.</p> <p>Page 62. Key Future Developments. Third para please add user groups i.e. It is important that the Rights of Way Officer &amp; USERS GROUPS are closely involved...</p> <p>Page 65. 8.1.2. Missing Links. Appendix 5.</p> <p>Comments. GC2 Add Chopwell Wood Horse riding Association to Stakeholders/Partners.</p> <p>GC/6. This is Common Land with higher rights for horse riders but access is needed at the eastern end if the route recommended is followed.</p>	<p>Noted. References to Statutory Duties are outlined in Appendix C and an amendment to the plan will be made to reflect this.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>GC/11. Greenside Mineral Line objection lodged against claim as higher rights exist.</p> <p>GC/13. Birtley to Lamesley off Road path – add and bridleway down Smithy Lane and through Longacre wood (creation agreement set in place by Mrs. Bowman).</p> <p>NCC/7. Scheme – should read Throckley Bank Top to South Farm.</p> <p>PLEASE ADD – DUE TO CURRENT AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT – UPGRADE TO BRIDLEWAY Off road link by Newcastle Airport from Prestwick road to bridleway network west of A696T.</p> <p>NT/6. This route is part of a Legal agreement following a stopping up order and is not permissive it is a claimed route with Legal agreements to dedicate as bridleway</p> <p>NTC/16. This is subject to a claim and agreement had been reached with previous Def Map Officer that it should be upgraded to bridleway.</p> <p>Post Script 2. Cobalt Business Park from T;16 to Benton Road, via electricity board land – Request this is added as it is a crucial link for riders from Murton – Particularly the young children who ride out from the riding school They have an extremely difficult time crossing Benton Road and this is the only route whereby they can access the bridleway links. The road safety issues surely meet criteria for the LTP.</p> <p>STC/3. Horseriders traditionally used this route – Source user evidence make permissive only as last resort.</p> <p>SCC/5. Rickleton Way to High General Wood. Possibly source use of Woodland trust Land running parallel to proposed route of cycle track.</p> <p>Page 66. 8.2.2 Roadside Verges – Please add BHS to first sentence.</p> <p>Page 65. Useful Links. 2nd para Please add BHS, i.e. BRAG, BAHA &amp; BHS were asked...</p> <p>Page 80. Motorised vehicles did not regularly use RUPPs they may have used CERTAIN RUPPs regularly.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Page 126. 13.4. Monitoring progress. Without officers in post to undertake work (i.e. Definitive Map Officer) very little progress can be made. But an important part of monitoring progress will be to see the 'missing links' gradually added to the network. This will mark some progress.</p>	Noted.
<p>K. Barnes (Gateshead Shopmobility Volunteer)</p>	<p>Nothing on mobility scooters as some cannot walk.</p>	<p>The plan partners recognise the benefit of mobility scooters in accessing the countryside. Some authorities have worked in partnership with other organisations to develop access to mobility scooters and will continue to assess the need/impact of these users in line with the DDA and the CROW Act in developing future schemes.</p>
<p>K. Brown (Private Individual)</p>	<p>As a horse rider/owner I would like to see more public information around/available on consideration of riders by drivers. I encounter many 'Sunday countryside' visitors who I am choosing to state are 'unaware' of how to approach/pass horses on the road. As a minority group member, I think that people are just not educated any more on consideration of other road users. This is a major safety issue of the future of road riding.</p>	<p>Noted. This particular comment is outside of the remit of the RoWIP within the guidance issued by DEFRA. The plan partners however, will work with local equestrian user groups on road safety issues.</p>
<p>K. Hughes (Ramblers Association – Northumbria Area Campaign Manager)</p>	<p>Emphasis should be on all users and not too much on disabled. Limited money should be spent where majority benefit.</p>	<p>Disagree. Local highway authorities and National Park authorities are required, under sections 60 and 62 (Part II) of the CROW Act, to review the adequacy of their Rights of Way network, and to prepare and publish plans which contain an assessment of whether local Rights of Way meet the present and likely future needs of the public;</p>

		<p>the opportunities provided for exercise and open air recreation and the enjoyment of the authority's area; and access to local Rights of Way by blind, partially sighted persons and others with impaired mobility. These actions chosen through the public consultation reflect the issues that most concern people in terms of access and enjoyment of the countryside through the Public Rights of Way network. They also appear to closely uphold the current work and projects in place and provide a positive direction for the delivery of the aspirations for future improvements that will create and maintain a more accessible network for all users.</p>
<p>K. Mair (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Also please don't presume we all have access to a computer.</p> <p>The style, syntax, vocabulary etc is too formal, not user friendly and puts one off from reading further. Too much like a legal document or textbook. The subject written should be presented less formally and with more panache.</p>	<p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all information material is accessible to all users.</p> <p>The final RoWIP is a document that outlines the actions for improvement to the overall access network and will be utilised by the authorities to assist in securing funding, for instance, to achieve the outcomes. A public appraisal document of the RoWIP will be produced</p>

	<p>I do appreciate however the efforts the five councils are making in improving the rights of way in the countryside.</p>	<p>and circulated once the plan partners have adopted the document.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>K. Pringle (Jesmond Dene Volunteer Ranger)</p>	<p>It's good that you are making an effort to consult more widely on an important part of peoples' lives.</p> <p>General approach: Please do not encourage more mixing of "carriages" with "walkers/cyclists". If a path is wide enough/good enough for "carriages" then it will encourage use by motorised vehicles (4x4, motor cycles) which is the last thing we need (even if illegal).</p> <p>You should work more closely/more actively with volunteer groups (Conservation Volunteers, Sustrans Rangers etc.) at a local level – with relatively small funding. These groups will have good local knowledge, high motivation, to make a big increase in improvements at a low cost to local authority budgets.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The plan partners note your concerns and will manage Public Rights of Ways in accordance with legislation whilst balancing the needs of legitimate users and local communities.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p>
<p>L. Buddin (N&amp;P NHS Trust)</p>	<p>Facilities for wheelchairs are important to me as I look after 6 people who I have to push around in them.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>M. Bayfield (Health Walk Participant)</p>	<p>To tell dog owners to put dog foul in bin/take home and not leave bags hanging on branches or on the ground.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.</p>

<p>M. Eggleston (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Horse rider signs/slow down for horses etc need to be erected in more areas to make motorised vehicles slow down and drive passing with plenty of space for safety – horses can be unpredictable at times. If they get a fright and who knows what could happen so the public need to be aware of this. Hope many of these areas are highlighted for everyone’s safety! Provide more signs to make it clear to walkers/riders who may expect to encounter motorised users to reduce conflict – another safety aspect to protect the public from harm if they are unaware of possible traffic. Erect more signs for bridle path crossings to warn traffic in advance of walkers/riders crossing to slow down or stop if necessary.</p> <p>Increase Bridleways as users at high risk on roads if bridleways disjointed. Busy roads to cross become very busy and blind corners a nightmare.</p> <p>New livery yards to be sited near to a bridleway network – very important for adult/children’s safety to keep away from roads where possible.</p> <p>Provide dual riverbank pathways and bridleways to separate conflict between different users–high safety aspect to give everyone their own space.</p> <p>Education and publicity on dog control etc – many dog walkers do not abide by safety rules</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers and Road Safety officers will continue to develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will look at ways of further enhancing the network where opportunities arise, concentrating on routes prioritised through the public consultation process and highlighted in Appendix J.</p> <p>The plan partners will work with planning authorities and planning legislation in connection to developments that have an impact or possible impact to the access network. See Section 4.7 – Long Term Planning.</p> <p>The plan partners note your concerns and will manage Public Rights of Ways in accordance with legislation whilst balancing the needs of legitimate users and local communities.</p> <p>Agree, the plan partners see the provision of</p>
--	---	--

	<p>when horses passing – need to highlight dangers of uncontrollable dogs around horses – had many near misses and frightened horses take off and behave out of character in these situations – CAN BE VERY DANGEROUS!</p> <p>At the end of the day these areas pinpointed above are for everyone’s safety. Being promoted /implemented and highlighting these to the public about the dangers encountered on these pathways/bridleways could prevent accidents occurring, even some fatal.</p> <p>Many People need to realise that they should keep their dogs under control by putting them on their leads until horses pass safely.</p> <p>Bikes/walkers/horse riders to have common sense about passing each other on bridleways – a bit of give and take does wonders!</p> <p>These pathways are for ALL the public to enjoy and need to be preserved and kept in a good state of repair to get many years out of them. The public need to realise this!</p>	<p>relevant information is paramount to users of the network. In view of this the partners propose to make the provision of information as accessible to as wide a range of audience as possible in accordance with Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>M. Graham (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Many dog owners ignore the bins, which are in place now. Policing and shaming dog owners who allow fouling of paths will be more effective than extra publicity or increasing the number of bins.</p> <p>Beware sanitising footpaths with too many signs, mowing, seats etc.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.</p> <p>The plan partners will ensure that any work to the access network will take into consideration the environmental and aesthetic impact whilst balancing the needs of users.</p>

<p>M. Hulme (Private Individual)</p>	<p>I looked at the questionnaire when I first received it and found it difficult to prioritise many of the suggestions. Having re-found the form I still find that practically all the suggestions in effect are 'high priority' i.e. all are good and need implementing.</p> <p>Having just moved back into the Whitley Bay (from West Midlands) we've been really impressed with the information and packs available for local walks i.e. walks from the Metro Stations, Tyne and Wear Access Map; Walking, Cycling, Horseriding, North Tyneside Waggonway (produced with help from local school children).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>M. Pearce (Northumberland &amp; Newcastle Society)</p>	<p>It is important to have a range of routes – some easy and “civilised”, others tricky and wild. Grades?</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>M. Reed (Private Individual)</p>	<p>To create a footpath from NZ328735 to NZ322733. To reinstate Bridleway at NZ298728 to NZ288726. To link footpaths.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners will look at these issues where opportunities arise.</p>
<p>M. Thorp (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Generally find footpaths/bridleways in Gateshead very good and well marked. Problems usually involve damaged stiles, overgrowth at his time of year.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>M. Weston (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Thank you for sending me a copy of your questionnaire. Rather than e-mailing yourself or “localaccessforum”. I decided to write.</p> <p>Suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fly-tipping. Unless the relevant Dept makes disposal easy cheap and convenient, then no amount of enforcement action will solve this problem. Slogans such as “the polluter must pay” will, if taken to extremes, merely ensure that we all end up paying over the odds.</li> <li>2. Japanese Knot Weed. At present this looks readily controllable in our area, but that could deteriorate rapidly if steps are not taken now. There should be an eradication team or teams established, and identification notices made available to the public. The team(s) should have a well-publicised telephone number so that the public can notify them when they encounter the weed.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>The Questionnaire. I am not qualified to comment on priorities in most of these areas and rather than complete a form and thereby mislead you, have offered comments below instead.</p> <p>Section 1 It is laudable to encourage the disabled into the countryside, but not if this involves a disproportionate per capita outlay, and certainly not if it renders them vulnerable to crime.</p> <p>Section 2 Item 2/7 sounds extravagant, and 2/6 and 2/10 sound good. I was professionally involved in health and safety at a senior level for 34 years. I don't feel at risk crossing roads, and I don't want to see the countryside plastered with signs. No doubt the statistics are against me, but I am more alarmed by bulls and herds of frisky young bulls in right-of-way fields.</p> <p>Section 3 Items 3/3 and 3/4 are good.</p> <p>Section 4 Items 4/2, 4/5 and 4/7 are good. No use putting things on websites that are too difficult to download – we don't all have broadband, and there must be some without a pc. (this comment also applies to Section 7.)</p> <p>Section 5. It all sounds good. I appreciate that the above comments are not going to fit into your questionnaire analytic programme, but then perhaps they don't deserve to.</p>	
<p>M. J. Stead (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Cycling in Central London is easier and feels less dangerous than cycling around Newcastle and London. Crossing or being on major roads here is not very pleasant.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling officers in the development of an integrated access network.</p>

	<p>Please focus on keeping the paths free from fly tipping, litter and broken glass etc.</p> <p>Please try and keep scramble bikes, mini motos, 4x4 users etc off cycle paths, bridleways, green lanes etc.</p> <p>Find some way of compensating the farmers who allow people to cross their land so both groups can “win”.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with the relevant enforcement agencies will continue to tackle problem areas.</p> <p>Noted. However, Public Rights of Way are “Public” and therefore the legislation does not allow for statutory compensation. Payments can be made via the Countryside and Environmental Stewardship schemes administered by Natural England to landowners who create access opportunities in their land.</p>
<p>Mark (Private Individual)</p>	<p>You should not waste money trying to prevent people being stupid e.g. un-necessary signs and development to make routes safer. People can appreciate risks themselves and don't need protection from them e.g. don't waste money building fences or upgrading signs etc or trying to protect people from roads.</p>	<p>Disagree; the authorities and landowners under Health and Safety legislation have a duty of care to the public, in the same way as the public have a duty of care to themselves and others. The partners will work with landowners as appropriate to fulfil the act.</p>

<p>Mr and Mrs P. Durant (Private Individuals)</p>	<p>There is a need to keep emphasising “Keep Britain Tidy”, starting with educating children from an early age not to throw litter down. Packs for use in schools and poster competitions could keep public awareness fresh. Emphasis on damage to wildlife could be used. Invite Youth organisations to be part of the project.</p> <p>We have noted with sadness damage to newly planted trees in Rowlands Gill on more than one occasion. How to stop this or apprehend those responsible is a problem.</p> <p>We appreciate the care taken to maintain the local environment to a high standard, particularly in the floral planting.</p>	<p>The plan partners recognise the benefits of working with children to protect and enhance the environment of local communities and will continue to work with relevant partners within the remit of the RoWIP.</p>
<p>Mr. D. Kaye (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Vigorous action to be taken on fly tipping, which is a disgrace. Why people foul their own nest is beyond me.</p> <p>It is not unusual to find cyclists using routes, which are clearly FOOTPATHS only. What can be done to discourage this?</p> <p>Every effort should be made to increase the amount of “open access land” under “CROW”. Permissive path schemes, such as the conservation walks, are excellent. There are a number around Corbridge, where I live. More of these should be encouraged.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.</p> <p>See Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9. The plan partners will work with other partners to assist in educating and informing users to the use of the network.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will work with Government Agencies to develop and manage areas of open and permissive access where opportunities arise.</p>
<p>Mr. I. Holloway (Private Individual)</p>	<p>People with low confidence may include those with limited mobility, visual or auditory impairment. Their needs should be addressed. Easy access/parking/toilets/path surface help.</p>	<p>The plan partners recognise the benefit of people with low confidence in accessing</p>

	<p>Need to satisfy both walking groups and individual “adventures”.</p> <p>High quality signs, information boards and leaflets all help those people who may not be skilled with a map and compass. I find it refreshing to walk a well-defined and safe route without thinking about route finding in poor weather. The Keelman Way leaflet is excellent – use this as an example of good practice.</p> <p>I have been impressed by the efforts of Gateshead Council to promote public rights of ways – keep up the good work!</p>	<p>accessing the countryside. Some authorities have worked in partnership with other organisations to develop access to this sector of the community and will continue to assess the need/impact of these users in line with the DDA and the CROW Act in developing future schemes.</p> <p>The plan partners will ensure that any work to the access network will take into consideration the needs of all users.</p> <p>The plan partners will provide additional information to signage, where resources allow and provide the greatest benefit to all users, in accordance with legislation. Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all promotional material is accessible to all users.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Mr. T. Owen (Private Individual)</p>	<p>There is a potential here for interlocking “virtuous circles” relating to Health, reduced pollution and enhancing populations’ leisure activities. So be ambitious. Thanks for what has been done.</p>	<p>The plan partners recognise the benefits of the access network to health, in reducing pollution and enhancing leisure activities and will continue to work with relevant partners within the remit of the RoWIP.</p>

<p>Ms. N. White (Private Individual)</p>	<p>There needs to be more information about what is out there for people without internet access.</p> <p>Also provide better public transport for those who do not drive and not able to cycle.</p>	<p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all promotional material is accessible to all users.</p> <p>Noted. This issue is outside of the remit of the RoWIP but will be covered by the sister document – the LTP.</p>
<p>N. Benson (Durham Heritage Coast Partnership - Heritage Coast Officer)</p>	<p>The Durham Heritage Coast Partnership consists of fifteen separate bodies concerned with the management of the defined area of Heritage Coast in County Durham and Sunderland. The defined area covers a small area to the east of the transport corridor in south Sunderland between the local authority boundary and Hendon. We therefore have a geographically limited interest in the plan.</p> <p>The Partnership has adopted the following key objectives to guide management of the Heritage Coast;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To conserve, protect and enhance the natural beauty of the coast, including the terrestrial, littoral and marine flora and fauna, geological interest, and its heritage features of architectural, historical and archaeological interest.</li> <li>2. To facilitate and enhance the enjoyment, understanding and appreciation of the public by improving and extending opportunities for recreational, educational and tourist activities, including sport and art, that draw on, and are consistent with the conservation of its natural beauty and the protection of its heritage features.</li> <li>3. To maintain, and improve the environmental health of inshore waters affecting the Heritage Coast and its beaches through appropriate works and management.</li> <li>4. To take account of the needs of agriculture forestry and fishing, and the economic and social needs of the small communities on the coast, by promoting sustainable forms of social and economic development, which in</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>which in themselves conserve and enhance natural beauty and heritage features.</p> <p>5. To promote community participation in the stewardship of the coast, optimising the potential of social and economic regeneration initiatives that are consistent with the conservation of the natural beauty and the protection of the heritage features of the Heritage Coast.</p> <p>6. To integrate fully with adjoining areas and within the region to actively promote Integrated Coastal Zone Management.</p> <p>A formal Management Plan for the area was published in April 2005 covering the period 2005-2010.</p> <p>We welcome the Tyne and Wear RoWIP and particularly welcome the support given to the provision of access along the coastal strip at Ryhope and Grangetown. The communities are effectively denied rights of access to this section of Heritage Coast, simply because of the natural action of the sea is something that the partnership are very keen to see rectified. Indeed the partnership recently commissioned two reports entitled "Coastal Connections" that provided very useful and detailed analysis of the heritage interest and its conservation and separately the access and audience development needs for this section of coast. The partnership notes their inclusion as a partner in the action and wholeheartedly support this as a priority. Strategically it will allow a coastal path to be followed from the centre of Sunderland to the centre of Hartlepool.</p> <p>We look forward to the final Statement of Action in due course.</p>	
<p>N. Frier (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Ensure cycle network and rights of way network join and are mapped as one.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling officers in the development of an integrated access network.</p>

<p>Nick Sandford (Regional Policy Officer, The Woodland Trust)</p>	<p>Thank you for sending us a copy of your Rights of Way Improvement Plan.</p> <p>We have no comments to make on the plan but please do continue to consult us about this and other plans which you may be developing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Not Provided</p>	<p>Liaise with police to control trespass by motor powered bikes and quads.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with the relevant enforcement agencies will continue to tackle problem areas.</p>
<p>Not Provided</p>	<p>Minority Groups usually get funding to support these activities.</p> <p>Maybe people should accept their capabilities and if they really want to do something – help themselves i.e. I have seen blind people helped on walks by friends or family, the same applies to wheelchair users.</p> <p>Some of your proposals would cost significant amounts of money, so I feel a lot of thought should be given to these before commitments are made. No matter how much is done some people will never walk – where there is a will there is a way! Conservation I believe is the main answer.</p>	<p>In undertaking the actions and objectives of this RoWIP the plan partners will consider the needs of all users in conjunction with the legislation requirements outlined within the DDA, CROW Act, for example and the guidance produced to assist in the development of the RoWIP, ensuring that the access network and information is available to all users.</p>
<p>Not Provided</p>	<p>Most people except hill walkers in remote areas would consider 3 to 5 miles a good walk. Therefore use that figure as a planning unit for designing and planning routes.</p> <p>Find some way of warning of wet areas at the onset of walks – footwear problems.</p> <p>Monitor and take out crossings i.e. planks laid across streambeds etc. Traps for the unwary.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all promotional material is accessible to all users and include the necessary information to assist the in preparing to undertake the route.</p> <p>The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose.</p>

	Better signing for drivers where a right of way crosses a dual carriageway.	The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers will continue to develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.
Not Provided	<p>I run 2 walking groups using public transport or a hire bus to reach areas outside our locality. There are 2 things which cause me problems:</p> <p>1. Stiles that are too high to step up to and are often not repaired.</p> <p>2. Signs – fingerposts or markers wrongly placed or with just “Public Footpath” written on. It helps to know where the path leads.</p>	<p>The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a “case by case” basis.</p> <p>The plan partners will provide additional information to signage, where resources allow and provide the greatest benefit to all users, in accordance with the Traffic Sign Regulations and General Directions 2002.</p>
Not Provided	<p>More money is needed to ensure that everyone who wants to can enjoy the countryside and the Rights of Way.</p> <p>People need to know where they can walk and be able to do this without fear of trespass or injury.</p> <p>There is a lot to do and the plan must be under continual review to reflect the changing needs. It must not be a rigid snapshot. It must be our future aims.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all promotional material is accessible to all users.</p> <p>See Section 7.0.</p>

Not Provided	Better waymarking especially in the vicinity of farms etc is needed. 'Straying' is often the landowners removing or concealing way markers. Path reinstatement after ploughing/planting is rare – much more enforcement is needed.	The plan partners will work with landowners/land managers in accordance with the legislation to protect the public's rights of access. This is further outlined in Section 4.0.
Not Provided	Have noticed lots of improvements.  The surface at entry points to Public Rights of Ways is still difficult for wheelchair users and carers.	Noted.  Noted. Section 4.1 – Surfaces amended.
Not Provided	More cycle paths to be developed in the local area for the ever increasing participation in the activity.	The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling officers in the development of an integrated access network.
Not Provided	Priorities should be: 1. Making safe cycling routes to schools. 2. Re-instate the cycling proficiency Test (or modern equivalent) at all schools. 3. Promote existing cycling routes to employers to encourage more people to cycle to work. 4. Develop more cycle lanes that also give priority at road crossings to cyclists similar to Holland, Germany etc.	The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling and road safety officers in the development of an integrated access network and information provision.
Not Provided	It would be nice for more seats on walks; you can sit on the grass but not when it has been raining.	The plan partners will ensure that any work to the access network will take into consideration the environmental and aesthetic impact whilst balancing the needs of all users.
Not Provided	I have no specific section to comment on, but I have to make a comment on the fact that you don't mention the accessibility for horse's more and I would like to see better riding areas.	The issue of access for horse related activities is covered in a separate sister document to the RoWIP, The Tyne and Wear Equestrian Access Strategy which can be found in Appendix K. This document was subject to public consultation as part of the RoWIP public consultation.

<p>Not Provided</p>	<p>When building or improving roads contractors are made to incorporate cycle lanes or shared paths as part of the programme to encourage use and lessen the use of cars.</p> <p>Encourage businesses to adopt cycle schemes for employers and reduce car parking</p> <p>Use community service orders to make improvements to the countryside paths/ environment as well as volunteers.</p>	<p>The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers and other key partners will continue to develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.</p> <p>Noted. This particular comment is outside of the remit of the RoWIP within the guidance issued by DEFRA. The plan partners however, will work with travel plan officers in providing infrastructure as part of a sustainable travel plan.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p>
<p>Not Provided</p>	<p>Knowing what's out there – This is an excellent section. I particularly liked the part on working with schools because children do need to be made aware of all the facilities, walks, public transport etc and areas of beauty in their area.</p> <p>Making the countryside accessible and safer – These sections are excellent. I particularly liked the content on access for the visually impaired.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>Too many visually impaired people are sitting at home who could be going out on guided walks. Sighted guides for walks would be great.</p> <p>Overall I think this is an excellent document. You have addressed the needs of the majority of special needs.</p> <p>One query do you have a "minicom" telephone for people who are profoundly deaf? There are a number of profoundly deaf people in Gateshead who rely on either texting or the use of a minicom or of course e-mailing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Each of the authorities have the facility to receive incoming calls via the "minicom" network of phones.</p>
Not Provided	<p>Please bear in mind that canoeists also need access to rivers. There are a lot of footpaths that see very little feet go on them. These paths look as if they have been forgotten about and need cutting back.</p> <p>Could you look to extend your range on the rights of way to include river use for small craft i.e. canoes/kayaks in the future.</p>	<p>The needs of access to water for the use of sports such as canoeing have been considered. The plan partners will maintain Public Rights of Ways that connect and allow access to water in line with current statutory duties.</p>
Not Provided	<p>Improve barriers on cycleways to prevent motorcycles but still allow easy cycle access.</p> <p>Cleaning Glass on cycleways.</p>	<p>The plan partners will ensure that any structures installed upon or adjacent to any right of way is fit for purpose and will be considered on a "case by case" basis in consultation with users/local communities.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Not Provided	<p>People should be aware that straying from their home does entail some hazards! Some of these measures are about reducing risk but people need to take responsibility for themselves! The element of risk is sometime makes going into the countryside a real adventure.</p> <p>Saying that "dog dirt" is a hazard that spoils most of my days out. I inevitably have to spend time wiping dog dirt off my children's shoes and clothes. It should be high priority educating the masses of thoughtless people who let the dog's poo everywhere!</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media</p>

		opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.
Not Provided	<p>One of the main difficulties is the conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on many paths. A code of practice should be encouraged to ensure cyclists give early warning of their approach to pedestrians.</p> <p>Constant disturbance of a quiet walk by silent cyclists discourages the use of footpaths by walkers.</p>	The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling, road safety officers and user groups in the promotion and education of rights and responsibilities of users to the access network in accordance with Policies NA9 and NA10.
Not Provided	<p>It is my opinion that the prosecution of fly tippers should be enforced in a very robust manner.</p> <p>Fly tipping must be controlled BEFORE the countryside access criteria's are implemented.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Not Provided	<p>Better Land Management</p> <p>Farmers should NOT be allowed to out dangerous animals in a field with a public right of way in it. This especially includes bulls and calves. Horses should be separated from people by electric fences.</p> <p>Farmers should be fined for not following these rules and be informed that walkers often leave a path to seek a safer route on farmers land when faced with this obstacle.</p>	Noted. The authorities will work within the remit of the legislation to ensure the public's right to use the access network is not hindered in any way. The authorities will tackle any complaints of obstruction by animals or other obstructions to use in line with the priority guideline in Appendix F and Policy NM3.
Not Provided	<p>I think the overall aim for you is to encourage as many people as possible to use, appreciate and care for our lovely countryside.</p> <p>I think a very important aspect is to cultivate a love of the countryside amongst the young so that future generations will consider personal health, global warming, pollution and care of the environment as top priorities.</p>	Agreed.

Not Provided	<p>It is very annoying when pedestrians or cyclists are forced to take long and circuitous routes to cover small distances, for example, new housing estates with only one entrance is bad.</p>	<p>The plan partners will work with planning authorities to develop and safe guard access routes as part of the sustainable travel infrastructure. See Section 4.7 – Long Term Planning.</p>
<p>P. Jones (Planning Manager, North East Assembly)</p>	<p>Consultation on the Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Tyne and Wear</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document. This letter is an officer response prior to member consideration, in order to meet the 3 August deadline. Should there be any changes following member consideration, an amended response will be forwarded to you thereafter.</p> <p>The North East Assembly (NEA) welcomes the production of a Rights of Way Improvement Plan, which examines the extent to which the rights of way network is accessible, meets existing needs, and identifies the opportunities the rights of way network presents in terms of exercise and recreation.</p> <p>Regional Planning Guidance 1 (RPG1), policy T14, encourages strategies to introduce measures to improve the safety, security and attractiveness of walking and cycling, including the maintenance and improvement of footways and cycle routes.</p> <p>The Secretary of State’s proposed changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) which will replace RPG1 once adopted, establishes broad principles for sustainable development in policy 2. These include promoting the concept of green infrastructure; a network of linked greenspace in and around the region’s towns and cities, improving health and well being and reducing the need to travel by private car.</p> <p>It is noted that more specific objectives of the rights of way strategy include enhancing the quality of the network; enhancing the network to increase the use of sustainable transport for accessing employment and education; and</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>improving their connectivity all contribute to encouraging walking and cycling. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan will assist in the implementation of RPG1 and the Secretary of State's proposed changes to the RSS, and therefore is supported by the NEA.</p>	
<p>P. Routledge (Private Individual)</p>	<p>You are trying too hard with this to "tick all the boxes".  Better paths – that covers everything in 1 go!!  Better access for all (blind, wheelchair, horses etc.)  Better info, in more places.  Joined up paths with byways, bridleways and cycleways.</p> <p>Don't make something so obvious into a major research strategy, it does not need this level of survey – waste of paper (I know it is required).</p>	<p>The content of the actions incorporated into the plan have materialised following 2 consultations with interested parties on the development and improvement of the access network. The final content has been driven by public consensus.</p> <p>The development of the plan has been dictated by legislation and further details can be found in Section 1.4 – Legal Context.</p>
<p>P. Taylor (Nexus)</p>	<p>The value of the ROW network in providing a resource for sustainable travel is acknowledged. Its potential to reduce car use and congestion is considerable and needs to be promoted in the way the Plan proposes.</p> <p>Rights of Way have to be maintained in a fit-for-purpose condition if they are to be used as a part of an integrated transport journey. Effective methods of drainage and vegetation control are required.</p> <p>Rights of Way connecting Metro lines and bus corridors with communities are deserving of enhanced inspection and maintenance as a means of reducing car use for the first or last leg of a journey.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners will ensure that the use of travel by sustainable means is promoted in accordance with Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 and in line with the aims of LTP sustainable transport objectives.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The plan partners acknowledge the benefits of access network integration with the public transport system and where Public Rights of Ways assist in providing</p>

	<p>Greater liaison between ROW authorities and Nexus would be valuable. It would allow Nexus to plan marketing campaigns involving bus and Metro travel for major investment, such as the proposed Chopwell to Winlaton Mill link. It would also enable highway authorities to plan ahead to upgrade ROW links along corridors of increased public transport activity, such as the opening of a new Metro station.</p> <p>Integration with the LTP should expand beyond the medium of the Walking Strategy. There is a mutual lack of awareness of future aims and objectives of ROW interest groups and the public transport industry.</p> <p>There is evidence of concerns by pedestrians over the indiscriminate use of footways by cyclists. A significant minority of cyclists in urban areas have little regard for highway law, or for other road users. The promotion of shared use of footways as cycleways should not be encouraged until this issue has been effectively addressed.</p>	<p>access to Metro lines and bus corridors will liaise with Nexus and Public Transport operators in the management of routes based on demand and needs of the local communities that they serve.</p> <p>Agreed. The outcomes of the plan cannot be achieved without partnership working and the plan partners welcome the opportunity to work with external partners in fulfilling the objectives of this RoWIP.</p> <p>The LTP have acknowledged that walking is only one small part in the needs of the shift to more sustainable modes of transport and are continuously monitoring the situation to make improvements to the current LTP, It is hoped the RoWIP will assist in future development of the LTP.</p> <p>The plan partners agree that this is a problem across Tyne and Wear, carried out by a small minority of users. The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling, road safety officers and user groups in the promotion and education of rights and responsibilities of users to the access network in accordance with Policies NA9 and NA10.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Safety at level crossings is a high priority for the railway industry. Network Rail is progressively working towards risk reduction by seeking to close or re-route footways and bridleways across tracks, particularly where high speed trains operate. The increased use of ROW crossing live railways should not be encouraged where feasible alternatives exist. Where alternatives are impracticable, a bridge is a preferable option to a lengthy diversion which could make a route effectively redundant.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners acknowledge the powers that Network Rail have in creating a fragmented network and will strive to work with the Railway bodies to reduce the need to cross live railways, without creating severance to the access network.</p>
<p>Pat Ritchie (Assistant Chief Executive – Strategy, One NorthEast)</p>	<p><b>RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE: A PARTNERSHIP PROJECT BY GATESHEAD, NEWCASTLE, NORTH TYNESIDE, SOUTH TYNESIDE AND SUNDERLAND COUNCILS</b></p> <p>I refer to your letter dated May 2007 inviting comments from One NorthEast in respect of the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Tyne and Wear.</p> <p>As you are aware One NorthEast is responsible for taking forward the review of the existing Regional Economic Strategy (RES) on behalf of North East England. The RES sets out how greater and sustainable prosperity will be delivered to all of the people of the North East over the period to 2016.</p> <p>The Agency welcomes the Councils’ joint preparation of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan which seeks to ensure that the benefits of the network of public rights of way within Tyne and Wear are fully realised.</p> <p>I confirm that the Agency has no specific comments to make at this time regarding this draft plan and I look forward to receiving the final plan in due course.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>R. Emms (Private Individual)</p>	<p>My first priority would be the creation of a cycle network in Tyne and Wear’s towns and cities.</p>	<p>The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling and road safety officers in the development of an integrated access network and information provision.</p>

	<p>I hope the Right of Way development plan will not divert resources away from an urban network.</p>	<p>The plan partners value the asset that urban routes can provide in the development of an integrated access network and therefore manage urban Public Rights of Ways in line with legislation and available resources.</p>
<p>R. Errington (Ramblers Association - Member)</p>	<p>Money would have been better well spent on replacing old and difficult stiles and better waymarking rather than the questionnaire. The problems are well known and have been reported and often lack of funding is given for not being able to do anything about them. Here is a questionnaire the asks for opinions on improving stiles, signs and footpaths that go way beyond the basics standard that cannot be achieved at the moment. As well as the large number of questions, some need more than an L, M and H to give an accurate answer. No 1 for example needs 5 answers.  Yes replace existing stiles e.g. old dangerous and badly sited.  Not with gaps.  Yes install kissing gates.  Not with Radar Keys. Too expensive and would be vandalised.  Not just well used paths; use of less used paths should be encouraged.  Yes to public improved access.  It would be wonderful for visually impaired and the disabled to get out in the countryside but the problems and cost that would entail should not be underestimated. There are stiles and footpaths that would prove a challenge to a cross-country runner. I know of a club that asked for a member to accompany a blind man on a country walk. Much thought was given to this and members decided that this needed special skills and was not something that anyone could do.  Do we need more footpaths for disabled etc?  We already have country parks, old railways and sea fronts that are ideal for the disabled.</p>	<p>Disagree. Local highway authorities and National Park authorities are required, under sections 60 and 62 (Part II) of the CROW Act, to review the adequacy of their Rights of Way network, and to prepare and publish plans which contain an assessment of whether local Rights of Way meet the present and likely future needs of the public; the opportunities provided for exercise and open air recreation and the enjoyment of the authority's area; and access to local Rights of Way by blind, partially sighted persons and others with impaired mobility. These actions chosen through the public consultation reflect the issues that most concern people in terms of access and enjoyment of the countryside through the Public Rights of Way network. They also appear to closely uphold the current work and projects in place and provide a positive direction</p>

	<p>Is the demand there that would justify the enormous costs?</p>	<p>for the delivery of the aspirations for future improvements that will create and maintain a more accessible network for all users.</p>
<p>R. Fordham (Planning Manager, Sport England: North East Region)</p>	<p><b>Rights of Way Improvement in the Countryside: A partnership project by Gateshead, Newcastle, North Tyneside, South Tyneside and Sunderland Councils</b></p> <p>I refer to your letter of May 2007, in respect of the above, and thank you for consulting Sport England.</p> <p>Sport England's "Planning for Sport and Active Recreation: Objectives and opportunities" (2005) sets out Sport England's planning policies and planning objectives.</p> <p>Sport England's Planning Policy Objective 15: To support the public rights of way network in its role of offering the single most important means by which people can get into and enjoy the countryside.</p> <p>Sport England's Planning Policy Objective 16: To support measures to protect, enhance and develop the network and other permissive routes that provide opportunities to access the countryside by foot, bicycle and horse. As such any initiative to enhance and improve the rights of way network receives the support of Sport England.</p> <p><b>Sport England's comments:</b> Having read the document, Sport England considers it to be comprehensive and well written. We are pleased that the document has used the Active People Survey to inform its research.</p> <p><b>The Planning Process</b> Unfortunately the professions of planning and rights of way have traditionally been viewed as separate areas, even though they have key overlaps, Sport England therefore welcomes the document's link between the planning process</p>	<p>An amendment to the plan will be made to incorporate this document.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The partners are consulted on relevant planning documents that may have an impact on Public Rights of Ways and access generally.</p>

	<p>and the rights of way network, particularly taking advantage of planning gain - an area that many rights of way documents sadly miss out. By joining or complimenting the Rights of Way Improvement Plan with the relevant Local Development Frameworks the opportunity can arise to use planning obligations to enhance the rights of way network as mitigation for any impact that a development may have. For example, a large housing development that may impact upon the enjoyment of a footpath could provide the opportunity to create a permissive route through land under the developer's control and link two separate networks together, or pay for the installation of a Pegasus crossing etc.</p> <p><b>Small scale development to enhance rights of way</b>  Linked to the above, the plan should recognise and promote small scale development that enhance and encourage people to use the rights of way network. Users of rights of way often require small scale facilities to assist them and make their journey more pleasurable. This could include drinking troughs for horses, washing facilities for mountain bikes, car parking, horse trailer parking or benches and signage to assist walkers. There is also an increasing trend for public art on or adjacent to rights of ways. Some of these developments may require planning permission and therefore there should be positive criteria that encourage such development in relevant Local Development Framework Documents. Sport England suggest that the plan should inform the Local Development Framework, by acting as an evidence base, to secure positive planning policies that permit, rather than refuse, small scale developments that are relevant and necessary for the rights of way network.</p> <p><b>Use of motor vehicles to facilitate sport</b>  Sport England would suggest that the document recognise, under Section 9.0, the legitimate use of cars and other vehicles for sport and recreation. Many recreational activities</p>	<p>Additionally each Highway Authority is a statutory consultee on planning applications, which may affect Public Rights of Way. Officers monitor applications and make representations when necessary.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. The amount of network available and utilised in pursuit of formalised motor vehicle based sports is minimal.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>rely on motor vehicles for access to resources. Cars, vans or trailers are used as a base, sometimes a changing room for many activities. This includes: angling, canoeing, equestrian events, country shows, mountaineering, ballooning and bird watching. There is a legitimate use of Byways by motor vehicles, particularly to facilitate sport. Sport England considers the plan should recognise and acknowledge this issue,</p> <p><b>Resource for sport events</b> Sport England considers section 9.0 should recognise the many formal sport events that utilise the rights of way network. Whilst informal active recreation takes place on public rights of way, so too do formal sporting events including running competitions, cycling competitions, horse endurance and even some forms of motor sports - usually operating under Road Traffic Act regulations to lawfully use the public right of way. The sporting opportunities offered by the rights of way network should be recognised in the plan, Such sporting uses, by their very nature, can be transient and peripatetic, and whilst may not require permanent facilities, do still require the rights of way network to operate.</p> <p>In summary, Sport England considers the improvement plan to be comprehensive and well written and one of the best examples seen to date.</p> <p>I trust you will endeavour to incorporate Sport England's above suggestions into the final version of the Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>
<p>R. Harrison (Lamesley Parish Council)</p>	<p>Some areas are being left to overgrow to prevent use; sometimes animals grazing will also prevent the use of rights of way. Kissing gates are much better than stiles but require more vegetation cutting as they become overgrown and prevent them opening and closing fully.</p> <p>Where paths are at side of fields these are being left to overgrow and prevent use.</p>	<p>The plan partners in accordance with the legislation relevant to vegetation management will carry out the maintenance and management of the Public Rights of Way network. See Section 4.1 – Maintenance.</p>

<p>R. Herdman (Becoming Visible)</p>	<p>Open for Public access across the large acreage of Ravensworth Wood and Park ASAP.</p>	<p>Agreed, Ravensworth Estate currently has no access entitlement and is seen as having potential to enhance the network. The partners will work in with the landowner and the Forestry Commission when opportunities arise to develop access within the estate.</p>
<p>R. Wilkin (Private Individual)</p>	<p>This document may result in more people using the countryside but it fails to make provision in any depth for the protection of wildlife. Thought must be given where new pathways are placed, margins of space should be allowed to protect banks of streams, rivers, waterways, woodlands, flower pastures, heathland.</p> <p>People should have a knowledge of countryside, of farming problems, of estate work, of wildlife requirements before gaining access to areas that are more sensitive to human nature. People should understand the countryside before they destroy it!</p>	<p>The plan partners will ensure that maintenance and management. Any work to the access network will take into consideration the environmental and aesthetic impact whilst balancing the needs of users.</p> <p>Agree, the plan partners see the provision of relevant information is paramount to users of the network. In view of this the partners propose to make the provision of information as accessible to as wide a range of audience as possible in accordance with Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9.</p>
<p>R. J. Taylor (North Tyneside Council – Funding)</p>	<p>Waymarking The problem with the traditional yellow arrow on a plastic or metal disc is that the sun eventually bleaches the yellow out. Could you consider simply making the discs in the shape of an arrow or mark out the fixing screws in the shape of an arrow?</p>	<p>Noted. The partners will seek to utilise materials that provide value for money, low maintenance and suitable for the situation/location in question.</p>
<p>S. Cavanagh (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Design good cycle routes to facilitate effective cycling to work and school. Most cycle paths are poor, badly thought out and best fit solutions. You need to consult cyclists who use them – they are the experts.</p>	<p>The plan partners will work in collaboration with authority based cycling and road safety officers in the development of an</p>

	<p>Dog fouling is still a major problem on beaches and parks and of course the school playing field.</p> <p>Keep up the good work – things are slowly getting better but the speed of progress is slow and the volume of traffic is getting ever larger. This needs to be addressed. I don't have a car and commute to work by bike – over 100 miles per week.</p>	<p>integrated access network and information provision. Consultation for this document consisted of a number of cycling organisations and individuals. See Appendix L.</p> <p>The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.</p> <p>Noted. This issue is outside of the remit of the RoWIP but will be covered by the sister document – the LTP.</p>
<p>S. Haswell (Scout Association – Great North District)</p>	<p>Composting dog poo bins – will the authorities provide suitable compostable bags to pick it up or some other method?</p> <p>Very in favour of encouraging more public transport. I use to get to walks.</p> <p>I am a city dweller and we have some nice walks nearby – publicise them to get more people to use them – fitness improvement and diversion from care etc. I am involved in cub scouts so take out groups of young people so well guided walks for groups will be excellent.</p> <p>Safe road crossings are very important and like the idea of big kissing gates – helps people with 3 wheeler pushchairs as well as prams –</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will continue to tackle problem areas.</p> <p>Noted. Policy NA16 will encourage the use of public transport and other sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9 will ensure that all promotional material is accessible to all users.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with Highway Engineers will</p>

	I have been in discussions with freemen (town moor) with some success. Would come to a focus group – let me know.	continue to develop the access network so as to reduce unacceptable risks to users and manage those features of the access network that make accessing the network enjoyable.
S. Mather (Private Individual)	If you intend to put gaps in walls instead of stiles I hope you make them wider than some of the old gaps as quite a lot of people are getting bigger now.	The plan partners will consider the provision of barriers etc in accordance with the current British Standards and in consultation with user groups and land owners/ land managers.
S. Petit (Birtley Youth Club)	Ensure that motorways/roads leave under crossings for pedestrians or footbridges wherever possible e.g. Birtley to Washington is almost impossible to walk.	The plan partners will work with a range of external partners in seeking to provide a joined up network. The actions within the RoWIP would not be realised if partnership working were not undertaken.
T. Foreman (Whitburn Village Residents Association)	Not only provide signs where motorised traffic may be encountered but try to keep walkers away from and give them priority over cyclists and horse riders.  Also more enforcement to keep cyclists and riders off footpaths.	The plan partners note your concerns and will manage Public Rights of Ways in accordance with legislation whilst balancing the needs of legitimate users and local communities.  The plan partners will carry out investigation into alleged illegitimate use and look at carrying out the relevant course of action based on the outcomes in line with the relevant statutory duties.
T. Lowden (Ramblers Association – Gateshead Group)	Instead of paying contractors to cut croppings and clearing pathways, use people who are doing “community service” including ASBOs.	The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will continue to

	<p>This should be cost productive as much of the work to other areas e.g. hedgerows, stile repairs etc could be inexpensive e.g. fly tipping if culprit caught and they clean up the mess.</p>	<p>to tackle problem areas. The plan partners value the importance of volunteer/community work and the work undertaken. The plan partners will continue to investigate opportunities to increase voluntary work in managing the network. The plan partners will work in partnership with other voluntary organisations in developing a mechanism across Tyne and Wear as outlined in Policy NM11.</p>
<p>T. Pollard (Private Individual)</p>	<p>Concentrates too much on disabled access not enough on making countryside accessible for all. High priority to be given to ensure all paths are usable, sign posted and way marked.</p>	<p>Disagree. Local highway authorities and National Park authorities are required, under sections 60 and 62 (Part II) of the CROW Act, to review the adequacy of their Rights of Way network, and to prepare and publish plans which contain an assessment of whether local Rights of Way meet the present and likely future needs of the public; the opportunities provided for exercise and open air recreation and the enjoyment of the authority's area; and access to local Rights of Way by blind, partially sighted persons and others with impaired mobility. These actions chosen through the public consultation reflect the issues that most concern people in terms of access and enjoyment of the</p>

	<p>It is important that gaps in the network are filled and appropriate links provided to avoid necessity of ROW users have to walk etc along country roads. This may require the provision of ROWs parallel to roads and should not concentrate on well-used paths.</p> <p>It is unnecessary to provide dual footpaths and bridleways to separate conflict between different user groups, especially if suitable surfacing is used and users are educated and encouraged to be aware of other users.</p>	<p>countryside through the Public Rights of Way network. They also appear to closely uphold the current work and projects in place and provide a positive direction for the delivery of the aspirations for future improvements that will create and maintain a more accessible network for all users.</p> <p>Noted. The plan partners will look at ways of further enhancing the network where opportunities arise, concentrating on routes prioritised through the public consultation process and highlighted in Appendix J. In addition, plan partners will work in partnership with Highway Engineers and support the work undertaken by the user groups to highlight the advantage of roadside verges in enhancing the access network, with a view of altering the cutting regime, taking in account road safety and biodiversity issues.</p> <p>The plan partners note your concerns and will manage Public Rights of Ways in accordance with legislation whilst balancing the needs of legitimate users and local communities. The provision of relevant information is paramount</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Landowners should pay the full cost and be responsible for all field edge paths that have been created at their request by diversion of cross-field paths.</p> <p>It is important that definitive maps are bought and kept up to date. It is essential that properly qualified, experienced and remunerated definitive map officers are employed.</p> <p>Monitoring and survey work should include taking the necessary action to tackle problems encountered.</p>	<p>to users of the network. In view of this the partners propose to make the provision of information as accessible to as wide a range of audience as possible in accordance with Statement of Action 1/3 and Policies NA8 and NA9.</p> <p>Noted. However, Public Rights of Way are "Public" and therefore the legislation does not allow for statutory compensation.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Tyne and Wear Joint Local Access Forum</p>	<p>Members of the Forum considered the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and made the following comments on the plan:</p> <p>Paragraph 7.1.1 – could "persons using the waterways" or something of this nature be included in the paragraph.</p> <p>The forum were delighted to see canoeists and blue trails mentioned in the plan.</p> <p>The forum were also impressed with the Limited Mobility and Disability section.</p> <p>Section 9.6 paragraph 2 – to say that vehicles regularly use RUPPS is not quite accurate, vehicles used some RUPPS occasionally.</p> <p>Section 9.10 – feel it is inconsistent with what is mentioned in 9.5, do canoeists fit in 9.10.</p> <p>From pages 104 there are a number of page numbers in the middle of the page, will this be sorted out in the final version.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p>

	<p>Section 11.5.4 – it was felt that this should include input by user groups as well as Rights of Way officers.</p> <p>Section 11.6.2 Urbanising the Countryside Paragraph – instead of over-provision of signposts can reduce enjoyment, could it say better/more discreet signage is generally a good idea.</p> <p>Page 110 – inclusively should read inclusivity.</p> <p>Page 117 – think it is important that somewhere in the document there should be reference to staffing levels being maintained (this was mentioned specifically in relation to the fact that there is still a vacancy for a definitive map officer in Gateshead)</p> <p>Page 126 – there isn't actually an annual report of the LTP, there is a bi-annual delivery report. Can this be checked.</p> <p>Page 123, Section 12, point 7, could this read, "continue to develop the... to ensure that it is accurate and regularly updated.</p> <p>Page 58 – Permissive access at Hedley West needs to be included, not sure if House needs to be there. Needs to be checked with DEFRA/ Natural England. There is also a DEFRA scheme in Newcastle on Hack Hall Farm land which should be included.</p> <p>Page 52 – misleading to say all roads hard surfaced as only service roads at Chopwell are hard surfaced. Second paragraph, need to delete comma after such as.</p> <p>Appendices – A contents page and page numbers would be useful.</p> <p>Appendix K GC2 says stakeholders and partners, the Chopwell Horseriders (CWHRA) raised £3,000 towards the scheme, it was thought that they should be included.</p> <p>GC5 – should also say upgraded to bridleway on the permissive part of the route.</p>	<p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>Noted. This section will be removed in the final plan.</p> <p>Noted. This issue is highlighted in Section 6.10 – Particular Risks.</p> <p>Noted. An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. Comment confirmed with DEFRA. No amendments in relation to Hedley West House. An amendment to the plan will be made in relation to Hack Hall Farm.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>GC6 – Station Road – Newburn – says upgrade. This is a statutory right of way. Instead of Station Road it would be River Lane to Newburn Bridge.</p> <p>NCC6 – A189 – opposite existing permissive routes, should not be down as a permissive route. It was agreed about 10/15 years ago.</p> <p>NTC/15 – Cramlington to Dudley Lane – think this is important to include overpass.</p>	<p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>An amendment to the plan will be made.</p> <p>Noted. Overpass falls into Northumberland.</p>
<p>W.B Carr (Small Holder)</p>	<p>Living in the countryside an ever increasing litter and fly tipping problem is leading to an adverse attitude for landowners towards those who pass through it. We don't understand why so many people discard wrappers, tins, bottles and partially eaten food. It could be that the opening of "through" routes or better access from roads to a right of way will not obstinate refusal to help or cooperate. 5 days out of 7, on average, I have to dispose of someone's mess. Now and again one of the collies finds a discarded pie or sandwich, eats it and half an hour later is sick. Paws slashed on broken glass bottles. No help at all from councils or government to remove fly tipping on private land. Good luck with you efforts to widen knowledge and interest.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan partners in partnership with the relevant Environmental Teams will tackle problem areas and provide education and information via a range of media opportunities in accordance with Policy NA9, NA10 and Statement of Action 8/6.</p>

In addition to the organisations/businesses/landowners listed above, the following submitted formal responses in their priority of activities to be considered for the Statement of Actions and/or in connection with the Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

All responses have been considered in the final version of this RoWIP.

Age Concern (Walk Leader)	Natural England
Annfield Plain and District Naturalists Club	Neil Hamilton – Newcastle City Council Councillor
Bethany City Church	North East Environmental Education Forum
C.H.A.R.C Phoenix Walking Club	Northern Kites (Individual Volunteers)
Camping and Caravanning Club (Individual Members)	Northumberland National Park and Countryside Joint Local Access Forum
Chester-le-Street Ramblers	R.W Shield (Landowner)
City Riders (Individual Members)	Ramblers Association (Individual Members)
Cycling Time Trials and Riding Club	RSPB (Individual Members)
Cyclists Touring Club (Individual Members)	South Tyneside Council
D.W. Malcolm – Newcastle City Council Councillor	South Tyneside U3A
Derwentside Byways and Bridleways Association	Sustrans (Individual Rangers)
Durham Amateur Rowing Club	Techshare
Environment Agency	The Woodland Trust
Friends of Tynemouth Station	Trail Riders Fellowship
Gateshead Health NHS Foundation Trust	Tyne Velo Cycling Club
Great North Forest	Tyneside Ramblers (Individual Members)
H.M.R.C.	Tyneside Recreation Club for the Blind
Hebburn Tennis Club	Tyneside Vagabonds Cycling Club
J. Cockerill (Land Manager)	University of the Third Age
J.S. Moor (Landowner)	West Rainton Green Group
Lomax Training Services	Wonder Walks Newcastle (walker)
National Trust (Members)	

## Results of Public priorities to Activities within the proposed Statement of Actions

### 1. Making the Countryside More Accessible

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
1/7	Encourage landowners to follow BSI requirements for bridges, stiles, gates and steps.	H	1
1/4	Identify Paths, which are significant desire lines with all abilities and undertake appropriate surface improvements. Publicise these routes.	H	2
1/3	Update existing, and create, new published accessibility information. Engage with disability user groups, and promote events.	M	3
1/11	Ensure that Rights of Way staff training on disability awareness and provision is current.	M	4
1/13	Accessible walks, within a quiet environment to enable the appreciation of aural cues, to be identified and promoted.	M	5
1/2	Explore opportunities for opening up the countryside for the mobility impaired. Compile existing information, survey and publish information on interactive map.	M	6
1/9	Suggest suitable routes. Partnership or working/funding needed for regular series of walks for visually impaired.	M	7
1/5	Consult as to the best available signage. Design, secure stock and install.	M	8
1/12	Seats extend walks for those of limited mobility or poor health. Sponsorship may provide seating beyond the scope of Rights of Way provision. Maintenance then becomes an issue.	M	8
1/1	Replace existing stiles with gaps or install large kissing gates. Concentrate on well used paths. Publicise improved access.	L	9
1/1	Produce tactile maps and interpretation panels for routes suitable for visually impaired.	M	10
1/8	Website should aim to meet, or exceed disability access criteria.	M	11
1/6	Publish Large print versions for all publicity material.	L	12

## 2. A Safer Activity

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
2/10	Make sure the Rights of Way in new development are open and non-threatening to avoid the creation of 'crime-alleys'.	H	1
2/4	Connect 'dead-end' Rights of Way with safe routes along busy roads through verge and footway improvement.	H	2
2/6	Input to future major road improvements to avoid the creation of network severance and dangerous crossings.	H	3
2/2	Make Road crossings safer with bridges, refuges, signs and visibility splays.	H	4
2/1	A safety audit of existing Rights of Ways/road crossings to prioritise improvements.	H	5
2/3	Audit of safe routes along busy roads extending and existing audit of verges and footways. Publicise provision through interactive website map.	H	6
2/7	New major bridges to make safe Rights of Way crossings with roads developed previously.	M	7
2/9	Erect more signs on country roads to warn of footpath or bridleway crossings.	M	8
2/8	Diversions or bridges to replace railway crossings that are becoming less safe as rail speeds increase.	M	9
2/5	More regular inspection of softwood bridges on Rights of Way to reduce the risk of injury through deterioration.	M	10

## 3. 47,000 New Homes

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
3/4	Ensure the Rights of Way are protected during development and that new facilities are provided to a good standard.	H	1
3/1	Liaise with planners and developers to minimise damage to existing network from new developments.	H	2
3/2	Secure funding and liaise with planners and developers to provide new countryside access linking into existing network.	H	3
3/3	Liaise with planners and developers to provide new open space for new populations.	H	46

#### 4. Knowing what's out there

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
4/3	Better waymarking integrating with urban signage to make paths more accessible to new users.	H	1
4/6	Improve and promote the use of public transport rather than private cars for countryside access.	H	2
4/2	Provide better access to information through leaflets, maps, and websites.	M	3
4/11	Provide signs making it clear where walkers and riders may expect to encounter motorised users so as to reduce conflict between the two groups.	H	4
4/1	Consolidate access information so that GIS and interactive web maps include permissive paths, access land, archaeological sites etc.	M	5
4/9	Assist in use of the countryside as an educational resource by the provision of curriculum packs for schools.	M	6
4/7	Promote the benefits of countryside access and sustainable transport with guided walks and extra publicity.	M	7
4/8	Work with community groups to promote the benefits of countryside access.	H	8
4/10	Survey current and potential use of Public Rights of Way, cycleways and footways for schools.	M	9
4/5	Roll out the programme of health walks to encourage people with low confidence to take health exercise using the Public Rights of Way network.	M	10
4/4	Fund the use of new technology to return to signs with distance information.	M	11

## 5. Filling in the Gaps

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
5/1	Identify and prioritise missing links in the network and the action required to close them. Concentrate on well-used paths. Publicise improved access.	H	1
5/8	Prioritise new and upgraded waterside routes with the least possible effect on conservation and river management.	M	2
5/12	Develop and promote routes based on existing bridleways and which are suitable for off-road leisure cycling.	H	3
5/3	Increase priority of circular walks with interpretation, where possible using parts of the existing network appropriate surface improvements. Publicise these routes.	M	4
5/2	Increase priority of bridleways as their users are currently at highest risk on roads and the bridleway network is disjointed.	H	5
5/4	Survey paths for their potential as school/commuter routes and identify improvements required.	M	6
5/7	A management strategy to map, establish requirements for, and make improvements to access to common land.	M	7
5/11	Implement minimum restrictions on byway use to protect the surface and the interests of wider user community.	M	8
5/5	Deliver a programme of improvements based on 5/4 (above).	M	9
5/16	Identify key river crossings, such as closed ferries, which impede access. Aim to provide bridges over time.	M	10
5/15	Provide dual riverbank footpaths and bridleways to separate conflict between different users.	M	11
5/13	Suggest suitable routes. Partnership or working/ funding needed for regular series of walks for visually impaired.	M	12
5/10	Encourage those applying for new livery yards to site them with regard to an appropriate bridleway network.	L	13
5/6	Prioritise byway improvements as these have not always been well recorded and carriage drivers not otherwise catered for.	L	14
5/9	Complete local Sustrans network and develop new cycle routes linking communities and countryside attractions.	L	15
5/14	Develop and promote routes based on existing and upgraded provision (Disused railways?) suitable for carriage driving.	L	16

## 6. Better Land Management

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
6/2	Work with landowners to improve waymarking where straying and inappropriate use is causing problems.	H	1
6/3	Education and publicity on dog control, composting bins for excrement.	H	2
6/6	Encourage landowners to dedicate more land as Open Access.	H	3
6/7	Promote the new countryside code by all media.	H	4
6/8	Increase resources addressing those aspects of policing rural crime that is access related.	M	5
6/5	Better permission procedures to ensure that routine works can be undertaken promptly and economically.	M	6
6/4	More effective liaison to reduce real and perceived conflict between conservation management and countryside access.	M	7
6/11	Funding for linear projects combining biodiversity, history and public access.	M	8
6/10	Sharing the maintenance costs of paths diverted from cross-field to field edge.	M	9
6/1	Extend proportion of network that is mown by landowners on their own land.	M	10
6/9	Funding for a more pragmatic approach to compensation to network improvements.	M	11

## 7. Develop Definitive Maps and Other Records

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
7/1	Consolidate changes from existing definitive maps onto a single reissued map and available on internal and web based computer systems.	H	2
7/2	Catalogue problems with existing definitive routes and determine preferred action and implementation.	M	4
7/3	Research and define path widths where not recorded on a definitive statement.	L	7
7/4	Map unclassified roads and other routes with public access, which integrate the network and make the information more public.	H	1
7/5	Complete research on historic routes; prioritise easy to use routes and record on the definitive map.	M	3
7/6	Project to develop policy for speedier processing of major path order packages.	M	5
7/7	Recover more realistic path order costs.	M	6

## 8. A Better Countryside Environment

Ref	Action	Public Priority	Level of Importance
8/6	Deal with fly tip backlog. Increase surveillance and prosecutions. Fast track clearance to discourage copycat actions.	H	1
8/9	Use of more volunteer groups to improve paths, which would otherwise be outside existing maintenance resources.	H	2
8/10	Extend provision of dog bins to popular rural Rights of Way using composting types to minimise servicing.	H	3
8/3	Increase monitoring and survey work by employing more Rights of Way Officers. Be more proactive.	H	4
8/8	Invest in scrub removal, drainage and longer term soft surfaces for paths to increase accessibility, enhance biodiversity and encourage use.	M	5
8/12	More frequent and selective cutting back of byway vegetation using contractors and volunteers.	M	6
8/1	Reduce threshold for action on cropping policy, target repeat offenders and encourage pressure through the community.	H	7
8/13	Improve voluntary restraint procedure by engaging with user groups and promoting self-restriction when surface conditions would lead to surface damage.	M	8
8/5	Engage local contractors on call off basis for small local problems with vegetation, surfaces and path furniture.	M	9
8/11	Identify utility poles that constitute a hazard or obstruction to Rights of Way users and request utilities to reposition them.	M	10
8/7	Research information that users would like on interpretation boards. Include access, accessibility, biodiversity and heritage themes. Produce and install on site.	M	11
8/4	Increase number of cuts to counter the effects of climate change. Increase length of cut to include more paths. Publicise these routes.	M	12
8/2	Extend the BVPI 178 survey to collect additional data on structures and path furniture. Possibly integrate GIS data technology to automate data collection.	M	13