

**EXECUTIVE BOARD – 22 SEPTEMBER 2015**

<b>Subject:</b>	Rights of Way Improvement Plan		
<b>Corporate Director(s)/ Director(s):</b>	David Bishop, Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director for Development and Growth Sue Flack, Director for Planning and Transport		
<b>Portfolio Holder(s):</b>	Councillor Nick McDonald, Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Growth and Transport		
<b>Report author and contact details:</b>	John Lee, Rights of Way Officer, Traffic and Safety Tel: 0115 8765246 Email: <a href="mailto:john.lee@nottinghamcity.gov.uk">john.lee@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</a>		
<b>Key Decision</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>Subject to call-in</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Reasons:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Expenditure <input type="checkbox"/> Income <input type="checkbox"/> Savings of £1,000,000 or more taking account of the overall impact of the decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Capital	
Significant impact on communities living or working in two or more wards in the City			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Total value of the decision:</b>	Nil		
<b>Wards affected:</b>	All		<b>Date of consultation with Portfolio Holder(s):</b> Throughout the process
<b>Relevant Council Plan Strategic Priority:</b>			
Cutting unemployment by a quarter			<input type="checkbox"/>
Cut crime and anti-social behaviour			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ensure more school leavers get a job, training or further education than any other City			<input type="checkbox"/>
Your neighbourhood as clean as the City Centre			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Help keep your energy bills down			<input type="checkbox"/>
Good access to public transport			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Nottingham has a good mix of housing			<input type="checkbox"/>
Nottingham is a good place to do business, invest and create jobs			<input type="checkbox"/>
Nottingham offers a wide range of leisure activities, parks and sporting events			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Support early intervention activities			<input type="checkbox"/>
Deliver effective, value for money services to our citizens			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Summary of issues (including benefits to citizens/service users):</b>			
The review and renewal of Nottingham's Rights of Way Improvement Plan provision will deliver improvements to the rights of way network which support sustainable transport options, the local economy, encourage healthy lifestyles and improve citizens' health and wellbeing.			
<b>Exempt information:</b> None.			
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>			
1 To review Nottingham's Rights of Way Improvement Plan adopted in 2007 (ROWIP1) against the matters identified at paragraph 5.1.2 below.			
2 To amend ROWIP1 by adoption of Nottingham's second Rights of Way Improvement Plan in the form attached to this report entitled ROWIP2 Adoption Draft 2015.			

**1 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

1.1 In November 2007 the City Council published ROWIP1 which had been formally adopted by the City Council the previous month. The publication of this document was in compliance with its statutory duty under section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. As required by the legislation, it contained a statement of action for improving and managing the local rights of way "off road" network (footpaths, cycle paths, byways, bridleways, canal towpaths and riverside walkways) to meet the current and future likely needs of the public. It was the City Council's intention at the time of its adoption that ROWIP1 would have a five year lifespan in line with the then Local Transport Plan (LTP1) and covered the

period 2006/7 to 2010/11, though the legislation requires that a rights of way improvement plan has to be reviewed (and, if necessary, amended) only every ten years (please see paragraph 5.1.1 below). In the light of the expiry of the five year period for ROWIP1 and other local circumstances, it is appropriate for ROWIP1 to be reviewed now and its amendment considered.

- 1.2 Since publication of ROWIP1, to help deliver a sustainable integrated transport system across Nottingham, there have been a number of changes to the City Council's transport objectives which are set out in the current Local Transport Plan (LTP). These objectives support the City Council's strategic priorities and emphasise the importance of an accessible, safe and attractive transport system. For example, improving cross-city transport link and access and infrastructure on pedestrian and cycle routes will encourage citizens to take up active travel options, be more physically active and improve health, wellbeing and quality of life. In turn, these improvements will support the local economy, businesses and economic growth.
- 1.3 To align the ROWIP process with the City Council's transport objectives and strategic priorities, a revised statement of action and policy listing has been incorporated into a new rights of way improvement plan (ROWIP2) which is attached to this report. These actions support the LTP, the Council Plan 2012 – 2015 (the new Council Plan 2015 – 2019 is due to be published later this year) and the Nottingham Plan to 2020 (Sustainable Communities Strategy). Additionally, Chapter 2 of ROWIP2 Adoption Draft 2015 includes a number of improvements made since ROWIP1 was published.

## **2 BACKGROUND (INCLUDING OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION)**

- 2.1 Statutory guidance produced by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) advises highway authorities of steps which should be taken to carry out the assessment. Amongst these are the collation and considerations of requests for improvements to the network and data on the condition of the network. The DEFRA guidance also advises that a survey be undertaken to assess the nature and scale of the present and future likely needs of the public in relation to the rights of way network. It further advises that the highway authority identifies other relevant information including other plans and strategies for the area and that the surveys be given sufficient publicity to ensure public awareness and participation.

### Preparation of the draft ROWIP 2: February to April 2013

- 2.2 To carry out an assessment of the matters identified at paragraph 5.1.2 below, between February and April 2013 a user questionnaire was made available on-line on the City Council's own website and the generic consultation web site, Nottingham Insight. With the help of the Nottingham Local Access Forum and the City Council's Park Rangers service, promotional posters were placed along primary walking, cycling and equestrian routes, along with libraries, health centres and information points providing details of where the questionnaire could be viewed and completed. In response 339 completed questionnaires and 4 separate responses were returned, and where appropriate and relevant, this information was included in the first draft ROWIP2. The questions and responses are replicated in Chapter 5 of ROWIP2 Adoption Draft 2015.

2.3 On 3 April 2014 Councillor Jane Urquhart, the then Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, approved the draft ROWIP2 for public consultation. The process of consultation took place in two stages as follows:

Stage 1: May to August 2014

2.4 In line with the guidance from DEFRA, between May and August 2014 the first ROWIP2 draft, along with an online survey, was made available for public inspection and comment via the City Council's and Nottingham Insight's web sites. Again, promotional posters provided details of where the draft ROWIP2 could be viewed and a response form completed.

2.5 The survey asked consultees whether the statement of actions in the draft ROWIP2 included sufficient improvements to make the rights of way network suitable for the present and future likely needs of the public, whether the draft ROWIP2 would increase the opportunities for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the authority's area and whether the draft contained sufficient emphasis on improving access for all including disabled users.

2.6 The survey also asked consultees to rank each individual action in the statement of actions in order of priority (high, medium or low).

2.7 Finally, respondents were invited to comment on the rights of way network, specifically and generally. (For the purpose of this report, the stage 1 survey is available to view at <http://gossweb.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/survey/rowip2>).

2.8 In total 33 consultation responses were received at this stage. Of these, 12 respondents ranked the individual actions in order of priority and also provided comments. 17 respondents provided comments only without ranking the actions in priority and 3 respondents ranked the actions in priority but did not provide comments. 1 response was received via email rather than through the online consultation.

2.9 The comments received from 28 respondents are summarised at Appendix 1, together with observations from the City Council's Rights of Way Officer on those responses. In summary the key points raised include the following:

- the need for departments to be more joined up when delivering improvements;
- the importance of providing clear information on how to report problems on the network;
- doing more to understand the specific needs of disabled users;
- being more aware of the potential impact on the environment and local communities when improving existing paths, creating new paths, carrying out summer maintenance and cutting back encroaching vegetation.

2.10 A number of comments were received from residents of the Nottingham Park Estate regarding proposals which may relate to the Park, although no specific proposals in the draft ROWIP2 would have affected the Park Estate.

2.11 In relation to the ranking of actions in order of priority, those considered by consultees at this stage to be the most important were (1) public paths orders/agreements to formally record public rights of way on the definitive map

and statement (2) clearly signing and publicising the network (3) maintaining and cleansing the network and (4) improving routes for walkers, cyclists and equestrians, including those with a disability. Full details of the survey responses in relation to the ranking of actions in order of priority is attached at Appendix 2.

- 2.12 All consultation responses received during the stage 1 consultation were considered, and where relevant and appropriate, were incorporated in the ROWIP2 second draft.
- 2.13 Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF) was set up pursuant to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. It is a statutory advisor to the City Council and includes representatives from landowner and rights of way user groups. NLAF has been involved in the preparation of ROWIP2 throughout. A NLAF ROWIP sub-group was set up in April 2013 to feed comments into the process and it was most recently consulted on the draft ROWIP2 in January 2015. Its comments were incorporated into the second draft ROWIP2 prior to its publication and the formal consultation between February and April 2015.

#### Stage 2: February to April 2015

- 2.14 On 4 February 2015 notice of the statutory consultation for the second draft ROWIP2 was published in two newspapers (Post Lite and Nottingham Post) circulating in the local area and ran from 4 February to 30 April 2015. Following a request from citizens in Dunkirk and Lenton Ward, the consultation was extended to the 18 May 2015. As above, the draft was available on-line and promotional posters provided details of where it could be viewed and a response form completed.
- 2.15 As with stage 1, the survey asked consultees to rank the individual actions in the statement of actions in order of priority (high, medium or low). The survey also invited comments on the rights of way network, specifically and generally. (For the purpose of this report, the stage 2 survey is available to view at <http://gossweb.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/survey/ROWIPfinalhys>).
- 2.16 In total 14 responses were received to this stage (12 in response to the on-line consultation and 2 by email). Of these 14 responses, 9 ranked the actions in order of priority and provided comments, 3 provided comments to the online consultation but did not rank the actions in order of priority and 2 provided comments only by email.
- 2.17 The comments received from the 14 respondents are summarised at Appendix 3, together with observations from the City Council's Rights of Way Officer on those responses.
- 2.18 In relation to the ranking of actions in order of priority, those considered by consultees at this stage to be the most important were (1) protecting and enhancing Nottingham's historic alleyways and (2) clearly signing and publicising the network. Full details of the survey responses in relation to the ranking of actions in order of priority is attached at Appendix 4.
- 2.19 Where appropriate and relevant, the consultation responses were incorporated into the ROWIP2 Adoption Draft 2015.

### **3 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED IN MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 ROWIP1 (and its statement of actions) could be retained in its current format. This option was however rejected for the following reasons:

- As detailed at paragraph 1.1 above, at the time of adopting ROWIP1 in November 2007 the intention was for a five year improvement plan (though the statutory requirement is to review the improvement plan after ten years i.e. for Nottingham, before November 2017). Therefore the existing ROWIP1 (including its statement of actions) is out of date and the assessment undertaken for ROWIP2 and consultation responses received bear this out;
- Changes to the Council's transport objectives and strategic priorities since 2007 have also rendered ROWIP1 obsolete.

### **4 FINANCE COMMENTS (INCLUDING IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE FOR MONEY/VAT)**

4.1 There are no direct financial implications or value for money issues arising from the recommendations within this report. Should Executive Board approve the ROWIP2 for adoption, the next stage will be to work with Area Committees, local citizens, residents and user groups to identify improvements to the rights of way network. The cost of an improvement scheme will be contained within the LTP allocations for rights of way, which is subject to ongoing review and change.

### **5 LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT COMMENTS (INCLUDING RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES, AND INCLUDING LEGAL, CRIME AND DISORDER ACT AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS)**

#### **5.1 Legal Implications**

5.1.1 Under section 60(3) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, the City Council is required to make a new assessment of the matters identified at paragraph 5.1.2 below, to review ROWIP1 and to decide whether or not to amend it. The legislation requires that these actions be carried out no later than ten years after publication of the first rights of way improvement plan (ROWIP1). For Nottingham this would be prior to November 2017.

5.1.2 The assessment must include the following:

- (a) the extent to which local rights of way meet the present and likely future needs of the public;
- (b) the opportunities provided by local rights of way (and in particular cycle tracks) for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the authority's area;
- (c) the accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted persons and others with mobility problems.

5.1.3 On a review of ROWIP1, the City Council must decide whether or not to amend it. If it decides to amend it, the revised ROWIP must be published as amended. If it decides to make no amendments to ROWIP1, it must publish a report of its decision and of the reasons for it.

5.1.4 The legislation requires that a draft rights of way improvement plan as amended shall be published, and a notice of how a copy of the draft can be inspected or obtained and representations made on it be published in two or more local newspapers circulating in their area.

5.1.5 The legislation also requires that before reviewing a rights of way improvement plan, the highway authority consults the Local Access Forum.. It requires that such other persons as the local authority may consider appropriate also be consulted.

5.1.6 Under delegation number 183 in the Scheme of Delegation the responsibility for preparing and publishing the ROWIP is delegated to the Corporate Director for Development and Growth jointly with the Director for Planning and Transport.

## 5.2 Crime and Disorder Act Implications

ROWIP2 Policy 29 provides that the City Council shall not implement an improvement scheme where advice from the relevant authorities shows it is likely to increase anti-social behaviour, crime or disorder. Additionally, Policy 26 promotes the City Council's *guide to public rights of way, planning and development* and the importance of public routes having good quality design, including the principles of "designing out crime".

## 6 SOCIAL VALUE CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The recommendations within this report do not have any implications for the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.

## 7 REGARD TO THE NHS CONSTITUTION

7.1 ROWIP2 includes a commitment to improve the rights of way network by making it more open, accessible and attractive which in turn will encourage more citizens to get out and about and enjoy Nottingham's rights of way network and open and green spaces. This will help the City Council deliver its priority for a healthy Nottingham and improve the quality of life of its citizens.

## 8 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

8.1 Has the equality impact been assessed?

(a) not needed (report does not contain proposals for new or changing policies, services or functions, financial decisions or decisions about implementation of policies development outside the Council)

(b) No

(c) Yes – Equality Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 5

8.2 Due regard will be given to the equality implications identified in the ROWIP's EIA and in the delivery of all rights of way improvement schemes. The EIA is attached to this report.

8.3 ROWIP2 gives particular emphasis to improving routes for disabled users where environmental and physical conditions allow, supporting the principles of “inclusive access” including appropriate gradients, ramps (as opposed to steps) no unnecessary physical barriers or other objects, sufficient resting points and clear signage, thereby making the rights of way network open, attractive and accessible by all.

## **9 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN WRITING THIS REPORT (NOT INCLUDING PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS OR CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION)**

9.1 None

## **10 PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT**

10.1 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000  
[www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/contents](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/contents)

10.2 Guidance on Rights of Way Improvement Plans, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs dated November 2007  
<http://archive.defra.gov.uk/rural/documents/countryside/prow/rowip.pdf>

10.3 Local Transport Plan (LTP3) [www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/transportstrategies](http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/transportstrategies)

10.4 Report to the meeting of the City Council held on 15th October 2007 entitled “Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2006/7 to 2010/11”  
<http://committee.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=155&MeetingId=769&DF=15%2f10%2f2007&Ver=2>

10.5 Minutes of the meeting of the City Council held on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2007  
[http://committee.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/Data/City%20Council/20071203/Agenda/\\$071015%20-%2030571.doc.pdf](http://committee.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/Data/City%20Council/20071203/Agenda/$071015%20-%2030571.doc.pdf)

10.6 Natural England [www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/inclusivetcm2-27716\\_tcm6-4032.pdf](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/inclusivetcm2-27716_tcm6-4032.pdf)

10.7 The Council Plan 2012 – 2015  
<http://gossweb.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/nccextranet/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=27471&p=0>

10.8 The Nottingham Plan to 2020 (Sustainable Communities Strategy)  
[www.onenottingham.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=5486gal](http://www.onenottingham.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=5486gal)

10.9 Delegated decision of Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation dated 3 April 2014

10.10 Questionnaires in 2013 and 2015 surveys on ROWIP2 (see paragraphs 2.7 and 2.14 of this report)

## **11 OTHER COLLEAGUES WHO HAVE PROVIDED INPUT**

11.1 Judith Irwin, Senior Solicitor, Planning and Environment

Tele: 0115 8764199  
Email: [judith.irwin@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:judith.irwin@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

11.2 Anthony Leafe, Engagement and Consultation Officer  
Tele: 0115 8763342  
Email: [tony.leaf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:tony.leaf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

11.3 Caroline Nash, Service Manager, Traffic and Safety  
Tele: 0115 8765243  
Email: [caroline.nash@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.nash@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

11.4 Pete Warren, Team Leader, Surveys, Data and Signal Design  
Tele: 0115 8765271  
Email: [peter.warren@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:peter.warren@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

11.5 Adisa Djan, Equality and Diversity Consultant  
Tele: 0115 8763132  
Email: [adisa.djan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:adisa.djan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)



**APPENDIX 1**

**Summary of written comments received to stage 1 consultation (May to August 2014)**

<b><u>Policy Number (where response is specific to a Policy)</u></b>	<b><u>Summary of comments</u></b>	<b><u>Officer observations on comments</u></b>
N/A	<p>I respect the effort that has gone into this document, it has much good content and reflects well on an authority that, even in these tough times, is doing the right thing in promoting alternatives to car use. HOWEVER pavements are rights of way too - should be one strategy for all? And there are often more problems with pavements (bad surfaces, A boards, illegally parked vehicles etc.) than on the actual rights of way network.</p> <p>Look at adapting surfaces to users, i.e. improving paths and tarmac for cyclists and wheelchairs. Eliminate potholes, move drain covers to kerb instead of in the road surface. Create cycle paths separate from main carriageway.</p> <p>As well as the current plans, I'd like to see specific details of new routes. For example: Making it mandatory to fit a cycle path alongside all new tram lines, and recommended along all new roads.</p>	<p>The ROWIP focuses on improvements to the off-road rights of way network (footpaths, bridleways etc) and therefore excludes on-road routes and pavements adjacent to the road. The Nottingham Cycle Action Plan 2012 – 2015 (and forthcoming Nottingham Cycle Design Guide) focuses on the design and improvements to on-road routes (<a href="http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/transportstrategies">www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/transportstrategies</a>). No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>The issue of A boards and other potential obstructions is covered by Policy 33 and vehicles blocking or parking on rights of way are dealt with under Policy 30. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>Draft ROWIP2 does not include site specific improvements and the reason for this is given at paragraph 1.1 of the Adoption Draft. Site specific improvements will form part of the next stage of the ROWIP2 process, including working with local communities, user groups and Area</p>

	<p>As somebody who might cycle more if the conditions were better this is wholly inadequate. If cyclists and pedestrians are to share when there are more than a handful of either there needs to be paths with decent widths. The River Leen route is nice enough, but not terribly wide and the new section looks like this will be particularly serious. Also stop using "motorcycle barriers" which make life difficult for cyclists and block access for people in wheelchairs.</p>	<p>Committees to identify improvements. Where appropriate, cycle and pedestrian paths have been provided along the NET Tram Lines 2 and 3. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>When constructing new rights of way, where environmental and/or physical constraints allow, the City Council follows national design standards, including widths, gradients and surface materials. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>Policy 24 provides where there is a locally identified need, and physically and/or environmental constraints allow, all new paths shall accommodate all users (mobility scooters, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians) including a suitable width, surface and no barriers. Policy 30 covers improving existing routes for walkers, cyclists, and equestrians including those with a disability. The use of motorcycle barriers and other objects which may impact on disabled users and cyclists is covered by Policy 27. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
N/A	Lack of ambition, confused strategies, poor interdepartmental communication, lack of positive leadership the public having major problems defining different people's responsibilities, poor communication,	Policy 25 (and table 25): Regarding poor communication and contact ability, all new signage will include information on where to report a problem. The remaining points are

	poor contact ability. I feel fresh thinking and a new approach to push forward ROWIP2 and for the Nottingham City Council to comply with its statutory duty.	generic comments. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	<p>Are we to have a path on the north bank of the Trent east of Trent Bridge? This has been talked about for so long.</p> <p>Extend the scope to include the routes east of the city along A52, Holme Pierrepont, Sandy Lane, up to Grantham Canal and along the Grantham canal. Including the redevelopment area of Cotgrave works.</p> <p>Well done for what has been done. Can we have more please, e.g. open the old mineral line from the new Gedling Country Park to Colwick Country Park. Also from Bestwood Country Park to Calverton.</p>	These comments relate to improvements outside of Nottingham City and are therefore outside the scope of the ROWIP2. These have been referred to Nottinghamshire County Council. Where joint working is required, Policy 30 includes a commitment to work with neighbouring councils to develop long distance routes. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	More waste bins and dog mess notices, quick clean-up of glass on cycle paths.	The problem with dog fouling was highlighted in the assessment process and Policy 28 covers this issue. Additionally, dog fouling “hot spots” on rights of way are referred to the City Council’s Neighbourhood Services to be included in the Fido neighbourhood cleansing programme. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	I like to walk around the lakes but, as I am disabled, it would be very much easier if there were more benches at reasonable distances apart instead of all in one place	This relates to Colwick Country Park and was forwarded to the Council’s Parks and Open Spaces service area. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Fishermen often block the canal with their long poles	This has been forwarded to the Canal and River

	and fishing paraphernalia. They act as though they own the canal.	Trust who are responsible for the management of the Nottingham and Beeston canal. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	I think it is a political tool being used by power hungry individuals to further their own personal motives.	This is a generic comment. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
Policy 25 (Signing and way marking).	<p>[The City Council should carry out] consultation with landowners before cycle routes and maps are handed out by Nottingham City council.</p> <p>In order to let citizens know where they can legally walk.....the City Council should ensure that Ordnance Survey is given sufficient information to enable public rights of way to be shown on the 1:50,000 and 1:25,000 maps (for example the footpaths through Colwick Woods</p>	<p>This relates to the Nottingham cycle maps North and South which include routes through the Park Estate. These routes have been removed from the cycle maps. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>Policy 25 amended to read as follows: Keep Ordnance Survey records up to date with modifications to the network as required.</p>
N/A	Many paths will never be fit for disabled people because they are unfit for able bodied walkers. Not enough is done to ensure paths are fit for use.	Improving routes for disabled users and promoting “access for all” and the “least restrictive option” is adequately covered by Policies 24, 27, 28, 30 and 33. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	None of the 13 actions listed have quantifiable actions associated. For this to be effective and useful you need to explain what you are going to do, and how you will meet the actions. I would suggest targets, and defined actions rather than vague statements to 'identify priorities...'	The reason for not including “quantifiable actions” within ROWIP2 is explained under paragraph 1.1 of the Adoption Draft. Site specific improvements will form part of the next stage of the ROWIP process, including working with local communities, user groups and Area Committees to identify local needs and carrying out

		improvements as necessary. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	[The ROWIP] should include commitments to define what you are going to change. i.e. what are the activities you will undertake to improve ROW A or path B.	As above. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Design standards setting out what kind of surface routes should have, minimum widths, amount of signage, information in signs etc.	When constructing new paths, where environmental and/or physical constraints allow, the City Council follows national design standards, including widths, gradients and surface materials.  Information on rights of way signage (including where to report a problem) is included under Table 6 of the ROWIP and is supported by Policy 25. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
N/A	NCC should concentrate on allocating cycle lanes throughout the city first, on public roads. Woeful lack of cycling provision.	This is a generic comment. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
Policy 24 (creating new public rights of way)	"Paths should provide circular routes ...". The survey design was fundamentally flawed and the conclusion that recreational walkers outnumber purposive walkers is unjustified. Therefore, the policy to provide circular routes as opposed to linear routes has no basis. Increasing recreational walking will not reduce car usage, but promoting foot commuting will reduce traffic congestion and carbon emissions. Linear paths are required to encourage purposive walking to and from	Policy 24 and table 7 amended to read as follows: recreational routes should be circular as opposed to linear and commuter routes should be as direct as possible, follow key desire lines and link to other key routes.

		places of work and study. The River Leen linear park should be made a priority.	
N/A		Pedestrian access to the first tram line was ignored in the planning stage and was inadequate at some stops. Plans for the two new tram lines should be inspected to check whether lessons have been learnt	As part of the NET Tram Lines 2 and 3, the City Council's Traffic and Safety service is carrying out safety audits on all proposed paths and "as built" inspections on all newly created paths. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.
Policy (publication ROWIP)	21 of	The objections raised in January 2011 & July 2010 i.e. my representations on the LTP(3) & its Challenges and Options stage, still stand.	<p>Having reviewed the objections raised to the LTP3 consultation, the paragraph which appears to be the most relevant to the consultation for ROWIP2 is as follows: <i>development of multi-user paths linked to flood defence schemes</i>** - <i>'Paths' that weren't previously there can bring-in a set of problems/ unwanted blights.</i> - <i>This** would be an awful harming act against wildlife, Nature and aesthetics, if it were applied to the Fairham Brook corridor in and around the local area here.</i></p> <p>There is already a public footpath (also used by cyclists) running along Fairham Brook between Silverdale and Clifton and there are no plans as part of the ROWIP process to create new paths along this watercourse.</p> <p>Subject to approval from the City Council's Executive Board, Policy 21 is a commitment to publish ROWIP2. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>

<p>Policy 22 (applications to modify the Definitive Map and Statement).</p>	<p>It follows that pushing-for paths and access 'here, there 'n' everywhere' wouldn't be/ isn't always beneficial/positive.</p>	<p>Policy 22 indicates what priority may be given amongst applications which have been submitted under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The duty of investigation itself is a statutory duty. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
<p>Policy 24 (creation of new public rights of way).</p>	<p>Robust consultation and/or planning rules ought to be observed - rather than 'creation of new public rights of way' regularized retrospectively (cite e.g. Clifton Wood rubble-track); on its proposed Action[s], constraints requires emphasis, so not to allow where inappropriate/ contentious; objection, footpaths ought not be blanket-recorded as bridleway or byway - altered in this way, away from their present context inter alia.</p> <p>Having looked through the proposed policies and actions we are very concerned, and so this is an objection to Policy 24 Action - Box 4, as we envisage parts of Clifton's semi-rural environment being eroded through this plan/proposal.</p>	<p>Policy 24 amended to read as follows: The City Council shall, subject to all statutory highway and planning requirements, and where there is an identified benefit to local citizens and users of the network, use its discretionary powers under the Highways Act 1980 to make Orders and Agreements to formally record public rights of way on Nottingham's definitive map and statement.</p> <p>A reply has been sent to the citizen explaining that there are no plans affecting Clifton (Trent Valley Way) and in the event that the City Council receives a request to upgrade a footpath to a bridleway or byway (to legally accommodate equestrians and cyclists as well as pedestrians) full public consultation will be carried out as part of the formal process. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>

<p>Policy 25 (signing and publicity)</p>	<p>Clifton, Silverdale &amp; Wilford, Grove Farm/R. Trent, area(s), with their semi-rural and green space aspects require an understated, low-key treatment and approach, so that frontline countryside isn't objectionably eroded/urbanized; in this regard certain sensitive locations don't want (overly) promoting so not to spoil their tranquillity and/or biodiversity.</p>	<p>Policy 25 is a commitment to adequately sign, waymark and promote public rights of way. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
<p>Policy 27 (use of barriers on rights of way)</p>	<p>Off-road motorbikes, and fly-tipping, are a problem/blight, to curtail in the Clifton area.</p>	<p>Dealing with motorcycles, the use of motorcycle barriers and other objects which may impact on disabled users and cyclists is covered by Policy 27. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
<p>Policy 28 (maintenance and cleansing)</p>	<p>Cutting-back 'vegetation' [native flora &amp; biodiversity] isn't necessarily the way forward, what about instead sensitive litter-picking.</p>	<p>Litter picking would not address vegetation which encroaches on and/or obstructs a path. However, for clarify Policy 28 has been amended to read as follows: Keep routes open and accessible by cutting back marginal vegetation at least 3 times per year (generally between April and September) taking account of the potential impact on wildlife and habitats, the conservation status of the site/area and relevant guidance.</p>
<p>Policy 29 (crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour)</p>	<p>Sensitive thought to locality [its] surrounding environment [dark(er) landscape] concerning light-pollution/lighting, 'helpful to see this included in the policy.</p>	<p>ROWIP2 already provides for requests for street lighting to be considered on a case by case basis taking into account the local circumstances and potential light pollution No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>



<p>Policy 30 (Improving routes for all users including those with disabilities)</p> <p>Policy 31 (Improving health, wellbeing and quality of life)</p> <p>Policy 33 (street clutter and “clutter busting”)</p>	<p>Table 2: scheme /Figure 22: Objection, the Fairham Brook [semi-rural/ wildlife] watercourse &amp; its corridor ought not to be urbanized in any way.</p> <p>[Section 3.3, page 12] [bullet 5]: It ought to be recognized that ‘Quality of life’ regarding ‘natural environment, needs not to erode or damage continuity / accustomations [extant] sense of place and sense of escape.</p> <p>Clutter mustn’t impair e.g. outer-suburb and/or Greenbelt/greenspace aesthetics either.</p>	<p>There are no improvement plans for this river corridor. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
<p>N/A</p>	<p>The ROWIP reads very well and covers and summarises all the main issues and opportunities that arise from Nottingham’s public rights of way and wider access network. As you are obviously aware, users of the network don’t stop at the administrative boundary between the City and the County, and there are a number of cross boundary issues and opportunities. A number of these have already been addressed; however, I hope that we (including the two Local Access Forums) can continue to work together on these matters to improve opportunities for all. I note</p>	<p>No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>

	<p>that there are some ambitious but hopefully achievable actions in your Statement of Action, and in my view, you have covered all the main functions and issues.</p> <p>In summary, the ROWIP is an excellent, very well presented and useful document highlighting both your statutory responsibilities and the wider opportunities with the ultimate aim of improving access for all members of the community.</p>	
N/A	<p>7 identical responses received with the following content:</p> <p>I am concerned about proposals that may relate to the Nottingham Park Estate as I feel that these would fundamentally change the nature of the environment and its impact on an historic conservation area.</p> <p>We have read the above document on the council's web site. On the whole we are in agreement in principle with the improvements. However, can you confirm whether or not it is the council's hope to include the Park Estate in the document, bearing in mind the recent details of a Cycle Route through the Park, published on the web site, published as a leaflet and about which, I understand, members of the Board of Nottingham Park Estate knew nothing.</p>	<p>A reply was sent to each of the consultees asking for further details of the specific proposals which may relate to the Nottingham Park Estate. To date, no responses have been received. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>A reply was sent to each of the consultees confirming there are no specific plans which affect the Park Estate. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
N/A	<p>I was pleased to see to-day that progress is being made in clarifying rights of way and continuing to improve the condition of certain paths and rights of way. Subject to the usual financial constraints, could I</p>	<p>A reply was sent to the citizen explaining that the ROWIP is not intended to provide site specific improvements for the reasons given above. In the event that funding is made available, this</p>

	<p>ask you to view the terrible and dangerous condition of the path from the car park down to the riverside path in Clifton Village which has continued to deteriorate since I explained the situation to you last year, There are now deep ruts of up to 8/9 inches towards the bottom of the path which is constantly flooded in the Winter months. I hope you can improve the situation in this attractive green belt area.</p>	<p>section of bridleway will be considered for improvements. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p>
N/A	<p>I was cycling along the canal towpath adjacent to London Road and saw the notice of consultation posted there. On Trent Bridge and many other similar stretches / examples where there is a wide pavement, cyclists should be encouraged (and in fact required) to use the pavement and this could be made expressly clear by dividing the pavement into pedestrian and cycling halves. At its simplest it is a white line and a couple of signs. So wouldn't cost much.</p> <p>Following receipt of reply from City Council, the consultee commented further as follows: I can see why Trent Bridge is difficult. The principle still holds for other pavements where the roads are not suitable for cyclists.</p>	<p>Reply sent to the consultee advising that overall, the cost to convert the height of the parapets on Trent Bridge would be substantial and parts of the outbound footways would need to be widened therefore making this quite an expensive scheme to implement. No change made to the first draft ROWIP2.</p> <p>The design and suitability of cycle routes on the road and pavement will be covered by the Nottingham Cycle Design Guide due to be published later this year.</p>

### APPENDIX 3

#### Summary of written comments received to stage 2 consultation (February to May 2015)

<u>Policy Number (where response is specific to a Policy)</u>	<u>Summary of comments</u>	<u>Officer's observations on comments</u>
N/A	<p>I am up in NG6 7AS and would highlight the fact that cyclists or bikers frequently ride around on the roads and pavements without lights. Very often in the pitch dark and wearing black or dark coloured clothing. Making them very hard to spot if you are driving a car. Also when they come up behind you riding on the pavement – when you are walking along.</p> <p>These people are a menace to both themselves and to others on the public highway, be it the pavement or the road. Frequently very young people and teenagers. Sometimes older people.</p> <p>Low Wood Road, Apollo Drive and Armstrong Road are the areas where I have seen it most frequently.</p> <p>The council needs to operate a strong and vigorous campaign to ensure that road safety amongst cyclists is enforced and the culprits apprehended.</p>	<p>This is a generic comment which refers to cycling on roads and pavements and is not therefore within the scope of the ROWIP. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.</p>

	The police should also be strongly encouraged, by the council, to mount a campaign on this subject.	
N/A	I know I have missed the consultation period but for many years I've enjoyed the walk up the canal towpath from Meadow lock at Trent Bridge into City centre. Increasingly am shocked by the dog mess from Meadow Lock to beyond the first bridge. We hope some procedure will be written into the new plans for this area to deter a flagrant disregard of dog owners civil responsibility towards our environment! Is this to do with increased presence of moored houseboats and their dogs possibly being allowed to roam?	This has been forwarded to the Canal and River Trust who manage the Nottingham and Beeston canal.  Additionally, based on the responses to the User Questionnaire, Policy 28 provides that by working with Area Committees and local communities to identify paths where dog fouling is persistent, the City Council will carry out enforcement and/or publicity / education campaigns to deal with the problem. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Regarding the notice which I have seen on the footpath which runs from Kingsdown Mount, and adjoins the footpath maintained by Broxtowe Council, I have spoken to you in the past regarding the unsatisfactory state of this path. The steps have been most beneficial for walking, but are now beginning to deteriorate. Needless to say this part leading up to the steps is and has always been very rough, and in a dangerous state during the winter and even in the summer if there is rain.	Funding from the LTP to improve this section of footpath (including the steps) has been approved. Subject to no changes to the budget stream, the work will be carried out during 2015/16 financial year. The consultee has been advised. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.

N/A	I would like to see more cycle / walking trails created using old railway lines. These would be ideal for able bodied and disabled users alike due to their flat terrain. Lines such as the old mineral line from the former Gedling Colliery etc would be ideal.	There is one disused rail corridor in Nottingham which runs adjacent to Hucknall Road, from Arnold Road to the city boundary with Ashfield. This route was identified during ROWIP1 and the surface has been upgraded and signage installed (see figure 3, page 4 of ROWIP2). No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Stop building on all our green belt and maintain our parks to a decent standard. Reinstate the footpaths on Broxtowe Park and commit to never building on it!	This is a generic comment and does not refer to the rights of way network. However, as part of ROWIP1 the City Council formally adopted "A guide to public rights of way, planning and development" ( <a href="http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/transportstrategies">www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/transportstrategies</a> ) No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Almost no mention of Broxtowe Country Park where many of the footpaths have almost completely washed away, even the new path has been overgrown in parts. There are several leaning trees in danger of falling down onto the paths.	During June 2015 the main path through Broxtowe Country Park was inspected and no erosion issues were identified. The trees have been reported to the City Council's Parks team. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	There needs to be more focus on how these connect with main infrastructure (existing roads). It is fine improving the paths but only if they connect at both ends.	This is covered by Policies 24 and 30. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.

Policy 25 (signing and way marking)	Need to provide walking routes throughout the city as open data as part of the councils commitment to Open Data. Need to ensure the data set used by Walkit.com for walking routes in the Greater Nottingham area is accurate and up to date - at least a 6 monthly review. Need a commitment to cross boundary working with the Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure effective maintenance and signing of routes throughout "Greater Nottingham" the Big Wheel area.	The Self-Guided Walking Leaflets produced by the Nottingham Local Access Forum for Wollaton Park, Martins Pond LNR and Colwick Woods LNR are available on line at <a href="http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localaccessforum">www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localaccessforum</a> <a href="http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/awalkinthepark">www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/awalkinthepark</a> <a href="http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/article/23089/Walking-in-Nottingham">www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/article/23089/Walking-in-Nottingham</a> and <a href="http://www.nottsguidedwalks.co.uk">www.nottsguidedwalks.co.uk</a> . Since 2007 a number of LTP funded signing schemes have been completed across Greater Nottingham, "the Big Track" ( <a href="http://www.thebigwheel.org.uk/maps/big-track/">www.thebigwheel.org.uk/maps/big-track/</a> ) and associated routes. The new footbridge across "the Loop" at Colwick Park, linking Gedling Borough to Nottingham, was built in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	About the dog mess problems, there only seems to be an entry for "cleansing" - so why aren't there more of those red bins to be installed? How can we expect dog owners to be more responsible, when they can cite the lack of bins for not bothering to clear the mess?	This is covered by Policy 28. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Any temporary diversions to rights of way should be adequately signed. Often, if there is signage for say a shared use pedestrian/cycle route, then any diversions are only showing what pedestrians should do - cyclists are forgotten.	This is a generic comment. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.
N/A	Opening up more of Wollaton Park with footpaths whilst still respecting the wildlife.	The paths through Wollaton Park are permissive as opposed to public (see paragraph 4.2, page 17 of ROWIP2).

	<p>Shared use for cyclists and walkers is not the answer, it is not ideal for either party. Segregation is required.</p> <p>As a cyclist A Frame Barriers are horrific, other means should be used. I have in the past had to un-wedge a pensioner and his bike from one.</p>	<p>During the design stage of new cycle paths and infrastructure, the availability of space and the safety of users of shared and segregated routes are included in a Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>The use of barriers and other objects on rights of way is covered by the City Council's separate "Policy on the use of barriers on rights of way". Policy 27 includes reference to the barrier policy. No change made to the amended draft ROWIP2.</p>
--	---	--