

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Warwick Area Committee

Date of Committee 24th 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 Access Manager
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.
Rugby Area Committee – 11th January 2006.
Stratford on Avon Area Committee – 18th January 2006.

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 Warwick District Council - 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 Nuneaton and Bedworth 30th November 2005
North Warwickshire 1st February 2006
- Further Consultation

Warwick Area Committee –24th 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 Warwick 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 (LAF) for Warwickshire, Solihull and Coventry, 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 57% from the town and parish councils within the County. 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 placed on deposit at the main County, Borough and District Council Offices, main libraries and the County's country parks on 29th September until 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 has also been 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

29th December 2005

Table 1 – Changes proposed internally

Page	Item	Change
		Assorted minor wording changes and typographical corrections throughout the document.
54	add before the heading 'Conclusions'	Both national research and our own research has shown that there is much demand for access to water and woodland. We have therefore included a section on access to woodlands and waterside.
56	S2d	Add note to the affect that "£422,000 has been awarded to NWBC by Heritage Lottery Fund"
67	Working Practices	Will not be written to reflect the policies. Targets will be included in the CAROWIP to formalise more wide-ranging working practices e.g. dealing with obstructions, which will relate to more than one policy.
87, 100-159	Appendix VI	Appendix VI will not appear in the final plan and appendices will be renumbered/ rearranged.

Table 2 – Responses to consultation and changes proposed as a result, together with draft response

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R1	Ewan Calcot	Forestry Commission		Would like some links with "regional forestry framework".		Page 55 add key references "Growing our Future – the West Midlands Regional Forestry Framework (Forestry Commission 2004)" Page 57 change S3 to be "Waterside and woodland access". Add action points : S3d "To support other organisations in securing access to woodland." resources = existing & partnership, funding = £5000 per route created, timescale = yrs 1-2 & 3-4 & 5+ , partners : Forestry Commission, Woodland Trust, Warwickshire Wildlife Trust, Landowners	[we will be writing separately to explore opportunities for partnership working – to be drafted]
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.		pp 11-62: Check that the headings within the document are clear and large.	(none)
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.	p36 : add Parish Councils as key partner in N2a, b, c p. 38: add Parish Councils as key partner in N8b	Thank you for your suggestions for specific improvements in the Bishop's Tachbrook area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect. As you have suggested, we have included Parish Councils as key partners in several of the actions in the Path Networks and Connections action plan. We have reviewed the priority which we have given to making new connections, and believe that we have achieved the right balance between the existing network and new paths in the plan. We may, however, review this in the future.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R4	Richard Millward	(Banbury)	Good readability.	1. Requests inclusion for waterborne access within countryside.		no change	<p>The CAROWIP's primary purpose is to provide a framework for the management of the rights of way network within the current legal framework. We have endeavoured to include more waterside access, but to create rights over the waterways themselves would require a change in the law.</p> <p>We hope that the Warwickshire, Solihull and Coventry Local Access Forum, who advise this authority, will be looking at the issues of access to waterways in the future.</p>
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.		no change	Work is already underway in preparing the information which can go online. However, the Definitive Map and Statement are legal documents and great care must be taken that the information is correct on all 1700 miles of the rights of way network, as it can affect people's land and property. We hope to have at least some of the county's rights of way online within five years.
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.	no change	<p>Thank you for your suggestions for specific improvements in the Hampton Lucy and Charlecote areas. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>My colleague, Milan Tursner, is correct in quoting current County Council policy. The CAROWIP is in draft form and will not become policy until the final (amended) version is approved by County Council Cabinet. Our role within Countryside primarily deals with recreational routes whereas his role deals with cycling as a means of transport. In cases such as a future Avon Valley route we would work closely together, but I should point out that the proposed timescale is 5+ years and we will not be able to achieve this without additional funding and staff time.</p>
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.		<p>Add an action re N Warks. in N8f</p> <p>"Assess provision of horse-riding routes in North Warwickshire and develop and progress a programme of enhancements", resources = partnership, additional staff time : funding = £5,000 per link : timescale = yrs 3-4 & 5+, partners = User groups, Parish Councils, District Council, WCC (others), local horseriders, landowners.</p>	<p>We believe that we have considered the needs of horseriders when preparing the plan, although it is not immediately obvious. There is a limited amount of money available to fund schemes for walkers and horseriders, but there is often money available for cycling improvements. We have therefore used the term 'NMU', or non-motorised user, so as to include all three countryside users to maximise our chances of obtaining additional funding.</p> <p>We are aware that there is limited off-road provision for horseriders and looked to address as much as we can whilst keeping a balance between our different activities. We are not-anti-horse and will always investigate reports of paths which are out of repair or blocked. There are, however, often legal difficulties where a path is not recorded, and we do operate with a limited budget. A wholesale upgrading of footpaths to bridleways would not be possible without a change in the law, but we do hope to look at achieving some</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							<p>important new bridleway links through the implementation of the CAROWIP. We have added a new action in the CAROWIP, under point N8, which applies solely to addressing the bridleway provision in North Warwickshire.</p> <p>In action N2c on page 36 we intend to identify the key equestrian links and work to secure them. If there are particular routes that you believe are needed, please let us know (regardless of any history of Definitive Map claims).</p>
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, and questions when review will be undertaken in Stratford district..	Stratford – timing of Definitive Map review within Stratford district.	no change	<p>Thank you for your suggestions for specific improvements in the Ilmington area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>Our policy on the review of the Definitive Map is explained on page 68 of the Draft CAROWIP. We have operated this particular policy since 1989, and periodically reviewed it. We still believe that a geographic progression is the most effective way to progress the review. The review of the Definitive Map in Stratford district is unlikely to commence for around five years.</p> <p>I will ask my colleague, Paul Williams, to update you on the situation with the E road you mention.</p>
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.		no change	<p>We have not included target dates for specific improvements because we do not yet know how many stiles, gates, signposts etc there are on the network. We will, however, include targets for numbers of improvements in our annual Statement of Intent, detailing how we intend to implement the CAROWIP. When we do carry out our full network survey, we intend for it to be done by trained members of staff, to a consistent standard, rather than use volunteers. .</p>
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.		no change	<p>It was good to have such positive feedback.</p>
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	Warwick & Stratford - support for Avon Valley Way	no change	<p>We have noted your suggestions regarding the Avon Valley Way extension and support for some of the actions within the plan.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				has sustainable tourism potential. 5. Believes AVW should become a promoted route.			
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.		no change	We have included the development of two major former-railway routes in the CAROWIP – from Kenilworth to Berkswell and Leamington to Rugby. Whilst we would wish to see even more greenways, much of the former rail network is in private ownership and so achieving public access is more complicated. We have taken advantage of opportunities where they arise and hope to continue doing so. However, it is unlikely that we will be able to get large numbers of these routes opened up for the public.
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 busy roads and remove need for excessive road walking.		no change	We recognise that there is sometimes a conflict between motorised users of rights of way and pedestrians. Often, this is due to the surface not being able to handle the amount of use, and where our budget allows we will work to improve and renew the surface for all users. The government is currently looking at changes in the law to minimise the impact of motorised users on rights of way.
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.		no change	In response to your comment about bicycle use, bicycles are allowed by law to use bridleways and byways. We are not proposing to open up all footpaths to bicycles, but their use of footpaths is not a criminal offence; rather, it is a trespass against the landowner. If misuse was a problem in a particular locality, we would work with the landowner(s) to see how it could be tackled. We have not made much of the areas of "Open Access land" (also known as 'right to roam' areas) because there is very little of it in Warwickshire. What there is consists largely of pockets of Registered Common Land, together with some areas of woodland, and the total area in Warwickshire is very small.
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.	no change	With respect to the path network around Wolvey, it may be a historical accident that there are no paths in a particular area – certainly our old maps do not show any paths. It may be that, historically, no-one needed to walk in that direction. If there are key sections which are needed to connect longer walks then it may be possible to look at creating those in the future.
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		no change	The problem of stiles and lack of dog-gates should largely disappear in time as we move towards using gates or kissing gates. If there are any particular stiles which cause you problems, please let us know and we will look into whether it can be replaced by a gate.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				awareness is important to urban dwellers. 4. Use of green tracks by motor cycles disturbs residents and makes tracks muddy. 5. Would like to see more flexibility for landowners who wish to move paths.			<p>We recognise that there is sometimes a conflict between motorised users of rights of way and pedestrians. Often, this is due to the surface not being able to handle the amount of use, and where our budget allows we will work to improve and renew the surface for all users. The government is currently looking at changes in the law to minimise the impact of motorised users on rights of way.</p> <p>We hope that our 'New Paths for Old' scheme (appendix VIII on page 161) will enable more flexibility in achieving changes to the network within the constraints of the current legislation.</p>
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 [of recognised promoted routes].		no change	<p>You suggested that we prioritise items in the action plan. We have chosen not to do this as our priorities would be fixed for the ten year period (or at least the five years before it is reviewed with the LTP). Instead we will use our annual Statement of Intent to prioritise our actions in more detail.</p> <p>Thank you for your positive feedback on our current signposting. It is not our intention to change all our signs to use fingerposts with destinations and distances, but only to use them where it will add to the overall countryside experience.</p> <p>We intend writing to Government asking the Minister that applications for changes to the Definitive Map received by authorities before the 2026 deadline be safeguarded, but this need not be included in the CAROWIP.</p> <p>I have noted your wish for The Monarch's Way to be included as a recognised route and shall put it forward for inclusion when we take our recommendations to the Local Access Forum.</p>
R18	John Roberts	Centenary Way, Walkways & Quercus	-	1. Provides a list of practical and specific suggestions which may help achieve some aims.		no change	<p>Thank you for your suggestions for specific improvements and promotion ideas. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>We look forward to working with you in the future, and in particular on your 'Railway Walks from Stratford'.</p>
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 in the action plans. 3. Questions the timescale of GIS work. 4. Wants a greenway in the area.	Stratford – wants to see a greenway in the north or east.	<p>Page 22 and page 59</p> <p>Add another action under A4b (to also be included in a new category "S13 Open space and green space", action S13a) to read "Undertake an assessment of current open space and green space provision within Warwickshire, so as to identify gaps in availability." Resources = existing & partnership, funding= £20,000, timescale = yrs 1-2 and yrs 3-4,</p>	<p>In response to your comments, the timing of the GIS work has been agreed as a realistic one given the complexity of digitising a legal document containing over 1700 miles of rights of way which must all be individually checked.</p> <p>Whilst we would wish to see even more greenways, much of the former rail network is in private ownership and so achieving public access is more complicated. We have taken advantage of opportunities where they arise and hope to continue doing so. However, it is unlikely that we will be able to get large numbers of these routes opened up for the public.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
						partners = Countryside Agency, Other councils, Land managers	We do recognise that not everyone has green space on their doorstep and have added an action to undertake an assessment of current provision. The Countryside Agency are keen to see this happen and have indicated that funding may be forthcoming to address this.
R20	S Barrows	(CV22)	Good readability.	1. As a horse rider feels it is time equestrian community had access to safe routes.		no change	In action N2c on page 36 of the Draft CAROWIP we intend to identify the key equestrian links and work to secure them. If there are particular routes that you believe are needed, please let us know (regardless of any history of Definitive Map claims).
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.	Add an action re N Warks. in N8f “Assess provision of horse-riding routes in North Warwickshire and develop and progress a programme of enhancements”, resources = partnership, additional staff time : funding = £5,000 per link : timescale = yrs 3-4 & 5+, partners = User groups, Parish Councils, District Council, WCC (others), local horseriders, landowners.	<p>I understand that you have had discussions with Paul Williams in the past regarding the specific Definitive Map claims so I have not addressed those points in this response.</p> <p>The distribution of the questionnaires in 2004 was done in a number of ways. We did send questionnaires to riding clubs, livery yards and stables in the County where we had contact details. Copies were sent to the BHS at Stoneleigh, and I believe they put a small announcement on their website. Countrywide Farmers also had the questionnaires, as they were one of our sponsors for the prize draw. In addition to trying to target horseriders specifically we did distribute questionnaires via the libraries and Tourist Information Centres. We do not have a database of horseriders, and so had to rely on these methods in publicising the questionnaires.</p> <p>In respect of the A5, we will be looking at establishing safer crossings of major roads, together with the Highways Agency. This is action N3a on page 37 of the Draft CAROWIP.</p> <p>In action N2c on page 36 we intend to identify the key equestrian links and work to secure them. If there are particular routes that you believe are needed, please let us know (regardless of any history of Definitive Map claims). We have added a new action in the CAROWIP, under point N8, which applies solely to addressing the bridleway provision in North Warwickshire.</p> <p>I was not aware that low-flying military aircraft was a problem in Warwickshire, although I am aware that this has been an issue in other areas . We recognise that there is sometimes a conflict between motorised users of rights of way and pedestrians. Often, this is due to the surface not being able to handle the amount of use, and where our budget allows we will work to improve and renew the surface for all users. The government is currently looking at changes in the law to minimise the impact of motorised users on rights of way.</p> <p>If you do experience problems with aircraft, or problems with the</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							surface of our bridleways, please let us know.
R22	Lisa Arben	WCC Legal	-	1. Specific comments on minor wording changes to five of the policies from WCC solicitor.		<p>Page 70: First paragraph of policy, change reference to Section 31(6) Highways Act.</p> <p>First, fourth and fifth paragraphs of background, change reference to Section 31(6) Highways Act.</p> <p>Second paragraph of background, change reference to Section 31(1) Highways Act.</p> <p>Page 20 add the following to 'Key references' - "Planning Policy Guidance 17 : Planning for open space, sport and recreation (ODPM 2002)"</p> <p>Page 29 add the following to 'Key references' - "Planning Policy Guidance 17 : Planning for open space, sport and recreation (ODPM 2002)"..</p> <p>Page 55 add a section "Key references" , and add "Planning Policy Guidance 17 : Planning for open space, sport and recreation (ODPM 2002)".</p> <p>Page 92 add the following to the end - "Planning Policy Guidance 17 : Planning for open space, sport and recreation (ODPM 2002)".</p> <p>Page 74: First paragraph of policy, change 'though' to 'through'.</p> <p>Paragraph on Statutory Notices: – replace 'being charged accordingly' with 'being required to reimburse WCC accordingly'.</p> <p>Paragraph on Formal Cautions: Add to end 'Formal Cautions can be</p>	[copy of committee background papers to be sent]

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
						referred to in court following convictions for a subsequent offence within a prescribed period. Paragraph on Prosecutions: The sentence before the bulleted list shall be changed to read 'The decision to prosecute shall be taken with regard to the evidence and the public interest. In looking at the public interest in taking a prosecution the following will be taken into account.' Page 79 Second paragraph after the numbered list – correct the spelling of 'disabilities'.	
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.		no change	It was good to have such positive feedback.
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.		Page 29 First paragraph of conclusions: reword to 'Whilst the benefits to health and well-being are clear, and existing countryside users cite health and wellbeing as important reasons for using the countryside, people may not take up walking, riding or cycling just because they know it will improve their health.' Page 30 H1g : change 'for doctors to prescribe' to 'for health professionals to recommend'. Page 32 New Action S7c "Assess existing and future promotional material to ensure that opportunities are taken to promote the health benefits of countryside activities." resources = partnership, additional funding = n/a, timescale = 1-2 yrs, 3-4 yrs and 5+, partners = WCC (others), PCTs New Action S7d "Produce a directory of healthy activities in the Warwickshire countryside." resources = partnership, additional funding = £5000 per edition, timescale = 3-4 yrs and 5+, partners = WCC (others)	[send a revised 'Health, wellbeing and social benefits' section, and 'Strategic developments and promotion' section]

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
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.		no change	<p>We do plan an accessibility audit of our signs and waymarks and we will look at whether the tops of waymark posts should be coloured. We are, however, unlikely to move to using fingerposts as standard. We must provide value for money for the public, and the cost of fingerposts is far greater than the cost of the posts and signs we use at present, and they are more prone to vandalism and costlier to repair.</p> <p>Thank you for your support for our 'gap-gate-stile' policy. Where stiles are reported to us as difficult to use, we will inspect them. In that instance our first preference will always be to see whether the stile can be removed.</p> <p>Until we have completed a full network survey we will remain reliant on reports from the public and our own observations to locate difficult-to-use structures. If you encounter particular stiles which are difficult to use, please let us know.</p>
R26	Brian Peers	Fenny Compton	Welcomes the plan.	1. Not all paths are suitable to be upgraded to a tarmac surface. 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.		<p>[see 'key routes' action point from Rugby Disability Forum (R32)]</p> <p>Page 44 new action P3e "Undertake a comprehensive review of signs and waymarking on public rights of way" resources = existing & partnership, funding = £2000, timescale = quick win, partners = disability groups, WCC (others), Parish Councils, P3 groups, LAF, CALG, User groups</p>	<p>I believe Stuart Ikeringill has responded to you separately on the consultation process, and consultation with landowners in particular.</p> <p>Improvements to footpaths will be undertaken according to our policy CA10 on page 80 of the Draft CAROWIP – i.e. material chosen to balance the needs of path users, cost, sustainability, local distinctiveness and the local ecology. We have no intention of tarmacking the countryside, and have no wish to see paths fenced in, although the landowner may fence the path in if they wish – that is largely outside our control.</p> <p>The purpose of the Disability Discrimination Acts 1995 and 2005 are to ensure that people with disabilities have an equal right to access places. Introducing a separate category of path would go completely against that. We do plan to make incremental improvements where they are needed. The starting point will be to identify some key routes for improvement and an action has now been added under A1 (page 21 in the Draft CAROWIP) for this. The key routes are more likely to be on the urban fringe where improvements will benefit the greatest numbers of people. We do also respond to specific requests for improvements.</p> <p>Our gap-gate-stile policy has met with approval from others. Kissing gates in general require less maintenance over their lifetime than stiles and are less likely to become dangerous for path users. In respect of returning arable land to livestock and vice versa; once a gate or stile ceases to be needed for stock control, it is required to be removed in any case (unless it can be shown that it has been there continuously since the path came into existence). It should therefore make no difference to the farmer whether the structure is</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							<p>a gate or stile. In fact, a gate would be easier to re-use elsewhere if needed. We have had no reported problems with the metal kissing gates not being stockproof.</p> <p>Your suggestion of a two-post gap is included in the current British Standard for Gaps, Gates and Stiles. I will therefore suggest it as an improvement which may aid navigation. We are now proposing to extend our audit of signs into a comprehensive review.</p> <p>The full width of the path need not be actively maintained and may act in a similar way to verges by the roadside. However, we have agreed to reduce the width required for enclosed footpaths from 4m to 3m.</p> <p>Changes to the Definitive Map must be made with care, and we have a responsibility to the public to use our resources wisely and for public benefit. We therefore believe that where the landowner will benefit from a diversion they should bear a proportion of the cost, and where there is a significant public benefit we will bear a proportion of the cost.</p>
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.		no change	<p>Thank you for your suggestions for a specific improvement in the Austrey area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>I have asked a colleague to get in touch with you regarding the Parish Paths Partnership scheme.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate your concern that safety aspects should come first, we must maintain a balance between the different aspects of our work. Promotion of the network is important as it maintains the interest in the countryside and prevents countryside access from becoming a minority activity. By encouraging more people into the countryside we can attract more funding, and also bring economic benefits to the area. The safety examples which you cite – N2b and N3d are reliant on partnership with others, and also require a large amount of negotiation and goodwill as well as significant amount of staff time. We will progress them as and when we can, and we do see them as a priority, but we cannot divert all our resources to achieving them.</p> <p>I believe that assessing the potential of a Quiet Lanes scheme has also now been included within the Local Transport Plan (LTP). This has been looked at in the past, but we should now be able to take lessons from other authorities who have been running Quiet Lanes schemes for a number of years. If the assessment returns positive results, Quiet Lanes may be included in a future LTP.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R28	Clive Rickman	(Kineton)	-	1. Comments about specific circular walks in Kineton area. 2. Makes suggestion relating to segregated surfacing of multi-user routes.	Stratford – would like to see a link into the bridleway at Kineton to allow circular walk as BAD and Land Rover are in the way of circular walks.	no change	<p>Thank you for your suggestions for a specific improvement in the Kineton area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>With regard to surfacing, it is unlikely that we would be able to implement a system of segregated surfaces because of the legal and practical considerations. To prevent horseriders from using part of a bridleway would require a legal order, and the legal order would be almost impossible to enforce. The success of the segregation on the greenway at Stratford is largely due to the fact that the bridleway is permissive, and the riders know it may be withdrawn if the greenway is misused.</p> <p>We do recognise that bridleways are key routes, for pedestrians and cyclists as well as horseriders, and hope that by continuing to make surface improvements where we can, that conditions will improve for everyone. If you encounter particularly bad surface conditions, please let us know. Until we have completed a full network survey, we rely on members of the public to bring problems such as this to our attention.</p>
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.		no change	<p>I am sorry that you feel that the plan is negative to dog walkers – it was not our intention. Many of the proposals included in the plan, such as additional routes, and replacement of stiles with kissing gates should improve access for dog walkers, even though that is not specifically stated in the plan. As pedestrians, dog walkers already have access to 100% of the network, notwithstanding problems with stiles which we hope the plan addresses. We have specifically targeted actions to benefit cyclists and horseriders who have a far more restricted network to enjoy.</p> <p>In our consultations with landowners, their most problematic issues centred on dogs – dogs straying from the path and dog fouling. Whilst we know that not every dog walker is irresponsible, our planned action points under E5 in the Action Plan are necessary to minimise conflict between landowners and dog owners. Much of our work is already centred around ensuring that the landowners are responsible about their rights of way – we must also ensure that the public are behaving responsibly.</p> <p>We currently have formal partnership agreements with around 55 parish and community groups who work in their own local areas. We have included targets under P7 and P8 to increase voluntary activity (both under formal partnerships and through other bodies) within Warwickshire.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R30	R Watson	(Coventry)	-	<p>1. Pleased to see support for Coventry Way.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		no change	<p>I have noted the suggestions you have made, particularly in respect of the posts to lean bicycles against when opening and closing gates.</p> <p>We are unlikely to be making many improvements to stiles; rather we will endeavour where possible to see them replaced with gates or removed altogether where they are not needed. Where there are bars across the ends of bridges, we do view them as obstructions and will have them removed, or replaced with gates.</p> <p>It is not always possible to put handrails on flights of steps as they are very prone to vandalism, and a damaged handrail can be more dangerous than not having one. If there are particular instances where you feel a handrail is needed, please let us know and we will investigate.</p> <p>We have included the development of two major former-railway routes in the CAROWIP – from Kenilworth to Berkswell and Leamington to Rugby. Whilst we would wish to see more old railways opened to the public, much of the former rail network is in private ownership and so achieving public access is more complicated. We have taken advantage of opportunities where they arise and hope to continue doing so. However, it is unlikely that we will be able to get large numbers of these routes opened up for the public.</p> <p>We recognise that there is sometimes a conflict between motorised users of rights of way and pedestrians. Often, this is due to the surface not being able to handle the amount of use, and where our budget allows we will work to improve and renew the surface for all users. The government is currently looking at changes in the law to minimise the impact of motorised users on rights of way.</p> <p>Series' of walks such as those published in the Coventry Evening Telegraph rely on volunteers to develop and write them, and this is not something we are able to get involved with. I would suggest writing to the author of the walks via the paper to ask whether their walks could start from more accessible places.</p> <p>We do try to see our leaflets stocked in bookshops and tourist information centres and will be looking at producing a marketing plan (Page 59, action S12a in the Draft CAROWIP) to maximise their effective distribution.</p>
R31a	Stephen Roots	WCC Community Transport	-	<p>1. More work needs to be done on relationship between public & community transport, and access to the countryside.</p>		no change	

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R31b	Stephen Roots	as an individual	-	1. Would like to see improved signage. 2. Suggests heavily used routes are given priority.		no change	I know that other counties do prioritise the most heavily used routes, but this relies on knowing levels of use. At present, much of this is anecdotal, as we have a limited presence on the ground. We have used automated counting devices in the past and hope to increase this in the future. Until such time as we have a satisfactory way of measuring use, we do not propose to prioritise in this way, beyond the obvious, such as prioritising routes leading out from centres of population and prioritising heavily promoted routes..
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.		<p>Page 17 Third paragraph : change to "...such as those from minority ethnic backgrounds, those on low incomes and young people."</p> <p>Page 19 Third paragraph : change "we have no wish to change the very nature of the countryside" to "we have no wish to 'urbanise' the countryside"</p> <p>Page 21 A1h : change to "Provide four new sensory trails" - add 5+ to the timescale.</p> <p>New action A1i : "Identify key routes for accessibility improvements", resources = partnership, additional funding = £1k pa, timescale = yrs 1-2 & 3-4, partners = disability groups, parish councils, district councils, WCC (others), minority groups.</p> <p>Page 22 A2b : add " and develop additional publicity material to promote them" to the end.</p>	<p>We have made a number of changes to the plan following our discussion.</p> <p>We look forward to working with you in the future.</p>
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.		Policy CA16 has been rewritten see Table 3	[copy of revised policy to be sent]
R34	Ken Taylor	Local Access Forum	-	1. Made specific suggestions for wording in Policy CA16.		Policy CA16 has been rewritten see Table 3	[copy of revised policy to be sent]
R35	Steven Wallsgrove	Ramblers Association & Local Access Forum	-	1. Made specific suggestions for wording in Policy CA16.		Policy CA16 has been rewritten see Table 3	[copy of revised policy to be sent]

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
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.		no change	[A response has been sent following consultation with traffic colleagues. N.B. The draft Countryside Strategy of the LTP includes points which should address the issue.]
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>		Policy CA16 has been rewritten see Table 3	[copy of revised policy to be sent]
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>		Policy CA16 has been rewritten see Table 3	[copy of revised policy to be sent]
R39	Julie Sullivan	WCC Chief Execs	-	1. Supports the balanced approach of Policy CA16. NB revised version of CA16 was circulated.		Policy CA16 has been rewritten see Table 3	[copy of revised policy to be sent]
R40	David Stuart	Burton Dasset Parish Path volunteers	-	1. Would like to see inspections of ploughed paths within 7 days rather than 15		Page 76 Policy CA7 “Reports of ploughing and cropping problems will be inspected within 15 working days of receiving the report.” will be replaced by “Reports of ploughing problems will be inspected within 10 working days of receiving the report. Reports of cropping problems will be inspected within 15 working days of receiving the report.”.	We have reviewed this policy and amended it so that ploughing problems are inspected within ten working days. Reports of crops on the path will be still be inspected within 15 working days.
R41	Len Gale	(Southam)	Good readability.	1. Would like to see more wheelchair friendly paths.		see R32	The plan is designed to take us through the next ten years by giving us a framework to work within, and targets to meet. Identifying the specific locations and areas will be left to our annual Statement of Intent, so that we can be responsive to needs and changes over the lifespan of the plan. Improvements to routes to bring them up to a standard for wheelchairs are covered in the Accessibility theme. Within our limited budget we have sought to set targets which will be achievable. In particular we will be looking at the standards set out by the Fieldfare Trust to develop additional routes. We will be adding an action to identify key routes for surface improvements. If you would like to get involved in helping us to identify these routes, please let me know.
R42	Curigwen Dittrich		Positive and enlightened.	1. Would like WCC to “achieve”, “implement” and “establish” rather than “seek”, “develop” and		no change	You commented about keeping bicycles off footpaths; we will not be encouraging cyclists to use footpaths. The primary purpose of stiles and gates on the network is to control livestock, rather than to

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				“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. 6. Requests improvements to verges for walkers as well as NMUs. 7. Questions why missing bridges will be ‘dealt with’ rather than replaced.			control users. Unless there is a change in the law, bells on bicycles will not be enforceable, but will remain good practice. Our term NMU or non-motorised user includes people on foot, so the actions relating to NMUs will automatically cover walkers. Spraying is undertaken only in limited circumstances. This will generally be on utility paths which tend to be in built up areas and fenced on both sides, and we will only use approved (certificated) contractors. It is unlikely that we will ever include the path numbering on signs as it means little to most people. In addition, the path numbers may be liable to change, which would incur unnecessary expense in re-signing. With regard to missing bridges on the network we have specified “deal with” rather than “replace” as a solution may involve moving a path (either onto an existing bridge or to a more suitable location for a bridge to be built) rather than just replacing a bridge.
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.	no change	We will be working closely with British Waterways in the future and will discuss the possibility of linking the Avon Valley Way with the Grand Union Canal.
R44	Peter Chater	(Leamington Spa)	-	Proposes a specific improvement at Offchurch.		no change	Thank you for your suggestions for a specific improvement in the Offchurch area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.
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.	no change	I would like to reassure you that it is not our intention to urbanise the countryside. I would refer you to the third paragraph of our surfacing policy on page 80 of the draft plan, where we expressly state that the type of surfacing chosen will be balanced with the local environment. The Avon Valley Way is a route that has existed from Stratford, downstream, for a number of years, using public footpaths. We hope to be able to extend the route from Stratford, upstream to Warwick, for walkers and cyclists, but development of the route will only follow extensive consultation and publicity. We do, however, remain committed to a pedestrian and cycle route between Stratford and Warwick. I have noted your suggestion for a specific improvement. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							takes effect.
R46	Janet Owen		-	1. Proposed specific improvement to canal towpaths. 2. Requests that tree cuttings are removed from site.		no change	<p>The majority of the canal towpath between Atherstone and Coventry is not a public footpath, but is a permissive route belonging to British Waterways. I will pass your comments on to them.</p> <p>It is not clear to me whether your comment about thorns relates to the towpaths or to rights of way in general. Usually, hedges and trees are cut back by the landowner. When we arrange for work to be carried out on trees, we try to ensure that all debris is removed from the path.</p>
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 who will still encounter problems on the paths. 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.		no change	<p>We do have a duty to ensure that all paths are open and available for use and this remains the focus of the Countryside Access Team. However, we also have a duty under the Disability Discrimination Acts 1995 and 2005 to ensure that people with disabilities can access our services. In addition, there are other duties, such as progressing the Definitive Map Review. In writing the CAROWIP we have attempted to balance all of our duties. Where we have concentrated on cyclists and horseriders, it is because so little of the network is available to them, but these works will also benefit walkers. From the point of view of attracting additional funding, we are more likely to succeed where our actions will benefit the widest cross section of people.</p> <p>We have not deliberately ignored walking clubs, but have instead looked on widening our actions to encompass the public at large. The results of our consultation in 2004 indicated that over 80% of people who responded to our walkers questionnaire were not members of any walking group.</p> <p>If you encounter overgrown and unsafe paths or dangerous stiles or footbridges, I would urge you to report them to us. This can be done online via www.warwickshire.gov.uk/countryside, by email to paths@Warwickshire.gov.uk or by telephone to 01926 413427. We do not yet have an inventory of path furniture or an inspection regime. This is something the CAROWIP will address. Until then we rely on path users such as yourselves reporting problems to us.</p> <p>Public transport, whilst outside the remit of the CAROWIP, is dealt with in the Local Transport Plan. Point N7a in the action plan (page 38 of the Draft CAROWIP) does set a target which we hope to work towards in conjunction with transport colleagues.</p>
R48	Justin Millward	Woodland Trust	-	Refers to their position statement on Public Access to Woodland, and highlights the need for more access to woodland.		see R1 Page 55 add to key references "Space for people - targeting action for woodland access (Woodland Trust 2004"	We have added an action point which reads "To support other organisations in securing access to woodland", and we hope to work with you in the future to increase access to woodland via the public rights of way network.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
						<p>Page 57 change S3 to be "Waterside and woodland access". Add action points : S3d "To support other organisations in securing access to woodland." resources = existing & partnership, funding = £5000 per route created, timescale = yrs 1-2 & 3-4 & 5+ , partners : Forestry Commission, Woodland Trust, Warwickshire Wildlife Trust, Landowners</p>	
R49	Tim Harvey-Smith	Wolston Parish Council	Impressed with layout and formatting	Expresses a positive opinion and makes no requests for changes.		no change	It was good to have such positive feedback.
R50	Sarah Faulkner	National Farmers Union	-	<p>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 routes will affect farmers. 8. WCC should audit leaflets for new trails to ensure accuracy. 9. Farmers should be consulted on clear standards for electric fencing crossing or adjacent to public paths. 10. Gaps in boundaries are not always appropriate and can be poorly waymarked. 11. NFU would like</p>		<p>Page 71 & 73 Policy CA3 and CA4 bullet point relating to enclosed footpaths to be changed from "4m for enclosed footpaths" to "3m for enclosed footpaths".</p> <p>Page 44 New action P4f to read "Review Policy CA11 Electric Fences and seek feedback from the farming and equestrian communities", resources = existing, funding = 0, timescale = yrs 3-4, partners = none</p>	<p>I hope that your desire for further promotion and countryside education about access land is dealt with under sections E5, E6 and S10 in the action plan. I have noted the details of the LEAF information boards for reference.</p> <p>We will continue to communicate with farmers over issues such as new routes and ploughing/cropping issues.</p> <p>Where public path orders are requested by landowners, they will not be forgotten, but they may be dealt with more speedily if there is a tangible benefit to the public as well as to themselves.</p> <p>The widths included in the Rights of Way Act 1990 have a specific relevance to paths across arable fields. Many of these routes, however, have a greater width specified in the Definitive Statement, which would override the widths in this Act. The widths have been chosen for the benefit of users of the network both now and in the future, but we have carefully reconsidered them. As a result we have reduced the width for enclosed footpaths from 4m to 3m in policies CA3 and CA4.</p> <p>It is our intention to increase awareness among landowners of Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 (page 51, action R3a). However, it is not essential to use that section to protect land which is under stewardship agreements for access, as the agreement itself is evidence that the landowner intends the access to be permissive.</p> <p>At present the Discovering Lost Ways project does not have a timetabled date for dealing with Warwickshire. When a date is</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				to continue to be consulted.			<p>announced we anticipate that there will be publicity by the Discovering Lost Ways project team.</p> <p>However, we are not expecting the research to highlight many routes in Warwickshire which we are not already aware of, and the project will not by itself result in routes being added to the Definitive Map. It will result in a database of evidence which will be handed over to WCC. We will then have the duty to act on that evidence through the Definitive Map Review process, in the same way as with existing applications for Definitive Map Modification Orders.</p> <p>We do offer a free checking service for people who are putting together promoted routes, in an effort to ensure the accuracy of information, but the authors and publishers are not under any obligation to consult with us. We will continue to offer this service (page 84, policy CA14)</p> <p>The policy on electric fences has been formulated after careful thought and consultation with the Local Access Forum, which includes a number of representatives from the farming community. We have had many cases over the years where electric fences have caused problems for path users, and believe the proposed policy is badly needed so as to set out clear and transparent rule which can be applied consistently. We have not received any other comments on this policy. We will however, agree to review it after two years and seek feedback from the farming and equestrian communities.</p> <p>We agree that a gap is not always appropriate. However, it still remains the most convenient boundary crossing for a user of the path provided, as you say, it is correctly waymarked and maintained. We have added a proposal to carry out a comprehensive review of our signs and waymarking within the first two years of the plan.</p> <p>We will remain in contact and continue to consult with you on issues affecting the farming community.</p>
R51	Keith Sinfield	Church Lawford Parish Council	Well written and arranged and makes interesting reading.	1. Hopes action plans won't founder through lack of funding. 2. Suggests a promoted route around Rugby, similar to A Coventry Way.	Suggested Rugby-specific promoted route.	no action	I have noted your suggestion for a promoted route encircling Rugby. This is not something the County Council could develop and promote, but we would be willing to support such a route if it were developed along the same lines as A Coventry Way and met the criteria for inclusion in the list of recognised promoted routes.
R52	Merche Bovill	Brailles Footpath Group		1. Livelihood of farmers is of primary concern. 2. Does not agree with, and will not participate in, removal of stiles, which the footpath group has installed and their replacement		no change	We understand that gates are not everyone's preferred option, but our gap-gate-stile policy has met with approval from others. It is also the current British Standard and the principle is endorsed by the Countryside Agency. The self-closing kissing gates which we use offer a stockproof and accessible boundary crossing, so much so that many landowners are now requesting them. They have several

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				with gates.			<p>advantages over stiles – they require less maintenance and are more easily used, as well as facilitating the passage of people with dogs. When we install these gates, it is after discussions with, and in most cases the support of, the landowner. They are installed with shear-nuts which prevent the gate from simply being unbolted and stolen. Any locked or damaged gates should be reported to ourselves and we will deal with them.</p> <p>In respect of returning arable land to livestock and vice versa; once a gate or stile ceases to be needed for stock control, it is required to be removed in any case (unless it can be shown that it has been there continuously since the path came into existence). It should therefore make no difference to the farmer whether the structure is a gate or stile. In fact, a gate would be easier to re-use elsewhere if needed.</p>
R53	S J Curtis	(Claverdon)	Comprehensive and informative.	1. Supports signs with destinations on. 2. Dogs are important for 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 horseriders perspective) 8. Supports Toll Rides and would welcome Quiet Lanes.		no change	<p>Thank you for your support for so many of our proposed actions.</p> <p>You should find that our policy of installing gates rather than stiles should lead to improved access for you and your dog(s).</p> <p>We have included a number of proposals to improve routes used by horseriders and recognise that more provision is needed. It is already our practice to improve difficult-to-open gate latches where they are reported to us.</p> <p>We would be pleased to hear of any specific routes where you believe attention is required.</p> <p>The Quiet Lanes proposal in our plan is on 38 (action N6c) and I believe will be mirrored in the Local Transport Plan (LTP). A Quiet Lanes scheme has been considered in the past by our transport colleagues, but has not been progressed. We are now in the position where we can learn from other authorities who have been piloting these schemes and, if the results of an assessment are positive, a scheme may be implemented in a future LTP.</p>
R54	Nicholas Butler	Council for the Protection of Rural England - Article in Leamington Courier	-	1. Would like to see Quiet Lanes sooner. 2. Believes more funding should be encouraged.		no change	no response – newspaper article.
R55	Cllr Hobbs	WCC Cllr	-	1. Where is reference to diverting footpaths away from dwellings and farm yards?		no change	<p>The research results did show that Parish and Town Councils were generally in favour of moving paths away from dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>This was considered as we drafted the policy on Public Path Orders (Page 71 in the Draft CAROWIP). The high priority cases fall</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							within several specific categories, linked to legislation, public safety or imminent danger to the path's existence. Under medium priority we included those cases where we believe the public can be best served. It is in this category that we have included instances where the town / parish council actively support a case. We decided that we should increase the priority of any proposed change which has the support of the local council, and not just restrict it to paths near dwellings and farmyards.
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.	no change	It is extremely useful to see how our two plans might be linked. We look forward to working with you in the future.
R57	Janet Batterbee	(Bedworth)	Very good readability.	No specific comments on plan, but general concerns about dumping in the countryside.		no change	<p>Problems with dumping and fly tipping on the roads and paths (provided they are within the highway boundary) should be reported to your local Council – in your case Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (phone no 024 7637 6376). It may be that the issue you are describing is related to a planning application, in which case it would normally also be the Borough Council who would be able to respond.</p> <p>Concerns about mud (or any other problem with the road surface) on the road can be reported to the WCC Highways Customer Service Centre on 01926 412515.</p> <p>I have passed on your comments about mud on the road, but you may wish to contact the Borough Council yourself about the earth dumping itself.</p>
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		no change	<p>Thank you for your support for our 'gap-gate-stile' policy. Where stiles are reported to us as difficult to use, we will inspect them and our first preference will always be to see whether the stile can be removed. Until we have completed a full network survey we will remain reliant on reports from the public and our own observations to locate difficult-to-use structures and so are not able to undertake a pro-active programme of change. If you encounter particular stiles which are difficult to use, please let us know.</p> <p>We do put information about path closures on our website (www.warwickshire.gov.uk/pathorders), but it can be difficult to understand. Until we have online mapping available for rights of way</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				<p>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.</p>			<p>it will be difficult to show the closures. Unfortunately, most canal towpaths are outside our control as they are not public paths, and are managed by British Waterways. I don't believe they list towpath closures although they do list closures to the navigation. They can be contacted on 01923 201120 or via their website (www.waterscape.com). I have noted your request for access from footpaths to towpaths and will talk to British Waterways about this in the future.</p> <p>There are a number of old railways managed and run by WCC as greenways. These include the Stratford Greenway, which is currently marked on OS maps, and there are two routes under development - from Kenilworth to Berkswell and from Leamington to Rugby. It is not always possible to see permissive routes marked on OS maps as their nature means that they can be withdrawn from use. However, WCC intends that routes it owns and manages will be included on OS maps wherever possible. The signing of the routes is down to the person who provides or manages the routes. I will pass on your request for car parking at future greenways to the Country Parks Land Manager who is responsible for the new routes.</p> <p>We do not plan any wholesale improvement of stiles, as we are working towards removing them from the network. However, other people have also suggested painting the tops of posts to aid navigation and so we will look at whether the tops of waymark posts should be coloured, when we come to review our signs and waymarks.</p> <p>If you encounter particular routes which are difficult to use, please let us know.</p> <p>We do not have a mailing list specifically for promoted routes, but I have added you to our mailing list for 'Viewpoint' our magazine which comes out twice a year.</p>
R59	Amanda Drakeley	Nuneaton and Bedworth Leisure Trust	Very good readability.	<p>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 Way to Health in Nuneaton and Bedworth and keen to work with WCC.</p>	Nuneaton and Bedworth – supports promoting Walking the Way to Health schemes.	no change	<p>We would hesitate to suggest additional waymarking in the countryside as there are already many 'totem poles' of waymarks out there which can get confusing. If self guided Health Walks trails are set up, whether by ourselves or another organisation, we would expect them to fall within our wider definition of a promoted route, and we would only support waymarking where a route meets certain criteria. Details of this are in Policy CA14 on page 84 of the Draft CAROWIP.</p> <p>The funding referred to is for each scheme or package of walks, rather than each district. If we are successful in achieving this additional funding, it will be spent after discussion with the people involved. We look forward to working with you in the future.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
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.		no change	<p>The research results did show that Parish and Town Councils were generally in favour of moving paths away from dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>This was considered as we drafted the policy on Public Path Orders (Page 71 in the Draft CAROWIP). The high priority cases fall within several specific categories, linked to legislation, public safety or imminent danger to the path's existence. Under medium priority we included those cases where we believe the public can be best served. It is in this category that we have included instances where the town / parish council actively support a case. We decided that we should increase the priority of any proposed change which has the support of the local council, and not just restrict it to paths near dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>The purpose of 'New Paths for Old' is to allow the improvement of the network through linked changes which have benefits for the public. The scheme itself allows us to consider several linked changes at once, and has no affect on the priorities within policy CA3 other than to raise the priority to medium if there is public benefit.</p> <p>If a parish or town council actively supports a proposal or if there is a significant public benefit, it will be dealt with as a medium priority. However, such cases are generally of benefit solely to the landowner and, as such, it is only right that these changes are funded by the landowner who benefits.</p>
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.		<p>Page 47 Add the following before 'Situation in Warwickshire' "The government is currently looking at changes in the law to minimise the impact of motorised users on rights of way, and this may make blanket changes to the rights which mechanically propelled vehicles have over certain routes. A Bill (Natural Environment and Rural Communities Bill) is currently before Parliament, but at the time of going to print, the outcome is not yet known. "</p> <p>Page 79 last sentence, replace 'negotiate' with 'use'</p>	<p>Our policy on Public Path Orders has been formulated to give some structure to how we deal with an increasing number of requests for changes. We are reaching the situation where we cannot deal with every application as soon as it comes in, and believe that proposals with public benefit should be our priority. Applications from landowners will not be ignored, but may take longer to progress if there is little or no benefit to the public. If WCC applies for a diversion in their capacity as a landowner they will be treated as any other landowner and prioritised according to the policy.</p> <p>We have added some text explaining the possible ramifications of the NERC Bill.</p> <p>I have obtained the correct copyright permissions relating to the images used, and I have noted your point about the accuracy of statistics.</p> <p>We have yet to prioritise the actions. Our annual Statement of Intent will include our priorities each year and will be agreed after consultation with the LAF. We have already gathered a number of</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							<p>specific suggestions as a result of the publicity surrounding the Draft CAROWIP. Once the CAROWIP takes effect, we will be asking for additional suggestions within local areas.</p> <p>Thank you for pointing out the confusion over the word 'negotiate'. We did of course mean 'use', rather than 'achieve' and will change the wording of the plan to reflect that.</p>
R62	Miss J Lester	Mancetter Parish Council	-	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 clearance of headland paths should be included, and should be dealt with pro-actively. 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. 11. Welcomes prioritisation for public path orders, but cost should be kept low for minor 		<p>Page 44 new action P3e "Undertake a comprehensive review of signs and waymarking on public rights of way" resources = existing & partnership, funding = £2000, timescale = quick win, partners = disability groups, WCC (others), Parish Councils, P3 groups, LAF, CALG, User groups</p> <p>Page 44 New action P4f to read "Review Policy CA11 Electric Fences and seek feedback from the farming and equestrian communities", resources = existing, funding = 0, timescale = yrs 3-4, partners = none</p> <p>Page 76 Policy CA7 "Reports of ploughing and cropping problems will be inspected within 15 working days of receiving the report." will be replaced by "Reports of ploughing problems will be inspected within 10 working days of receiving the report. Reports of cropping problems will be inspected within 15 working days of receiving the report."</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions for specific improvements in the Mancetter area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>I have taken note of the various observations you have made about the content of the plan and sought only to address the requests and queries in this response.</p> <p>Other people have also suggested that we look further at our signs and waymarking and we have therefore added an action to undertake a comprehensive review. This will include looking at the points you mention.</p> <p>Landowners are, for the most part, aware of their responsibilities in respect of rights of way, but there are a minority who ignore those responsibilities or who deliberately flout the law. We advise landowners of their responsibilities on an individual basis as we find that the most effective way of achieving results is through individual communication. We already have two leaflets which set out the landowners' responsibility. One of these specifically covers ploughing and cropping, but the other has a wider application and applies equally to all landowners, whether farmers, householders or organisations. If you would like copies of these leaflets, please let me know.</p> <p>In response to your comments about ploughing and cropping and headland paths, we believe we have struck the right balance. We will, for the first time have policies relating to Enforcement (CA5) and Path Reports and Inspections (CA7). and we have made a firm commitment in Actions P1 and P2 to be pro-active in tackling these ongoing problems.</p> <p>With regard to our policy on enforcement, every case is different. To proceed to an automatic prosecution after a set number of warnings will not be appropriate in every case, as it may be more cost effective to take another course of action.</p> <p>In terms of the resources and numbers of staff available to us, we have seen a significant investment over the past fifteen years, and a</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				<p>amendments..</p> <p>12. Promotion and maintenance of the Centenary Way should be a priority. Network must be in a good condition for tourists otherwise they may not return.</p> <p>14. Welcome proposals for monitoring and progress.</p> <p>15. Believes Definitive Map Review should be progressed in a timelier manner.</p> <p>16. In not in agreement with policy CA2 landowner declarations.</p> <p>17. Public Path Orders need to be processed more quickly.</p> <p>18. Cyclists and horseriders should be kept separate from walkers.</p> <p>19. The enforcement policy needs strengthening.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>23. Wishes to see local distinctiveness within the plan in relation to signing and waymarking.</p> <p>24. Welcomes the gap-gate-stile principle, and would like to see more anti-cycle barriers.</p> <p>25. Concerned about the use of insulated handles on electric fences.</p> <p>26. Welcomes 'behind the hedge' schemes and moving level crossings to bridges or underpasses.</p>			<p>commitment from the authority to the work which we carry out. Indeed, we are fortunate in having a ranger team when many other counties have lost theirs. However, we are unlikely ever to expand to the level which you are suggesting. There is not a bottomless pit of money and WCC must constantly seek to achieve more within limited resources. We do have additional seasonal rangers working for us during the busy summer months.</p> <p>Where a change is made to the path network for benefit for a private landowner, rather than the public, the public purse should not fund it. The cost of the process will be the same no matter how small or large the change, and the timescale will in general remain the same, as the process we must follow is set down by law. Our policy on Public Path Orders covers prioritisation of these cases, and this should lead to the cases with most public benefit being dealt with sooner than they might otherwise be.</p> <p>The Centenary Way is covered in action points S1b (page 56) ensuring that it is inspected, and T2f (page 63) dealing with promotion. Rather than have an officer solely responsible for the Centenary Way, path reports and inspections are dealt with as part of our general maintenance and enforcement work. We will always respond if problems are reported to us. The promotional material will be dependent on our success in bidding for additional funding.</p> <p>We are very much aware that meeting the 2026 target for completing the Definitive Map Review is a significant challenge – a similar situation exists in many counties. We have indicated (Action point R1b on page 50) that to meet the deadline will require additional input, but we work within limited resources and must always keep a balance between our duty to keep the path network open and available and our duty to keep the Definitive Map under review. We intend writing to Government asking the Minister that applications for changes to the Definitive Map received by authorities before the 2026 deadline be safeguarded, but this need not be included in the CAROWIP.</p> <p>The policy on landowner declarations reflects the law as it stands. If a landowners does not wish a route to become public in the future, a deposit under S31 Highways Act is the most effective way for them to register that. There are many cases where the landowner permits people to cross his or her land but does not wish a route to become public, and this affords them some protection. Legitimate claims under the Highways Act rely on 20 years use as of right, without force, secrecy or permission. Section 31 Deposits have no effect at all on the validity or otherwise of public use prior to the date they are made, but a longstanding permissive route is still a</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				<p>27. Welcomes the continued commitment to P3.</p> <p>28. Welcomes the continues support for promoted routes.</p> <p>29. Believes the policy should allow for more permissive routes, such as those under planning agreements.</p>			<p>permissive route and cannot be claimed as public.</p> <p>I understand from your letter that Mancetter has a particular concern around horseriders and cyclists sharing routes with walkers. Whilst we agree that cyclists should not be using footpaths I should point out that horseriders and cyclists have access to only a fraction of the routes which are available to walkers. There is therefore a need for more shared routes, but we are mindful that where we seek to get routes upgraded to fill gaps in the network, they should be of a sufficient width to be able to accommodate the additional users. Where there is a footpath suitable to be upgraded we would not wish to impose an additional separate route on a landowner, although we might require additional width to be made available.</p> <p>Cycling is becoming more important across the county as alternatives to the car are sought. There will be a particular emphasis given to utility routes where improvements might result in a reduction in car journeys. This is a common theme running through the CAROWIP and the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>There is no mechanism in law which allows us to install gates and stiles to prevent cycle use. Then purpose for those structures is to control livestock. However, in circumstances where there is a particular safety issue we may be able to put staggered barriers by the roadside.</p> <p>We have looked at our policy on path inspections, following your comment as well as a number of others. The timescales we have given represent the longest we would leave it before an inspection.</p> <p>In most cases we would look at the problem well within the timescale. However, in order to work most effectively, and to reduce unnecessary travel, we need to take a considered approach to planning these inspections, rather than jumping into the car each time someone reports something. We do, however, propose to change the timescale given for inspecting reports of ploughed out paths, as this has been raised by others. Ploughing reports will be inspected within 10 working days, whilst inspections of crop obstruction will remain at 15 working days.</p> <p>The target that paths be inspected at least once every ten years is an ambitious one, given that there has been not been a routine inspection programme before. Routine inspections will need to be carried out in a way which does not adversely affect the other work which we do, and I anticipate that the most popular paths will be inspected far more often during the ten year period. We do not believe the work should be carried out by local volunteers, as we need to ensure consistency across the county, but nor are we able to devote someone to it full time without taking resources away from</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							<p>elsewhere. If you wish to carry out more regular inspections of your Parish, we will be pleased to receive them in addition to our own inspections.</p> <p>We have yet to write a working practice covering inspections, but it is likely to include walking the whole route and recording the presence and condition of every structure, signpost and waymark, as well as recording surface condition, obstructions and any other issues.</p> <p>The use of insulated handles on electric fences is already widespread and we receive very few complaints about it. The most common complaint is that there is no provision for a crossing point. We have, in response to concerns from the landowning community, agreed to review the policy after two years.</p> <p>A policy has been included on permissive paths in order to clarify the situation. We do not generally get involved in the creation of permissive paths outside our own landholding, and believe that public money is better spent on achieving a permanent solution wherever possible. We believe that Section 106 planning agreements offer the perfect opportunity to see a route created for the public in perpetuity. A route which is subject to heavy traffic because of a development is likely to suffer the increased traffic on a permanent basis. Where we are given the opportunity to comment on section 106 agreements we will push to see improvements to public rights of way where it is appropriate.</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.		no change	<p>We are very much aware that meeting the 2026 target is a significant challenge – a similar situation exists in many counties. We have indicated (Action point R1b on page 50) that to meet the deadline will require additional input, but we work within limited resources and must always keep a balance between our duty to keep the path network open and available and our duty to keep the Definitive Map under review.</p> <p>Our work in liaising with planners and developers is important in preventing problems which would cause us difficulty in the longer term. In many cases it is more effective to deal directly with a developer, rather than use a planner as an intermediary, as information can sometimes get muddled when passed through a third party. This work will not interfere with the pace of the Review, as there is a dedicated officer whose main role is to deal with planning matters, land searches and other similar customer contacts.</p> <p>We intend writing to Government asking the Minister that</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
							applications for changes to the Definitive Map received by authorities before the 2026 deadline be safeguarded, but this need not be included in the CAROWIP.
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	<p>Page 44 Add to end of Policy P4c “following the policy on gaps gates and stiles.”</p> <p>Page 6 amend definition of Access Land to read “Land subject to rights of access on foot under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (commonly referred to as the ‘Right to Roam’).</p> <p>Page 9 Amend the definition of Right to Roam to read “Commonly used phrase to describe access rights introduced under the CROW Act, it gives the public access to some open country (mountain, moor, heath and down) as well as registered common land. It does not give the public the right to walk everywhere.”</p> <p>Page 11, 23, 29 and 90 change “the ‘Right to Roam’” to “the new access rights under the CROW Act (sometimes referred to as the ‘Right to Roam’).”</p>	<p>In response to your comments about local distinctiveness, we believe the policies CA8 and CA9 will safeguard the local distinctiveness of the Cotswolds. All the actions in the plan must be carried out within the framework of the policies, however we have added an additional reference to the policies in action point P4c.</p> <p>We have used the phrase right to roam in some places, as that is the phrase commonly used by the public and the press. However, in response to your comments we have amended our wording to clarify things.</p>
R65	Emily Wigley	Southam Town Council	-	Suggests Southam as a location for an information point in the south of the County.		no change	Thank you for your offering of Southam as a location for a new information point. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.
R66	Mr R Smith	Shuttington Parish Council	-	1. Believes that most minor country roads are unsafe for non-motorised users and that this should be a prime consideration in the Plan. 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 horseriders and cyclists. 4. More resources or a different		<p>Add an action re N Warks. in N8f</p> <p>“Assess provision of horse-riding routes in North Warwickshire and develop and progress a programme of enhancements”, resources = partnership, additional staff time : funding = £5,000 per link : timescale = yrs 3-4 & 5+, partners = User groups, Parish Councils, District Council, WCC (others), local horseriders, landowners.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support of aspects of the CAROWIP.</p> <p>Our theme on “Path networks and connections” addresses the issues around the speed and volume of traffic on minor country roads, as well as major trunk roads. In particular, our actions under N2 and N3 (page 37 of the Draft CAROWIP) are relevant. The traffic is beyond our control, and we have a duty to maintain the existing network as well as develop it for the future. I believe we have struck the right balance between our various duties and powers.</p> <p>We received a number of comments relating to poor provision of bridleways in North Warwickshire and have proposed an additional action for the plan. This will read “Assess provision of horse-riding</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				<p>approach are needed to meet the 2026 deadline for Modification Orders. 5. Definitive Map cases should be prioritised according to public benefit. 6. Definitive Map should be on the internet. 7. Recognised promoted routes 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.</p>			<p>routes in North Warwickshire and develop and progress a programme of enhancements”.</p> <p>In terms of the Definitive Map Review we are aware that the 2026 deadline poses difficulties for almost every County, not just Warwickshire. We have highlighted the need for additional resources to meet the deadline. The policy on how the cases are prioritised has been in place since 1989, and has been reviewed periodically. We still believe that it represents the most effective way of dealing with the cases. You will be please to know that we dealt with the North Warwickshire cases first, and the review in that area is substantially complete.</p> <p>We do already work with neighbouring authorities on paths which cross the County boundary, and action N2d (page 36) indicates our continues commitment to those routes</p>
R67	Jan Robinson	(Wilmcote)	-	Should be specific reference to paths which cross private gardens.		no change	<p>The research results did show that Parish and Town Councils were generally in favour of moving paths away from dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>This was considered as we drafted the policy on Public Path Orders (Page 71 in the Draft CAROWIP). The high priority cases fall within several specific categories, linked to legislation, public safety or imminent danger to the path’s existence. Under medium priority we included those cases where we believe the public can be best served. It is in this category that we have included instances where the town / parish council actively support a case. We decided that we should increase the priority of any proposed change which has the support of the local council, and not just restrict it to paths near dwellings and farmyards.</p>
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.		no change	<p>We have received several comments in respect of towpaths in response to our Draft CAROWIP, and I will forward these to you. We look forward to working with you on future projects.</p>
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. 4. Suggests specific reference to the integration of cycles and		no change	<p>We have included a reference to Quiet Lanes on page 38 of the plan, and I understand that something similar is likely to be included in the final Local Transport Plan. However, although we remain committed to assessing the potential of such a scheme, we do not anticipate implementing a scheme for at least five years.</p> <p>I will pass your comment about a list of linked websites to our webmaster - we will be able to keep an up to date links page on our website. I see no need for this to be included as in the CAROWIP, as such a list could soon be out of date.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				trains as per CTC campaign.			We have considered local distinctiveness and it is a consideration in our policies on 'Gaps, gates and stiles' and 'Signing and waymarking'. However, road signs and milestones are outside the remit of this group. I will pass your comments on to our transport colleagues.
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 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.		Page 44 new action P3e "Undertake a comprehensive review of signs and waymarking on public rights of way" resources = existing & partnership, funding = £2000, timescale = quick win, partners = disability groups, WCC (others), Parish Councils, P3 groups, LAF, CALG, User groups	<p>We plan to tap into the existing support for the CAROWIP to get suggestions for specific projects or schemes that people would wish to see carried out. However, prioritisation will need to be done at a County level. We already work with many Parish/Town Councils and other local groups and will continue with this in the future. I have noted you proposed form for gathering suggestions.</p> <p>We will be including an action to review our signs and waymarking and I will ensure that the height of waymarkers is considered. Any change to our signs and waymarking will be carefully considered, and the basic colours of arrows will remain the same, as the colour conventions are common across England and Wales.</p> <p>Where we are able to improve verges for use by non-motorised users, we will liaise with colleagues over individual verges to ensure they are maintained and available.</p> <p>We hope very much that increased publicity material will lead to a greater understanding between users of rights of way. A code of conduct, such as you mention for people at sea, is unlikely to be successful unless it is a national initiative.</p> <p>We work very closely with farmers and have included some actions which could be of benefit to them if they wish to diversify. These are S11a, T3b and T4a in the action plans.</p> <p>We are not able to get directly involved in the Defra schemes, although we are consulted once a scheme is proposed, and we do suggest access improvements in some of those cases.</p>
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.		<p>Page 7 add to the glossary "English Nature - Government body responsible for promoting nature conservation and protecting biodiversity. Will soon combine with the Countryside Agency and Rural Development Service to form a new body, Natural England."</p> <p>Page 9 add to the glossary "SSSI - Site of Special Scientific</p>	<p>We have added a reference to sustainability in 'Vision and objectives' in the executive summary, and we have added a caution in our section on 'Strategic developments and promotion'. We have also made several changes to the glossary, as you suggested.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
						<p>Interest - Site designated by English Nature which enjoys special protection under the law and which has great ecological or geological significance.”</p> <p>Page 12 first line, amend to read “...well used in a sustainable way with a network...”</p> <p>Page 55 add to end of first paragraph “However, we should exercise caution and ensure that our improvements are compatible with the sustainability of the Warwickshire countryside.</p>	
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.		no change	<p>You will be aware that the law requires a dog to be ‘under close control’. Until and unless the law is changed neither we nor anyone else can put up signs on public rights of way requiring dogs to be on leads. We do recognise that dogs out of control are a significant worry to farmers, and our consultation in 2004 confirmed this. We can allow advisory signs, but these can only request that a dog be on a lead.</p> <p>We are aware that there can be conflict between livestock farming practice and the existence of public rights of way, but our system of rights of way has been in existence for hundreds of years and is unlikely to change significantly. We have included specific actions in the plan not just to educate people about dogs in the countryside, but also to educate people more generally about farming.</p>
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.		<p>see changes in response to Countryside Agency R85</p> <p>Delete pages 100 – 159 inclusive : Appendices will be renumbered and the consultation reports will not appear in the final plan.</p>	<p>[response yet to be drafted – see notes below]</p> <p>1. See R85 response 2. We will keep it as an appendix. 3. These resources are outside the control of the Countryside Access Team. Country Parks and Greenways will be included in a ‘Green Space Strategy’ in due course. 4. Consultation results will not be in the final plan</p>
R74	Margaret Kane	Kenilworth Rambling Club	-	1. Supports specific actions in Plan. 2. Questions need for replacing missing bridges. 3.		no change	<p>Thank you for your support and suggestions.</p> <p>The missing bridges we have highlighted are spread across the</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				Supports signposts with destinations. 4. Suggests establishing volunteer groups in other parts of the County.			county, and are ones where there absence leaves a significant gap or break in the network. We do believe it is essential to replace them.
R75	M Marlow	(Kenilworth)	-	1. Reports specific path problems. 2. Questions cost of proposed Two Castles Walk. 3. Suggests a widely available form for reporting path problems.		no change	<p>The route you refer to in Abbey Fields is a tarmac path which I believe is maintained by our transport colleagues. I will pass your comments on to the appropriate people.</p> <p>I have passed on your comments about the path near Dunns Pits Farm and asked someone to have a look at it.</p> <p>Developing a two castles walk will require more than just a waymarked presence on the ground. There are large issues to deal with such as where to cross the A46, and it is likely that additional sections of path will need to be created. In addition to that, there will be a cost associated with producing leaflets or a guide book. Whilst we can recoup some of the costs over time if we charge for the guidebook, we do require the money up front before we can commence the project. This action is dependent on us receiving additional funding and will only happen if we are successful in bidding for it. The money will not be taken out of our existing rights of way budget.</p> <p>We already have a form on-line for reporting path problems, which can be accessed at any library. Paper forms have been available from the Ramblers' Association for many years, and so we have not felt the need to design one ourselves, but I will bear it in mind for the future.</p>
R76	Gary Jeffery	(Pathlow)	-	1. Surprised that diverting footpaths away from dwellings and farm yards is not in the Plan.		no change	<p>The research results did show that Parish and Town Councils were generally in favour of moving paths away from dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>This was considered as we drafted the policy on Public Path Orders (Page 71 in the Draft CAROWIP). The high priority cases fall within several specific categories, linked to legislation, public safety or imminent danger to the path's existence. Under medium priority we included those cases where we believe the public can be best served. It is in this category that we have included instances where the town / parish council actively support a case. We decided that we should increase the priority of any proposed change which has the support of the local council, and not just restrict it to paths near dwellings and farmyards.</p>
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.	no change	Thank you for your support.

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R78	Sean Macmillan	(Stratford upon Avon)	Good readability.	1. Supports improvement, extension and development in the countryside. 2. Wishes to see paths diverted away from private residences.		no change	<p>The research results did show that Parish and Town Councils were generally in favour of moving paths away from dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>This was considered as we drafted the policy on Public Path Orders (Page 71 in the Draft CAROWIP). The high priority cases fall within several specific categories, linked to legislation, public safety or imminent danger to the path's existence. Under medium priority we included those cases where we believe the public can be best served. It is in this category that we have included instances where the town / parish council actively support a case. We decided that we should increase the priority of any proposed change which has the support of the local council, and not just restrict it to paths near dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>If a route away from a dwelling or farmyard offers a significantly better route for the public then it would be dealt with as a medium priority. Unfortunately, in many cases where a path runs through a garden, there no better alternative, and we cannot close a path unless it is not needed for public use.</p>
R79	Richard Preston	Worcestershire County Council and the Worcestershire Local Access Forum	Easy to follow and understand. Plan was very well structured.	1. Concerns over how the plan might be updated over its lifetime. 2. Thought the plan went away from Defra guidance in trying to encompass more than rights of way. 3. Believes more vision is needed e.g. should have an action to lobby government for legislation changes. 4. Keen to continue working together where authority areas adjoin.		no change	[response yet to be drafted]
R80	Alan F Cook	(Nuneaton)	Good readability, the graphical layout is good.	1. Disagrees with allowing four wheeled vehicles into rural countryside. 2. People's right of access to countryside should be measured by their numbers, not by money or lobbying influence.		no change	<p>We recognise that there is sometimes a conflict between motorised users of rights of way and pedestrians. Often, this is due to the surface not being able to handle the amount of use, and where our budget allows we will work to improve and renew the surface for all users. The government is currently looking at changes in the law to minimise the impact of motorised users on rights of way.</p> <p>We undertook a significant consultation in 2004, which showed us that the majority of users are not members of any particular groups. The results from this consultation have been used to help us develop this plan, and I am confident that we have the balance right between the various aspects of our work.</p>
R81	Keith Sheppard	The Lighthorne Society	Thorough and comprehensive study. Very	1. Parish Councils and user groups should be consulted as to location and development of		no change	Thank you for your suggestions for specific improvements in the Lighthorne area. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
			good readability.	circular trails. 2. Refers to specific improvements desired in Lighthorne. 3. Believes contingency plan needed if funding is not forthcoming. 4. Believes primary aim should be on maintenance and improvement, whilst getting non-users and minority groups into the countryside should be secondary and left to their associations and communities. 5. Believes fast-track pilot schemes should be set up to improve localities, and requests Lighthorne be one of those pilots.			<p>at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.</p> <p>We will welcome suggestions from Parish/Town Councils and local groups, but the details of the implementation of the plan remain to be finalised. The New Paths for Old scheme is intended to give landowners a better chance of achieving a path network which sits better with their farming practices – we have not anticipated Parish/Town Councils or other groups being in a position to apply for or fund changes to the network in this way. Where we take on a change proactively the Parish / Town Councils will always be consulted, and we will try to consult with other local groups (we are not always aware of such groups).</p> <p>We are aware that we may not be successful in bidding for additional funding. However, we will not simply be asking for more money from the coffers of the County Council, but will also be bidding to outside bodies, often in partnership with others, which should maximise our chance of success.</p> <p>If we do not achieve any additional funding, we will carry out those actions within the plan which are indicated as being achievable within existing resources.</p> <p>We have a duty under the Disability Discrimination Acts 1995 and 2005 to ensure that people with disabilities can access our services, and it is important that we do not confine our activities to existing countryside users. The service is funded by all the people of Warwickshire and they should all have the opportunity to enjoy our countryside.</p> <p>We have not yet identified specific schemes (other than the 'Quick Wins') as the plan has not yet been finalised. However, we will bear in mind Lighthorne's desire to be amongst the first beneficiaries of the plan.</p>
R82	Mark Burden	(CV32)	Good readability.	1. Believes money should be spent on maintenance, improvement and expansion of the network, rather than promotion, and that festivals, promotion and admin take second place. 2. Agrees with new links, use of verges, replacing missing bridges and adding greenways linking towns. 3. Believes action should be taken to reduce use of paths as dog toilets. 4. This is a chance		no change	<p>Whilst I appreciate your concern that practical work should come first, we must maintain a balance between the different aspects of our work. Promotion of the network is important as it maintains the interest in the countryside and prevents countryside access from becoming a minority activity. By encouraging more people into the countryside we can attract more funding, and also bring economic benefits to the area. The sums of money listed under additional funding are money which we will need to find from outside our core budget. If we are unable to source that money, we will not be able to carry out those actions within current resources.</p> <p>We have included measures to try to educate dog walkers, but we have no powers to enforce a ban on dog fouling. Whilst a bylaw</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				to provide an alternative to the car, with associated health, social and cost benefits. 5. Provides specific ideas as to the what he believes the plan should contain and requests that it is included.			could be put in place by a district or borough council, it would be very difficult to enforce and would probably not be seen as a priority. We have worked closely with colleagues preparing the Local Transport Plan (LTP), which will be published in parallel with this. Both plans take the view that walking and cycling is to be encouraged, and the LTP contains both a Walking Strategy and a Cycling Strategy which address issues around reducing reliance on cars. Thank you for your detailed analysis of the content of the plan. I have noted your comments.
R83	Roger Noyce	Stratford Ramblers	Good readability, thorough.	Welcomes the Festival of walks and offers assistance.		no change	Thank you for your offer of assistance. I will pass it on to my collage, Craig Williams, who organises the festival.
R84	Lise Evans	Advantage Alcester	-	1. Refers to Roger Noyce's comments. 2. Supports a Walks Festival.		no change	Thank you for your support.
R85	Nigel Jones	Countryside Agency	Clear and readily understood.	1. Research is needed into the needs of users with mobility limitations. 2. The plan has not addressed the need for more open space in the absence of access land.		<p>Page 20 Add to key references "By all reasonable means: inclusive access to the outdoors for disabled people (Countryside Agency 2005)".</p> <p>Page 22 Add category "A4 Further research" and add action A4a to read "Undertake research into the needs of users with disabilities, which can inform future actions." Resources = existing & partnerships, funding = £20, 000, timescale = yrs 1-2, partners = Countryside Agency, Disability groups, WCC (others)</p> <p>Add another action under A4b (to also be included in a new category "S13 Open space and green space", action S13a) to read "Undertake an assessment of current open space and green space provision within Warwickshire, so as to identify gaps in availability." Resources = existing & partnership, funding= £20,000, timescale = yrs 1-2 and yrs 3-4, partners = Countryside Agency, Other councils, Land managers</p>	<p>We have added an additional action specific to further research into the needs of disabled users. In preparing this plan we have looked carefully at both the Countryside Agency's own research and the demonstration ROWIPs undertaken by other authorities, as well as consulting the Local Access Forum. We therefore believe we have adequately considered the needs of users with mobility problems in preparing our CAROWIP.</p> <p>We recognise the value of good green space provision and the role of country parks as gateways to the countryside. We have therefore added another action point relating to further research in that area.</p> <p>We look forward to working with you on both of these additional projects and other actions within the CAROWIP.</p>

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
R86	Ron Weston	(Bedworth)	-	1. Specific suggestion for a new greenway in Bedworth.		no change	Thank you for your suggestions for a greenway in Bedworth. We will not be including specific schemes within the CAROWIP, but will keep a record of them with a view to looking at them when the CAROWIP takes effect.
	DEADLINE 22 Dec 06						
R87	Paul Tromans	(Aston Cantlow)	Good readability.	1. 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.		no change	<p>The research results did show that Parish and Town Councils were generally in favour of moving paths away from dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>This was considered as we drafted the policy on Public Path Orders (Page 71 in the Draft CAROWIP). The high priority cases fall within several specific categories, linked to legislation, public safety or imminent danger to the path's existence. Under medium priority we included those cases where we believe the public can be best served. It is in this category that we have included instances where the town / parish council actively support a case. We decided that we should increase the priority of any proposed change which has the support of the local council, and not just restrict it to paths near dwellings and farmyards.</p> <p>The purpose of 'New Paths for Old' is to allow the improvement of the network through linked changes which have benefits for the public. The scheme itself allows us to consider several linked changes at once, and has no affect on the priorities within policy CA3 other than to raise the priority to medium if there is public benefit.</p> <p>If a parish or town council actively supports a proposal or if there is a significant public benefit, it will be dealt with as a medium priority. However, such cases are generally of benefit solely to the landowner and, as such, it is only right that these changes are funded by the landowner who benefits.</p>
R87	John Ridgley	Harbury P3	-	1. Supports and welcomes several of the actions in the plan, and comments on several specific issues. 2. Offers support in achieving some of the actions.		no change	Thank you for your support for the CAROWIP, and your offers of assistance. I have noted the specifics you mention and we look forward to continuing to work together with the Harbury P3 group in the future.
R88	Helen Maclagan	WCC Museums Service		1. Requests mention is made of need to comply with specific wildlife and heritage legislation. 2. Requests an action to link GIS rights of way data with other relevant GIS data e.g. habitats, sites and monument record. 3.		Page 51 New action – R4e "Establish links between and share the rights of way dataset and other environmental datasets e.g. as habitat, species, archaeology." resources = existing, partnerships :	We already have a duty to consider the legislation which you mention. The CAROWIP seeks to set out those targets which we are setting ourselves above and beyond our statutory duties. It is for this reason that we have not added reference to the legislation. In particular, we have stated on page 67 of the Draft CAROWIP, in respect of our policies, that we do not seek to set out the law. One of the tasks still before us is to set down our working practices, and

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				Requests 'avoidance of erosion to archaeological sites' be added to criteria for New Paths for Old. 4. Requests Museum Service be added as a partner in certain actions. 5. Requests production of information linking to other topics of interest e.g. ecology, archaeology, geology.		<p>additional funding = 0, timescale = 3-4 yrs, 5+ yrs, key partners = WCC others, Heritage and environment professionals</p> <p>Page 71 Policy CA3 Add under medium priority "where a PPO is, in the opinion of WCC heritage or ecology professionals, necessary to safeguard an archaeological or ecological feature"</p> <p>Add WCC (others) to list of key partners under actions; H1e</p> <p>Add "Heritage and environmental professionals" to list of key partners under actions; E4b, E4d, H1e, S6b</p> <p>Add "WCC (others)" & "Heritage professionals" to list of key partners under action S2c</p> <p>New action S6e "Work with heritage and environmental professionals on promotional material which links together topics e.g. history, archaeology, wildlife" resources = existing, partnerships, funding = £5000 per publication, timescale = 1-2 yrs, 3-4 yrs, 5+ years, key partners = WCC others, heritage and environmental professionals.</p>	<p>it is here that it will be important to list our duties under the legislation.</p> <p>I have added, as you request, an action relating to the sharing of GIS data. This will be action R4e and will read "Establish links between and share the rights of way dataset and other environmental datasets e.g. as habitat, species, archaeology."</p> <p>The New Paths for Old Scheme is specifically about linked changes which can benefit both a landowner and the public. In the past, legislation has not permitted us to link such changes together. The criteria are therefore about when changes should be included under a scheme, rather than about whether a change should be made. We have added a sentence in our policy relating to PPOs (page 71 of the Draft CAROWIP) which would fall within medium priority – "where a PPO is, in the opinion of WCC heritage or ecology professionals, necessary to safeguard an archaeological or ecological feature."</p> <p>We have added "Heritage professionals" and "Environmental professionals" as partners in addition to WCC (others) as this will allow us to also work with external bodies. We are reluctant to use terms relating to the internal structure of WCC as this means little to anyone outside the organisation and may be liable to change within the lifespan of the CAROWIP.</p> <p>We have also added an action under S6 which reads "Work with heritage and environmental professionals on promotional material which links together topics e.g. history, archaeology, wildlife".</p>
R89		British Horse Society		response expected but not yet received			
R90		Country Land and Business Association		response expected but not yet received			
R91	Arthur Fowkes	Norton Lindsey Parish Council	Too long and extensive to be a practical working document.	1. Actions will be overtaken by other forces leading to changes in requirements. 2. Actions are not practicable within the budget allocation. 3. Would have preferred to see an annual action plan with revisions and extensions as conditions change. 4. Biggest issue is to		no change	We have prepared this plan in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which requires us to produce a plan of action. A timescale of ten years is the maximum given by the legislation and we anticipate producing the next Improvement Plan in five years, alongside the next Local Transport Plan (LTP). The guidance indicates that, in the future, Rights of Way Improvement Plans will be fully integrated within the LTP. We have indicated (page 65 of the CAROWIP) that the plan is likely to be reviewed in five years time, as well as setting out how we will produce an annual

	Name	Address/ Organisation	Overall opinion	Specific comments	Area relevance	Proposed changes	Outline proposed response
				keep paths in good repair. Most footpaths are not and require significant maintenance. 5. Systematic patrolling of rights of way has to be addressed if additional facilities are to be managed.			<p>'Statement of Intent' which will determine our actions for any one financial year.</p> <p>The CAROWIP itself is only 65 pages long, excluding the appendices, and we do not believe that to be excessive.</p> <p>We wrote the plan in the knowledge that we would not be able to undertake all the actions within existing budget or staffing allocations. We have indicated in the action plans where additional funding or staff time would be required. We would expect to bid for additional moneys outside our allocated budget, and to work in partnership with others to achieve targets.</p> <p>We have made significant improvements into the standard of the rights of way network over the past decade, and this plan will put in place the first systematic survey and regular monitoring arrangements.</p>

Table 3 – Revised policy on Antisocial behaviour and crime

Policy CA16: Antisocial behaviour and crime

In addition to the criteria set out in the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, WCC will only consider gating orders across public rights of way, or routes reasonably alleged to be rights of way (including adopted footpaths), as a last resort i.e. where other means of dealing with antisocial behaviour and crime have been exhausted (as envisaged by the legislation).

Where gating orders are made, the principle of 'least restrictive option', consistent with achieving a significant reduction in antisocial behaviour and crime, will be applied on a case-by-case basis, e.g. gates to be locked only between specified times of day and/or the order to be for a limited period of operation.

Gating orders in force will be reviewed periodically, and varied or revoked where the situation allows.

WCC will consult with its LAF and, through local advertising, those people in the locality who may be affected by the route as a utility path, as well as those people occupying properties in the immediate vicinity of the route in question.

Background

It is recognised that the gating of alleys and cut-throughs can be an effective means of reducing crime and antisocial behavior. However, in certain areas of the country, residents and local authorities have been frustrated by being unable to gate those back alleys that coincide with public rights of way (highways).

Government has recently introduced the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 that introduces the power for local authorities to make gating orders that will restrict public use. This new legislation clearly provides for the gating of highways in circumstances where other measures to control crime and antisocial behavior have been exhausted. However, it is not hard to envisage circumstances where the need to introduce such orders can be in conflict with other Council priorities contained within the LTP and the CAROWIP relating to sustainable travel, safer routes to school, health, and recreation. It is the responsibility of the Council to balance these interests in an evenhanded way. In particular the Council must fully research the facts before initiating any action.

Previously the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 introduced powers whereby routes could be permanently extinguished within areas designated by the Secretary of State as "high crime areas". To date these designations have largely been applied to inner city areas, and it is not envisaged that the use of these powers will be necessary in Warwickshire.

N.B. At the time of writing this policy the Regulations for gating orders have yet to be published, and the Act itself is not yet in force.