

NORTH YORKSHIRE  
LOCAL ACCESS FORUM

WEDNESDAY 27<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2012

NYCC REVIEW OF THE RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2 –  
DRAFT RESPONSE OF THE FORUM.

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to set out and agree the response to be made by the Local Access Forum to officers on the review of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

2.0 RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONS WITHIN THE CONSULTATION

2.1 *Consultation Question 1*

Yes The public were asked for their suggested improvements to the RoW system in the RoWIP 1 questionnaire. Many replies came in and appear in an unpublished schedule to the plan implementing these should be given more prominence in RoWIP 2.

*Consultation Question 2*

Yes but unless they are republished as part of RoWIP 2 they will be forgotten or ignored.

*Consultation Question 3*

Yes

*Consultation Question 4*

Yes

*Consultation Question 5*

No

*Consultation Question 6*

See comments section below

*Consultation Question 7*

More than enough

*Consultation Question 8*

See comments below

3.0 SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE CONSULTATION DRAFT

3.1 (page numbers refer to those in the LAF Agenda for the 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2012 meeting)

### **Section 5 Objectives**

#### **1. Accessibility**

Add a reference to improving access to access land

#### **2. Usability**

P4 For the purposes of public information would it be appropriate to mention the DEFRA guidance on gaps, gates stiles and the removal of obstacles?

#### **3. Maintenance**

P8 As well as concentrating on local community paths and links to neighbouring communities and the other points made in this objective we would like to see a mention of upgrading some paths that allow access to more isolated areas of countryside to encourage greater use of the 'outer' network . (see also consultative question 4 below)

P10 Reword to: Maximise the efficient and effective use of volunteers, including user groups, in delivering appropriate improvements to the network and provide appropriate training, supervision and support for all volunteers and ensure job satisfaction.

#### **8. Safety**

P25 Reword to: Engage with partners across all transport networks to promote the safety of all user classes and in particular provide, where possible, off road passages to avoid non-motorised users having to travel on roads with no separation from the main traffic streams.

Page 89

Table 1 From LTP SEA Objectives to RoWIP Sustainability Checklist Objectives

Para 13 Minimise community severance Remove  
Whilst severance is unlikely to be caused by RoW, can RoW help minimise severance?

Para 14 Either add all users of rights of way in the first column or more appropriately reword the final objective to show that the aim covers all legal users of RoW.

Consultation question 1 (page 87)

No it looks quite comprehensive.

Consultation question 2 (page 91)

We don't know enough about the assessment to comment.

Consultation question 3 (page 93)

Subject to the comment on original para 13 on page 90 –  
see above Yes

Consultation question 4 (page 95)

The bullet points (pages 94 to 95) need further attention and suggestions are set out below. If the bullet points remain in the next draft they should be numbered as they are then easier to refer to.

Bullet point 1 Construction this should also include maintenance. There should be a code of conduct for contractors doing work on new or existing RoW.

Bullet point 2 Illumination of routes should only be in built up areas or possibly dangerous passages along well used country roads. There is a wide enough choice of lighting equipment now to prevent light pollution.

Bullet point 3 it should be obvious that if each project is to be judged against the RoWIP objectives it will frequently come within more than one objective. The total benefit can then be used to judge the negative effects.

Bullet point 4 agreed amend objective P17. Consider adding 'ensure all waste is disposed of legally and in an environmentally sensitive and/or sustainable way.

Bullet point 5 We agree with the comment made. There is a legal obligation to maintain and although there is a priority matrix work can't just be limited to the higher priorities or no work would be done outside the main routes.

Bullet point 6 It is a difficult term to define and it might be easier to convey the objective without using this controversial word?

Bullet point 7 We prefer the second suggestion as it would seem to have more force.

Bullet point 8 We agree with the suggestion.

Bullet point 9 Yes and perhaps add something to the effect: and by seeking to have 'rollback agreements' in place where erosion will occur and it may not be possible to control it by normal methods.

Bullet point 10 Its important that this area does not get too protective. Warning that a route might be subjected to flooding may be a good idea but is it really needed.

Bullet point 11 Yes but is there a better word than 'townscape'. Do not tarmac the countryside!

Bullet point 12 We agree with the comment but not sure the solution is correct. Define what you are trying to do:

Make passing the works easy for the user while the works are taking place.

Improving the route by the work – this is surely already covered?

Bullet point 13 Is this not covered by P18? It could probably be affected by adding 'environment' after 'natural' in P18 and deleting P19.

#### 4.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

- 4.1 More pollution is more likely to be caused in the long term by not maintaining RoW, than by maintaining them, even taking into account the pollution caused during maintenance.
- 4.2 Does improving BOATS so that more vehicles use them increase pollution?
- 4.3 The objectives seem to work on the principle that you use RoW for a reason. Surely the greatest use of RoW is for pleasure and this should have greater acknowledgement in the document.