

NORTH YORKSHIRE
LOCAL ACCESS FORUM

17 August 2006

Prioritisation of Reported Problems

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To brief members on the proposal to manage reported problems on the public rights of way network on a priority matrix, based around the importance of the route and the severity of the problem

2.0 Background

- 2.1 Currently we know little about the type of problems that are reported and the time it takes to resolve them. Being able to measure and report on performance will help the section provide a more customer focused service.

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 The attached draft prioritisation Matrix shows the approach we wish to take. Currently we are resolving over 3000 problems a year but, in relation to individual reports, we are unable to provide the public with any detail regarding the length of time it will take to resolve the issue when they report it to us.
- 3.2 Prioritisation of reports currently takes place using officers experience and knowledge.
- 3.3 The intention is to split paths into 3 categories based on their importance and or level of use. The work to categorise the paths will be done using the CAM's data base and our GIS system. Officers will have the flexibility to change categories based on their local knowledge.
- 3.4 Problems will be defined A, B, C or D and we also intend to record Improvements that are requested. Treating the issue in this manner combined with the importance of the problem gives us the basis for our matrix. We have then assigned a period of time to each category of problem. These times are not set in stone; we intend to run with the system for 3 months as a trial and report back on our actual performance in 2007.
- 3.5 Finally on the last page of Appendix 1 are our proposed Performance Measures. It is clear that we will be unable to achieve the times set out in the matrix 100% of the time, therefore we have set ourselves targets, currently they range from 70% to 90%, again we will report back after the three month trial as to whether these are achievable.

3.6 It is our intention to be as transparent as possible regarding what we are doing and how we are doing it, to this end it is our intention to have reports from the system available on the web, with regular reports brought to the LAF, County and Local Liaison Groups.

4.0 Recommendation

- (a) The Local Access Forum comment on the proposal.
- (b) The Local Access Forum agrees that we pilot the Matrix from January 2007 and bring an initial report on performance to the meeting in May 2007 for discussion.

Contact Officer

Iain Burgess

Access and Rights of Way Manager

01609 532894

**NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
RIGHTS OF WAY AND ACCESS
DRAFT**

MANAGING REPORTED RIGHTS OF WAY PROBLEMS

The Rights of Way and Access Section manages 6200kms of public rights of way across the county. There are numerous maintenance and enforcement issues that arise and our aim is to address these in a way that gives priority to the type of route and the urgency of the problem. We will measure ourselves against the grid below, which gives an indication of how we will address your individual problem or concern.

PROBLEM SEVERITY	PATH STATUS			
		1	2	3
	A (High)	Within 5 working days	Within 10 working days	Within 15 working days
	B (Medium) (Ploughing/cropping and maintenance items)	Within 2 Months	Within 3 Months	Within 6 Months
	C (Medium) (Other enforcement)	Within 2 Months	Within 3 Months	Within 6 Months
	D (Low)	Within 3 Months	Within 6 Months	Basic maintenance Within 12 Months; position statements with monthly website updates
	I (Programmed Improvements)	Within 6 Months		
	I (Improvements – not Programmed)	No Timescale Requirement		

PROPOSED PATH STATUS DEFINITIONS

CATEGORY 1

- National Trails, The Yorkshire Wolds Way, Pennine Bridleway Pennine Way and Cleveland Way
- Routes formally promoted by the County Council
- Canal Towpaths and Riverside
- Paths known to have high-

CATEGORY 2

- Other promoted routes
- Routes within 0.5km of settlement boundary

CATEGORY 3

- Routes more than 0.5km from edge of settlement
- Dead end paths
- Duplicate routes currently not being used
- Low use routes

PROPOSED PROBLEM SEVERITY DEFINITIONS

HIGH SEVERITY (A)

Problem reported or identified by NYCC as an immediate or potential danger or nuisance to the public requiring priority action or other action that is time-limited

- Hung up tree or branch
- Potentially dangerous structure
- Electric fence across path
- Fallen tree completely blocking path or partially blocking bridleway
- Dangerous animal
- Aggressive landowner / intimidation
- Shooting near to or across path

MEDIUM SEVERITY (B) Ploughing/Cropping and maintenance items

Problems reported or identified by NYCC that do not present a danger to users

- Path obstructed due to undergrowth or overgrowth
- Missing signpost / replacement signpost
- Routine structure repair / replacement
- Disturbance of surface of a path
- Path obstructed due to growing crop
- Path reinstated but to less than minimum requirement

MEDIUM SEVERITY (C) Other enforcement items

Issues where action may be commenced quickly but may take longer to fully resolve

- Complete obstruction of path
- New or recent erection of fence across path
- New or recent encroachment
- New or recent unauthorised structure on path
- Electric Fence adjacent to path un-insulated / not signed

LOW SEVERITY (D)

Issues that can be classified as having minor impact on BVPI 178, technical infringements often reported only by user group survey, issues that can be addressed as and when resources available / in the area

- Path being used by public not on definitive line
- Horses on footpaths not causing damage
- Cycling on footpaths not causing damage
- Surface out of repair (non-specific danger)
- Signpost repair
- Structure improvement
- Requests for dog access
- Fallen tree on path where public are deviating around
- Path diversions, except where formal applications submitted
- A long-standing obstruction with the public happy to use alternative.

IMPROVEMENT (I)

All improvement works. A 6-month timescale is allocated once works are programmed.

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT / PUBLIC RESPONSE TO REPORTED ISSUES

1. Acknowledgement within corporate guidelines monitored through the sections software systems
2. Full response (which could be an initial acknowledgement) to members of the public, individual users and Parish Councils
3. Block reports / problems reported through user group surveys will have monthly update reports on the Council's website
4. Definitive Map Applications / Diversion and Extinguishment Application Registers are on the Council's website

OUR TARGETS ARE TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUE AS FOLLOWS

1. No of cat A1 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 90%
2. No of cat A2 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 80%
3. No of cat A3 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 75%
4. No of cat B1 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 80%
5. No of cat B2 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 70%
6. No of cat B3 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 75%
7. No of cat C1 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 80%
8. No of cat C2 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 70%
9. No of cat C3 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 70%
10. No of cat D1 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 70%
11. No of cat D2 issues reported / % addressed within timescale – Target 70%
12. No of cat D3 issues reported / No outstanding / Reduce by % Annually
13. No of Cat I (Programmed Improvements completed within 6 months) – Target 75%