

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee **Rugby Area Committee**

Date of Committee **11th January 2006**

Report Title **Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Warwickshire**

Summary

Cabinet on 30th June 2005 authorised the then Director of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy to prepare and publish a Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This report is to advise Members on the responses already received to the ongoing consultation exercise and how it is proposed to amend the Plan.

For further information please contact

Martin Fry
 Countryside Recreation
 Tel. 01926 413431
 martinfry@warwickshire.gov.uk

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework?

Yes/No

Background Papers

Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Warwickshire – already circulated to all Members.

Proposed list of amendments to Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Warwickshire.

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- *Details to be specified*

- Other Committees Cabinet – 30th June 2005
- Local Member(s)
- (With brief comments, if appropriate)
- Other Elected Members
- Cabinet Member
- (Reports to The Cabinet, to be cleared with appropriate Cabinet Member)

- Chief Executive
- Legal I Marriott – comments incorporated
- Finance
- Other Chief Officers
- District Councils Rugby Borough Council commented twice as part of consultation process
- Health Authority
- Police
- Other Bodies/Individuals Local Access Forum, Parish Councils, adjacent highway authorities and members of the public

FINAL DECISION **YES/NO** *(If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)*

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :

Details to be specified

- Further consideration by this Committee
- To Council
- To Cabinet 23rd February 2006 – For approval of final version of Plan
- To an O & S Committee
- To an Area Committee Stratford on Avon 18th January 2006
Warwick 24th January 2006
Nuneaton and Bedworth 25th January 2006
North Warwickshire 1st February 2006
- Further Consultation

Rugby Area Committee – 11th January 2006

Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Warwickshire

Report of the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy

Recommendation

That the Rugby Area Committee considers the Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan; the results of the consultation exercise for the Plan; and, the proposed changes to the Plan, and provides comments to Cabinet for formal adoption of the Plan.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW) has placed a new duty on the Council to prepare a 'Rights of Way Improvement Plan' (ROWIP).
- 1.2 The rights of way network provides the most significant means by which the public access the County's countryside. However, there are also other significant types of access which complement the network such as canal towpaths, greenways, nature reserves and other public land. In order to reflect this, the ROWIP is therefore to be titled "Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Warwickshire" (CAROWIP).

2. Statutory Framework

- 2.1 The CROW Act has specified that a ROWIP must provide an assessment of the needs of the public, the opportunities for open air recreation and the accessibility of local rights of way for disabled people. The ROWIP must be published by 2007 and reviewed at least every 10 years. Further guidance on the preparation of ROWIPs has been produced by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).
- 2.2 The Department for Transport issued guidance for the production of the Local Transport Plans (LTP), which stated the intention that authorities will formally integrate ROWIPs with the LTPs to be prepared in five years time. In addition the guidance has indicated that Government would welcome any attempts to achieve an informal integration by preparing ROWIPs in parallel and conjunction with LTPs.

- 2.3 The CAROWIP has been prepared to the same timescale as the LTP, and will integrate as far as possible, whilst recognising that many of the priorities of a CAROWIP are outside the scope of the LTP and vice versa.

3. Consultation

- 3.1 Last summer the Council undertook an extensive research exercise which included parish councils, the Joint Local Access Forum for Warwickshire, Solihull and Coventry (LAF), countryside user groups and members of the public. This exercise resulted in a superb response, with over 2,500 completed questionnaires, including a response rate of 77% from the town and parish councils within the Rugby Borough. The results have guided the content of the CAROWIP.
- 3.2 In addition, the Countryside Agency has worked with a number of pilot authorities throughout England to produce exemplar ROWIPs. The Council has used this best practice as it has emerged and incorporated it into the CAROWIP. A great deal of other transferable secondary research has also been used.
- 3.3 Prior to the CAROWIP, a consultation draft CAROWIP was circulated to LAF members, key stakeholders, neighbouring highway authorities, district and borough councils within the County, and, the Town and Parish Councils which returned the questionnaires mentioned in paragraph 3.1 above. The consultation draft CAROWIP has been amended to reflect the comments received during this consultation.
- 3.4 The CROW Act requires that, once the draft CAROWIP has been prepared, it be published for a period of statutory public consultation and the guidance indicates this should be a minimum 12 week period. The CAROWIP was on deposit at the main County, Borough and District Council offices, main libraries and the County's country parks from 29th September to 22nd December 2005.
- 3.5 The CAROWIP was also distributed to County Council Members, Parish Councils, LAF members, key stakeholder organisations and other County Council officers. It was also published on the Council's website (www.warwickshire.gov.uk/carowip) and distributed to members of the public on request.
- 3.6 The CAROWIP has received a positive response from the LAF. The CAROWIP is the first ROWIP to be published in the West Midlands and one of the first countywide ROWIPs to be published in England. The publication of the consultation draft CAROWIP in late Summer has enabled the Council to apply for and receive an implementation grant from the Countryside Agency to complete three of the projects identified within the CAROWIP Action Plans as 'quick wins'.
- 3.7 The initial responses to the consultation are detailed in **Appendix A**. Any further comments received on the CAROWIP will be reported orally to the meeting. The majority of respondents who expressed an overall opinion of the CAROWIP generally expressed a positive opinion.

- 3.8 A proposed list of amendments to the CAROWIP will be circulated to Members in advance of the meeting.
- 3.9 The final proposed version of the CAROWIP will then be taken to Cabinet, along with the LTP, in February 2006.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Members are invited to provide comments on the Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan, the results of the consultation and the proposed change to the Plan arising from the consultation.

JOHN DEEGAN
Strategic Director of Environment and Economy
Shire Hall
Warwick

19th December 2005

Rugby Area Committee – 11th January 2006
Draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan for Warwickshire

APPENDIX A OF AGENDA NO

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R1	Ewan Calcot	Forestry Commission		Would like some links with "regional forestry framework".	
R2	Gillian Rutledge	WCC Environmental Design	Interesting, useful reading, clear and easy reference.	1. Enlarge paragraph headings within Themes for clarity. 2. Consider single combined bibliography in appendix.	
R3	Jennifer Lord	Bishops Tachbrook Parish Council		1. Suggestions for seven specific schemes to support utility walking. 2. Believes 'path networks and connections' should be given more priority. 3. Include parish councils as partners in circular walks in Actions N2, N3 and N8. 4. Further suggestions relating to links with Warwick Gates and Warwick Technology Park.	Warwick – specific route links with Bishops Tachbrook especially for cyclists.
R4	Richard Millward	Banbury	Good readability.	1. Requests inclusion for waterborne access within countryside.	
R5	Keith Kondakor	Nuneaton	Good readability.	1. Online mapping should happen sooner than 5+ years. 2. Agrees with health improvements via walking and cycling. 3. Agrees that verges should be used to link network.	
R6	Alan Scaife	Hampton Lucy PC		1. Trail between Warwick and Stratford could include a bridge over the Avon at the location of the former Alveston Ferry and suggests working with Sustrans. 2. Two specific suggestions for new bankside access to create circular walks. 3. Specific suggestion for verge improvements.	Stratford – bridge over Avon & bankside access.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R7	Mrs W Taylor	Nuneaton	Not very readable.	1. Only four specific actions to help the horse rider. 2. Horse riders don't want to be on the roads. 3. Suggests upgrading footpaths to bridleways. 4. Plan is very good for walkers.	
R8	Mr A G Wilkins	Ilmington Parish Council	Very commendable and thorough.	1. Suggests a specific position for an information board. 2. Ilmington would benefit from more walkers to sustain pubs and shop. 3. Notes that there are footpaths missing from the Definitive Map and a specific problem with an unclassified county road.	Stratford – timing of Definitive Map review within Stratford district.
R9	Anthony White	Stratford District	Well presented and pretty thorough.	1. Target dates are missing for specific improvements. 2. It would also be a good idea to number stiles and gates to aid identification. 3. Comments that relying on ramblers to survey paths is not sufficient.	
R10	Tony Green	Cyclists Touring Club and Ramblers Association, Staffordshire	Superb piece of clinical, unbiased appraisal of the facts.	1. Hopes funding will be forthcoming to ensure success.	
R11	Roger Clay	Stratford & Warwick Waterways Trust		1. Welcomes initiatives described within plan. 2. Suggests route through Warwick Castle Park follows north bank. 3. Suggests 'New paths for old' can be used to build connectivity to build Avon Valley Way (AVW). 3. Agrees that desire for waterside access justifies proposed AVW. 4. AVW between Stratford and Warwick has sustainable tourism potential. 5. Believes AVW should become a promoted route.	Warwick & Stratford - support for Avon Valley Way

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R12	Paul Sayer	CV35	Very good readability.	1. Good balance of effort/resource between maintaining and improving current assets and acquiring new routes. 2. Agrees that disjointed nature of bridleways is an issue for cyclists. 3. Would like to see more of the old railway routes brought into use as cycle routes.	
R13	Derek Wade	Nuneaton Rambling Club	Very good readability	1. Disagrees with off-roading on green lanes/rights of way because damage to surface makes walking impossible. 2. Agrees with 'New Paths for Old' – re-route paths away from motorways and remove need for excessive road walking.	
R14	Arthur Knapp	Ilmington	Generally approves of content.	1. Removing stiles may enable illegal use by mountain bikes. 2. Specific concerns about how trees are removed. 3. Asks why is there no information about right to roam areas.	
R15	Sid Hindmarsh	Wolvey Parish Council		1. Asks what steps can be taken to create paths in a specific area around the village.	Rugby – would like to fill in gaps around Wolvey.
R16	J F Rickett	Barton on the Heath Parish Council	Read with interest.	1. Little to comment on which has not already been covered in the tome. 2. Concerns about litter and lack of dog-gates beside stiles. 3. Agrees that countryside awareness is important to urban dwellers. 4. Use of green tracks by motor cycles disturbs residents and makes tracks muddy.	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R17	Trevor Antill	Monarch's Way Association	Welcomes opportunity to comment.	1. Conflict in countryside is more perception than reality. 2. Supports and offers assistance with map reading training. 3. Suggests prioritisation of Action Plan points. 4. Against use of finger posts and approves of current signing. 5. 2026 deadline is unachievable for completing Definitive Map review and applications should be safeguarded past this date. 6. Notes that Monarchs Way meets criteria for inclusion in The List.	
R18	John Roberts	Centenary Way, Walkways & Quercus		1. Provides a list of practical and specific suggestions which may help achieve some aims.	
R19	Dorothy Mitchell	Studley Parish Council		1. Agree with stile replacement by gates, educating dog owners, working in partnership with Sustrans and improving surfacing on access to school routes. 2. Specific comments over resourcing the action plans.	Stratford – wants to see a greenway in the north or east.
R20	S Barrows	CV22	Good readability.	1. As a horse rider feels it is time equestrian community had access to safe routes.	
R21	Judy Vero	Atherstone	Pleased to see the CAROWIP.	1. Comments about rights of way work in general, and the original consultation in North Warwickshire. 2. Supports the use of toll-rides. 3. Suggests specific routes for new bridleways. 4. Bridleway provision in NW is poor and roads are too fast/busy to use. 5. Severance of routes by the A5 is a problem. 6. Has concerns over low flying military aircraft and use of rights of way by motorcycles and off-roaders.	North Warwickshire – believes there are too few bridleways in NW and that the council does not do enough to secure them.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R22	Lisa Arben	WCC Legal		1. Specific comments on minor wording changes to five of the policies from WCC solicitor.	
R23	Carol Laye	Kenilworth	Very good readability.	1. Doesn't disagree with anything. 2. Great to see the needs of horse owners taken into account.	
R24	Rosie Smith	WCC Environmental Design (Health)		1. Health section underplays the potential of country parks and rights of way. 2. Proposes other specific changes to the wording of the plan and amendments to improve consistency. 3. Plan will be of interest to and welcomed by those working in the health improvement sector.	
R25	David Close	District Councillor for Wellesbourne	Plan is to be commended.	1. Makes suggestions for improved methods of waymarking. 2. Supports proposal to replace stile with gates.	
R26	Brian Peers	Fenny Compton	Welcomes the Plan.	1. Not all paths are suitable to be upgraded. 2. Has reservation about gap-gate-stile. 3. Believes more landowner involvement and understanding is needed before the plan is progressed. 4. Suggests that WCC should finance more changes to the Definitive Map.	
R27	Jayne Brooks	Austrey Parish Council	Welcomes the CAROWIP.	1. General approval of the proposals. 2. Prefer to see more money spent in the short term on improvements to personal safety (by delaying some of the publicity elements). 3. Interested in potential of Quiet Lanes but wants it sooner.	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R28	Clive Rickman	Kineton		1. Comments about specific circular walks in Kineton area. 2. Makes suggestion relating to surfacing of multi-user routes.	Stratford – would like to see a link into the bridleway at Kineton to allow circular walk as BAD and LandRover are in the way of circular walks.
R29	E A Blunt	Shipston on Stour	Very good readability.	1. Believes plan is negative to dog walkers and will alienate them. 2. Believes dog walkers should have new opportunities too. 3. Supports increased access & good communications. 4. More use of voluntary groups to implement the plan.	
R30	R Watson	Coventry		1. Pleased to see support for Coventry Way. 2. Supports the use of metal kissing gates and hand-posts on stiles. 3. Would like to see posts to lean bikes against where gates have to be opened. 4. Wants better maintenance of routes used by cyclists. 5. Suggests specific practical improvements to allow use by those with disabilities, but also says that it is impractical to make everywhere fully accessible. 6. Motorcycles and 4x4 vehicles should be excluded from unclassified roads. 7. Walkers and cyclists should not have to go along increasingly busy roads. 8. Recover more old railways for recreational use. 9. Suggests walks should start from public transport routes.	
R31 a	Stephen Roots	WCC Community Transport		1. More work needs to be done on relationship between public & community transport, and access to the countryside.	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R31 b	Stephen Roots	as an individual		1. Would like to see improved signage. 2. Suggests heavily used routes are given priority.	
R32	David Foster & Jack Lawton	Rugby Disability Forum		1. Suggested specific changes to wording within Accessibility Strategy. 2. Suggests use of buses with dropped floors and flexibus service for access to countryside. 3. Would like to see a definition of 'key routes' and offer assistance in identifying them. 4. Made specific suggestion for suitable surfacing for accessibility. 5. Should be more than two sensory trails over the ten years of the plan. 6. 'Countryside for all' should be promoted more.	
R33	(meeting 13 October 2005)	Local Access Forum		1. Overall approval of and support for document. 2. Specific concerns about the wording of Policy CA16.	
R34	Ken Taylor	Local Access Forum		1. Made specific suggestions for wording in Policy CA16.	
R35	Steven Wallsgrove	Ramblers Association & Local Access Forum		1. Made specific suggestions for wording in Policy CA16.	
R36	Michael Orlik	Solicitor & Local Access Forum		1. Wants the CAROWIP to include the use of traffic orders to exclude traffic from narrow country lanes which connect public paths, and in cases where a route is especially suitable for persons on horse or on foot.	
R37	Spencer Payne	WCC Research Unit		1. Supports Policy CA 16 and makes specific suggestions for wording. <i>NB revised version of CA16 was circulated.</i>	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R38	Lisa Arben	WCC Legal		1. Made specific suggestions for wording of and changes to Policy CA16. <i>NB revised version of CA16 was circulated.</i>	
R39	Julie Sullivan	WCC Chief Execs		1. Supports the balanced approach of Policy CA16. NB revised version of CA16 was circulated.	
R40	David Stuart	Burton Dassett Parish Path volunteers		1. Would like to see inspections of ploughed paths within 7 days rather than 15	
R41	Len Gale	Southam	Good readability.	1. Would like to see more wheelchair friendly paths.	
R42	Currigwen Dittrich		Positive and enlightened.	1. Would like WCC to “achieve”, “implement” and “establish” rather than “seek”, “develop” and “review” 2. Asks how bicycles will be kept off footpaths if stiles are replaced by gates 3. Agrees with public access through Warwick Castle Park 4. Questions whether spraying paths is a good idea 5. Requests path numbers on signposts	
R43	Roger Hancock	Stratford upon Avon Canal Society	Good readability.	1. Agrees with proposal to extend Avon Valley Way to Warwick and would also like it linked into the Grand Union Canal which would enable it to extend to Rugby.	Stratford & Warwick – supports Avon Valley Way extension.
R44	Peter Chater	Leamington Spa		Proposes a specific improvement at Offchurch.	
R45	Gill King	Charlecote Parish meeting	Positive overall, clear and simple layout.	1. Concerned that country pathways could be urbanised in the name of accessibility. 2. Essentially opposed the a riverside walk and cycleway between Stratford and Warwick. 3. Proposes a specific utility path improvement	Stratford & Warwick - opposes Avon Valley Way extension.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R46	Janet Owen			1. Proposed specific improvement to canal towpaths.	
R47	Alan Cameron	Leamington Rambling Club		1. Much of the resource would be used in bringing a small number of paths for disabled visitors, casual visitors, horse riders and cyclists at the expense of regular countryside visitors. 2. Hardly any groups or clubs of regular countryside users are referenced. 3. Questions the availability of public transport on Sundays when most people use the countryside.	
R48	Justin Millward	Woodland Trust		Refers to their position statement on Public Access to Woodland, and highlights the need for more access to woodland.	
R49	Tim Harvey-Smith	Wolston Parish Council	Impressed with layout and formatting	Expresses a positive opinion and makes no requests for changes.	
R50	Sarah Faulkner	National Farmers Union		1. Requests promotion of Countryside Code, and information about Right to Roam and dogs/dog fouling. 2. Essential that farmers are consulted if new links are to be created. 3. Welcome intention to resolve ploughing and cropping via liaison. 4. Public Path Orders requested by landowners should receive timely attention and not be forgotten. 5. Questions why widths for routes created by orders are wider than those in the Rights of Way Act 1990. 6. Section 31 Highways Act 1980 should be more widely publicised. 7. Discovering Lost Ways project should be more widely publicised as opening up of new	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
				routes will affect farmers. 8. WCC should audit leaflets for new trails to ensure accuracy. 9. Farmers should be consulted on clear standard for electric fencing crossing or adjacent to public paths. 10. Gaps in boundaries are not always appropriate. 11. NFU would like to continue to be consulted.	
R51	Keith Sinfield	Church Lawford Parish Council	Well written and arranged and makes interesting reading.		
R52	Merche Bovill	Brailes Footpath Group		1. Livelihood of farmers is of primary concern. 2. Does not agree with, and will not participate in, replacement of stiles with gates	
R53	S J Curtis	Claverdon	Comprehensive and informative.	1. Supports signs with destinations on. 2. Dogs are essential for family walking and sheep wire on stiles means dogs must be lifted over. 3. Would like to see more cafes similar to the one at Hatton Locks 4. There is a shortage of bridleways and off road riding. 5. Existing bridleways are poorly maintained and gates difficult to open. 6. Family often rides outside the county where the bridleways are better. 7. Lanes are too busy and traffic too fast (from both walkers and horse riders perspective) 8. Supports Toll Rids and would welcome Quiet Lanes.	
R54	Article in Leamington Courier	Council for the Protection of Rural England		1. Would like to see Quiet Lanes sooner. 2. Believes more funding should be encouraged.	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R55	Cllr Hobbs	WCC Cllr		1. Where is reference to diverting footpaths away from dwellings and farm yards?	
R56	Bobbie Russell	Barford Parish Plan Committee		1. Links a number of points in the Action Plans to Actions within the Barford Parish Plan, including support for Avon Valley Way between Stratford and Warwick; support for Quiet Lanes; support for improved maintenance; support for access through Warwick Castle Park; provision of new public footpaths; and support for more cycle provision	Warwick and Stratford – supports Avon Valley Way extension and access through Warwick Castle Park.
R57	Janet Batterbee	Bedworth	Very good readability.	No specific comments on plan, but general concerns about dumping in the countryside.	
R58	W E Major	Rugby ARPO50	Welcomes the far-seeing plan.	1. Supports replacement of stiles with kissing gates but believes stiles could be improved in the interim. 2. Would like to have access to information about path closures. 3. Would like to see more access from footpaths onto towpaths. 4. Signing and recording on maps of permissive paths, e.g. old railway lines, would be helpful. 5. Would like to see car parking at future greenways. 6. Would like to see more visible markers on paths where hedges have been lost. 7. Would like to be kept informed of developments to promoted routes.	
R59	Amanda Drakeley	Nuneaton and Bedworth Leisure Trust	Very good readability.	1. Is involved in Walking the Way to Health and supports the Health and Wellbeing Section. 2. Would like to see waymarked walking the way to health routes. 3. Questions how funds may be allocated. 4. Offers Walking the Way to health training 5. Ready to develop promotional leaflets and routes for Walking the	Nuneaton and Bedworth – supports promoting Walking the Way to Health schemes.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
				Way to Health in Nuneaton and Bedworth and keen to work with WCC.	
R60	Colin Ray	Wilmcote	Good readability.	Greater priority should be given to diverting paths out of farmyards and away from dwellings. This should be included in New Paths for Old and believes it should be tackled pro-actively.	
R61	Steve Gardner	Devon County Council	Nicely laid out, clear to read.	1. Likes the Policies. 2. Believes the public path order system may be seen as giving a raw deal to landowners. 3. No reference to Natural England and Rural Communities Bill and implications for vehicles in the countryside. 4. Comments about specific statistics and copyright. 5. Believes a prioritisation system will be needed for suggested improvements. 6. Questions the use of the word 'negotiate' on page 79 - does it mean 'agree deal with landowner' or 'get past'.	
R62	Miss J Lester	Mancetter Parish Council		1. Agrees with the replacement of stiles with gates. 2. Believes the improvement of key routes is essential. 3. Should have a comprehensive review of signs and waymarking, not just an audit. This was in the discussion draft and was very welcome. WCC should use yellow topped posts. 4. Believes education of landowners should be included in the Education Action Plan. 5. Definitive Map should be available online. 6. Health wellbeing and social benefits can only be encouraged if the network is in good repair. 7. Agrees that connecting routes are needed. 8. Believes ploughing and cropping enforcement and	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
				<p>clearance of headland paths should be included, and should be dealt with pro-actively.</p> <p>9. Believes that two ranger teams are needed with one based permanently in the north of the County. 10. Stronger enforcement is needed and enforcement should be taken after a set number of warnings. The annual ploughing and cropping campaign needs reviewing.</p> <p>11. Welcomes prioritisation for public path orders. 12. Promotion and maintenance of the Centenary Way should be a priority.</p> <p>13. Network must be in a good condition for tourists otherwise they may not return.</p> <p>14. Welcome proposals for monitoring and progress. 15. Believes Definitive Map Review should be progressed in a timelier manner.</p> <p>16. In not in agreement with policy CA2 landowner declarations. 17. Public Path Orders need to be processed more quickly.</p> <p>18. Cyclists and horse riders should be kept separate from walkers. 19. The enforcement policy needs strengthening. 20. Believes inspections of reported routes should be sooner than 10 days from a report.</p> <p>21. Concerned about a three month inspection time for other reports and believes these could be carried out sooner by partner groups.</p> <p>22. Inspection of paths once every ten years is not adequate. 23. Wishes to see local distinctiveness within the plan in relation to signing and waymarking. 24. Welcomes the gap-gate-stile principle, and would like to see</p>	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
				<p>more anti-cycle barriers.</p> <p>25. Concerned about the use of insulated handles on electric fences. 26. Welcomes 'behind the hedge' schemes and moving level crossings to bridges or underpasses.</p> <p>27. Welcomes the continued commitment to P3.</p> <p>28. Welcomes the continues support for promoted routes. 29. Believes the policy should allow for more permissive routes.</p>	
R63	M L Menzler	Open Spaces Society	Pays tribute to the immense amount of work put into the Plan.	1. Questions whether R1 in the Action Plan is sufficient to allow the review of the Definitive Map to be completed. 2. Questions whether liaising with developers should be part of the work of the Definitive Map Team.	
R64	Mark Connelly	Cotswold Conservation Board		1. Wishes to see more reference to local distinctiveness, particularly within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. 2. Would prefer the plan not to use the phrase 'right to roam'.	Stratford – Cotswold Area of Outstanding Beauty
R65	Emily Wigley	Southam Town Council		Suggests Southam as a location for an information point in the south of the County.	
R66	Mr R Smith	Shuttington Parish Council		<p>1. Believes that most minor country roads are unsafe for non-motorised users and that this should be a prime consideration in the Plan.</p> <p>2. Agrees that health considerations are an important part of the CAROWIP. 3. Believes more energy should be spent in connecting bridleways or promoting suitable rides for both horse riders and cyclists. 4. More resources or a different approach are needed to meet the 2026 deadline for Modification Orders.</p> <p>5. Definitive Map cases should be prioritised</p>	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
				according to public benefit. 6. Definitive Map should be on the internet. 7. Paths should be marked more clearly on the ground and not require expert map reading. 8. There should be co-operation with other authorities to connect paths which pass out of the County.	
R67	Jan Robinson	Wilmcote		Should be specific reference to paths which cross private gardens.	
R68	Claire Purcell	British Waterways		1. Welcomes the recognition of towpaths as valuable permissive routes. 2. Looks forward to working with WCC on future projects relating to canal towpaths.	
R69	Mike Murray	Coventry City Council		1. Suggests that Quiet Lanes be mentioned as part of a toolkit of ideas for minor country roads. 2. Provide a list of relevant local websites in the appendix. 3. Consider the need to reflect local distinctiveness in design of rights of way and countryside furniture, including signposting.	
R70	Vic Taylor	Kenilworth	Those responsible are to be congratulated.	1. Suggests that existing support for the plan could translate into assistance with prioritising, and suggests a form layout to gather suggestions. 2. Suggests a code of practice for the countryside - who has priority in any situation. 3. Suggests that the height of waymarkers be increased, and suggests re-siting road signs which are on grass verges. 4. Suggests cutting of verges which can be used to connect bridleways. Concerned that user groups with single focus may not value other users. 5. Concerned that changes to signing could lead to confusion. 6. Concerned	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
				that there is the lack of support for some groups. 7. Concerned that there is a lack of support for farm diversification. 8. Comments on DEFRA funding to land managers for access.	
R71	Anton Irving	English Nature	Reads very well.	Believes more importance should be given to sustainability and biodiversity, and makes specific suggestions to improve the wording of the plan and policies.	
R72	Roger Stone	Local Access Forum member and Land Agent		1. Concerned that there is a lack of understanding and concern for farmers and farm workers on livestock farms. 2. Believes that there should be signposts by the roadside, where paths enter agricultural land, which say that dogs are required to be kept on leads.	
R73	Paul Harris	Oxfordshire County Council	Comprehensive and easy to read.	1. Would have preferred to see the plan follow more closely the topics set out in the statutory guidance. 2. Bring 'State of the Network' from the appendix into the body of the Plan. 3. Observes there are no policies relating to country parks, towpaths or greenways and suggests that some are formulated, or that rights of way policies are placed in a different document. 4. Believes detail related to consultation takes up too much of the plan.	
R74	Margaret Kane	Kenilworth Rambling Club	Read document with interest.	1. Supports specific actions in Plan. 2. Questions need for replacing missing bridges. 3. Supports signposts with destinations. 4. Suggests establishing volunteer groups in other parts of the County.	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance
R75	M Marlow	Kenilworth		1. Reports specific path problems. 2. Questions cost of proposed Two Castles Walk.	
R76	Gary Jeffery	Pathlow		1. Surprised that diverting footpaths away from dwellings and farm yards is not in the Plan.	
R77	Ian Fletcher	Inland Waterways Association		1. Welcomes and supports Plan. 2. Actively supports improving access to watersides including extending the Avon Valley Way.	Stratford & Warwick – supports Avon Valley Way extension.