

Rights of Way Management Plan 2018 – 2026

Draft ROWMP consultation

Summary of comments

APPENDIX 1

Contents

1.0	Nottinghamshire's ROWMP consultation January to April 2018	3
2.0	Summary of results from consultation	3
3.0	Question 3 – additional comments relating to the assessment of users needs	4
4.0	Question 5 – additional comments relating to the network assessment	6
5.0	Question 6 – a question asking respondents to prioritise on the ROWMP's six key aims	7
6.0	Question 8 - additional comments relating to policies and procedures	8
7.0	Question 9 – a question asking respondents to prioritise on the actions in the Statement of Action	13
8.0	Question 10 – Are there any other issues you would like to see covered in the ROWMP?	14
9.0	Copy of draft ROWMP consultation form	24

1.0 Nottinghamshire's ROWMP consultation January to April 2018

As part of the consultation process for Nottinghamshire's draft Rights of Way Management Plan, consultees were asked to complete an online comments form which consisted of ten questions. The form included open and closed questions including the opportunity to make general observations. Consultees were also invited to prioritise on the actions detailed in the draft Plan's Statement of Action.

2.0 Summary of results from consultation

Question	Response
Q1. Do you support the general principles of the Plan?	Yes - 97%
Q2. Do you think research in support of the draft ROWIP included an adequate assessment of users needs?	Yes - 93%
Q3. Any comments relating to Q2?	Yes – 23%
Q4. Do you think an adequate assessment of the rights of way network in Nottinghamshire was made in producing the draft ROWIP?	Yes - 97%
Q5. Any comments relating to Q4?	No
Q6. A question asking respondents to prioritise on the six key aims of the ROWIP.	-
Q7. Do you agree with the policies and procedures outlined in chapter 6 of the draft ROWIP?	Yes - 90%
Q8. Any comments relating to Q6?	Yes - 38%
Q9. A question asking respondents to prioritise on the actions in the Statement of Action.	-
Q10. Are there any other issues you would like to see covered in the ROWIP?	Yes - 53% added additional comments (see attached)

3.0 Question 3 – additional comments relating to the assessment of user needs

<i>Comment made by:</i>	<i>Comments summary</i>	<i>NCC response</i>	<i>Text amended</i>
	<p>Section 4.3 dog walkers, I live near the tram route I have lost a lovely walk which used to be the old tram route.</p> <p>Your ROWMP would help if it could feed the suggestion for an off lead dog parks in Nottingham be established. Your plan is helpful and knowledgeable but could do more.</p> <p>Your appendix 1 shows that land managers have highlighted fowling dogs as their top priority. Yet you have no solutions, bins are difficult to manage,</p> <p>Section 7. 1.4 your aims first bullet point could be addressed if you provide well thought out Off-secure areas for dog walkers, funded by membership which could address another one of your bullet point for funding. If you need help with this point I'd be happy to join you as I am a resident of Rushcliffe and need a safe place for my dogs.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Willing to discuss issues with respondent and District Council.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>
	Sorry, surely you could have come up with a shortened version, who has time to read 148 pages!	Executive summary available.	No
	Very likely, although it is hard to tell. There does not seem to have been much publicity locally.	Noted	No
	More could be done to create safe off road walking or cycle paths to encourage more children and inexperienced walkers/cyclists to exercise safely and in a healthy environment away from traffic fumes	Noted	No
	Parts of Nottinghamshire have very poor bus links even in the week. Shamefully the villages north of, Collingham had better bus links back in the 1980's than to-day! this is just one example	Noted	No
	Results were based on existing statistics. How many users were actually quizzed on their opinions and use of the Rights of Way	Extensive surveys and research were undertaken in the Pilot Plan and the 1 st Plan. Recent surveys background	No

		information has been gleaned from users groups, the Local Access Forum and general correspondence to NCC's Countryside Access Team.	
	<p>The Plan says the "The most popular activities are cited as walking and cycling although horse riding continues to be a popular activity...".</p> <p>Whilst cycling is a more popular activity than horse riding many cyclists only ride on the road network. Horse Riding may well be a more popular activity than cycling on the PROW network.</p> <p>Your plan needs to reflect that reality. That is certainly the impression I get from using the bridleways in the county. Elsewhere the plan refers to the "prevalence of Mountain bikes". I don't think mountain bikes are prevalent over road bikes. In recent years there has been a relative decline in mountain bike sales as against road bikes.</p>	<p>Mountain biking is wide spread throughout the County but is particular popular in the former Dukeries estates.</p> <p>Agreed road bikes are very popular but this Plan focus is on countryside access.</p>	No

4.0 Question 5 – additional comments relating to the network assessment

<i>Comment made by:</i>	<i>Comments summary</i>	<i>NCC response</i>	<i>Text amended</i>
	No comments received for this question.		

5.0 Question 6 – a question asking respondents to prioritise on the ROWIP’s six key aims

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Aim</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
Aim 1	To protect, maintain and seek to enhance the network for all lawful users	1
Aim 2	To improve access to the network for all, including those with visual impairment and mobility problems, by adopting the principle of the least restrictive option	3 (joint)
Aim 3	To improve the safety and connectivity of the metalled road network with the rights of way network	4
Aim 4	To increase awareness of the network and the understanding of the wider benefits arising from its use, such as leading an active and healthy lifestyle, and making a positive contribution to the local economy	5
Aim 5	To provide a revised and updated definitive map and statement, with particular reference to the resolution of map anomalies and support for the ‘Lost Ways’ project	2
Aim 6	To enhance and increase community involvement in managing and improving the network	3 (joint)

6.0 Question 8 - additional comments to relating to policies and procedures

Comment made by:	Comments summary	NCC response	Amend text
	An online version of the Definitive Map and Statement would be useful. If it is, publicising it may encourage more people to use the network.	The Definitive Map is a hard copy kept at County Hall and is available to view by appointment. A working non-definitive copy is available to view online at www.rowmaps.com	Yes
	Many walkers are of the senior age. It would help all senior people if a reliable and regular bus service into and around Nottinghamshire (at least) connecting all major towns with the most popular walking areas. This would aid the fitness and wellbeing of this growing band of people to be less reliant upon the NHS etc. The connectivity of buses from Newark for example is very poor.	Noted.	No
	Although the enforcement of policy A1-9 has seemed very poor.	Noted.	No
	This section is very overwhelming and not accessible to a lay person.	Noted.	No
	The plan says nothing, it just states the Status Quo.	This section of the Plan clarifies the NCC position on a number of important Row issues.	No
	You are asking for a yes/no answer to 28 pages of policies and procedures?! How is it possible to agree or disagree with all of them!	Noted. Additional comments section to be used for individual policy comments.	No
	A new by-pass/road can open up, new opportunities. This normally equates to more housing/industry/traffic. However, sometimes the countryside and the wildlife are incorporated, to some degree. Many demands are made of the land. farming-quarrying-housing-industry-extraction [gas/oil] sometimes I fear for the land has we humans over ride are needs and in doing so lose part of nature and sadly part of our self's.	Noted.	No
	I find the barriers a real	Noted, see Para	No

	<p>nuisance. I cycle along the canal between Butler and QMC, and spend a large amount of time negotiating staggered barrier obstructions. I don't understand what purpose they serve, and they are a real nuisance to cyclists. If the intention is to slow down the cyclist on road approach, then that can be done without having to dismount, although it seems odd that in a dangerous area the slow user is asked to slow down, surely the fast user should be slowed?</p> <p>The barriers are also a deterrent to wheelchair users, and parts of the canal (e.g. Cotgrave Park) are now nicely surfaced as an accessible route. In addition, there are barriers along the route that serve no purpose at all, being placed in the middle of nowhere and not at a junction with main road (e.g. new barrier inside Cotgrave Park along the canal, and another along the canal between Shephards road and Basingfield).</p> <p>I could see the point of barriers if the stop dogs or children running onto road (I have a dog and a closed gate would be useful), but the staggered crossing is the worst of both worlds, forcing cyclists to dismount and preventing wheelchair access whilst doing nothing for the safety of dogs and children. Either no barrier or a closed gate would be better than the staggered barrier.</p> <p>Stiles are a problem for less able people.</p> <p>There is also a massive problems with access across fields. Farmers largely ignore rights of way where I walk, with fields ploughed, obstructed by crop, hedges overgrown, and fallen trees blocking for years. I appreciate that farmers cannot act on obstruction immediately, but around me there are public rights of way that are permanently obstructed.</p>	6.5.5 of the Plan.	
--	--	--------------------	--

	<p>I had emailed you about this (several times), and the landowners were notified, but nothing has changed. There must be a way of enforcing these routes. I appreciate farmers won't bother if a route isn't used, that's fine (although it probably isn't used because it's obstructed), but if they are notified, then they MUST act. They have not acted when I reported it before. This must be enforced, with penalties that could support the cost of enforcement."</p>	Noted, see section 6.7 of the Plan.	No
	<p>Signage should reflect the Character of the land through which the path is passing.</p> <p>Stiles should NOT be used - footpaths are particularly important to encourage exercise amongst those with limited mobility, and stiles are very difficult for those with limited movement of knees and hips.</p> <p>Maintenance and Enforcement We are particularly supportive of the lengthmans schemes and that it continues. They should be an integral part of the strategy</p> <p>Processing applications takes far too long - e.g. discussions on reopening the Southwell racecourse access has been ongoing for 6 years without success despite agreement by all parties.</p> <p>Deviation required by new developments should not where possible be on roads or pavements as a first option. Alternatives should be researched.</p> <p>Opportunities - Further and continued development of interconnection of existing paths with other local and national networks should be undertaken."</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, as per the Plan the Authority encourages Farmers to replace their stiles with gates.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, see xx of the Plan.</p> <p>Noted and ongoing where resource allows.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>Policy A5 8 is strongly supported. This is a way of making the network suitable for current recreational needs. Creation orders and agreement should be used more often. The council needs to use the powers that it has to create a suitable</p>	Noted.	No

	<p>network and reduce road accidents.</p> <p>Policy A1 13 it is not clear whether the bullet points are ""stand alone"" or ""conjunctive"" they should not be considered ""conjunctive""; The use of the word ""or"" after each point would clarify this issue.</p> <p>Policy A1 14 The council needs to confront the Canal and River Trust on the equestrian access to towpaths and to make creation agreements or orders on such routes where suitable. This has already been done on part of the Grantham Canal where a kilometre of public bridleway has been created. There is no good reason why this could not be further extended to other sections of the canal and other suitable canals. This would have safety benefits for the public.</p>	<p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Noted. The length of bridleway on the Grantham Canal was added to the Definitive Map by way of a Definitive Map Modification Order not a Creation order.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Maintenance – 6.2.1: the standard and frequency of maintenance of PRowS seem to have improved dramatically since the advent of ViaEM. It is likely that, at least in the shorter term, the number of defect reports will rise given the perception that they will result in effective remedial action being taken; then probably decline over time as the general maintenance standard improves. The effect of this on resources is only partially recognised in 6.2.2.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>I particularly support the council using its to create routes to make good gaps in the network and to reduce road accidents especially for horse riders. The council needs to take active steps to ensure all suitable cycle tracks are open to horse riders including those on canal towpaths. This would improve public safety as there is a great deal of evidence of injury and death on the roads caused by interaction of horses with traffic but NO evidence that horses pose a risk to other non-motorised users.</p> <p>I strongly support the policy A5</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

	<p>8. This is the only realistic way a safe and viable network for horse riders is likely to develop in some areas. It should apply where there obvious gaps in the network and were road safety issues would otherwise exist.</p> <p>The policy should be applied to insure all appropriate cycle routes should be developed to allow horse riding including appropriate lengths of canal tow path. The Canal and River Trust need to be challenged about this.</p>		
--	--	--	--

7.0 Question 9 – a question asking respondents to prioritise on the actions in the Statement of Action

<i>Action ref. No.</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
SOA1.2	77
SOA1.3	70
SOA1.5	70
SOA1.1	67
SOA1.4	66

<i>Action ref. No.</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
SOA2.3	70
SOA2.6	69
SOA2.2	68
SOA2.5	65
SOA2.1	63

<i>Action ref. No.</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
SOA3.3	69
SOA3.1	67
SOA3.2	67

<i>Action ref. No.</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
SOA4.1	62
SOA4.2	57
SOA4.4	57
SOA4.3	56
SOA4.5	53

<i>Action ref. No.</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
SOA5.1	73
SOA5.6	72
SOA5.2	71
SOA5.3	69
SOA5.5	63
SOA5.4	58

<i>Action ref. No.</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
SOA6.1	67
SOA6.2	67

8.0 Question 10 – Are there any other issues you would like to see covered in the ROWIP?

Comment made by:	Comments summary	NCC response	Text amended
	Enhance existing rights of way with secure off lead dog parks. Hold farmers accountable when they shot dogs that were not doing anything wrong.	Noted	No
	A more detailed policy covering working with community groups	Noted, individual discussion will take place with partners.	No
	There is nothing about: creating alternative; quiet way"" routes between locations; the linking of existing dead-end PROWs to create a better network; working with central government on opening up access of PROWs to more users; working with agencies (such as Sustrans) to facilitate the above I am very disappointed in the direction this plan has taken. As you state up front, all the aspirational goals have been removed, so it comes across as a bit of a tick boxing exercise.	Disagree, references are made to connectivity, anomalies, and partnership working with all stakeholders. Noted.	No
	Does 5.7 above exist? I didn't see any reference to the safety of pedestrians v cyclists. In the area where I live many of the ROW have been opened to cyclists and there is only one path still dedicated as a footpath. Some of the path/tracks are not wide enough for dual use, others have been tarmacked allowing the cyclists to move at high speed especially in the rush hours. A collision with a cyclist is very painful.	No, typo on consultation questionnaire. Reference to surfacing is recognised in the Plan. Cyclists have a right to use bridleways but the law states they must give way to walkers and riders.	No
	I would like to encourage the council to work with volunteers on e.g. path maintenance as much as possible and to work in partnerships with local groups, as a way of keeping costs down and getting the best local knowledge about how the rights of way network is performing. Also waymarking, as much as possible, should not just state whether it's a public ROW, but also that waymarks should state destinations/distances/directions to nearby locations. It also could be a miss to only produce a plan to maintain but not to improve, as enhancing ROW brings increased benefits in terms of public health, sustainable transport, tourism and the local economy.	Noted. See Aim 6. Noted. Local destinations will be considered where circumstances dictate and resource allow. Noted, there will continue to be improvements.	No No No

	Greater common sense in linking up circular bridleway routes, (many are dead ends, or continue as footpaths)	Noted. Work continues on dedications, creations and claims for higher rights.	No
	<p>I wonder if SOA 2.6 is correct - Work with the Local Access Forum. Liaise with all groups who cater for the needs of people with disabilities to ensure the Council does all it can to improve access provision, including where resources allow, publicising barrier free routes and encouraging land-owners to replace approved stiles with kissing gates.</p> <p>I understood that even kissing gates were quite restrictive and a two-way opening, self-closing gate was the preferred option.</p>	Noted, kissing gates are stock proof while allowing step free access.	No
	What options there are/should be when proposals appear to be fragrantly ignored, as for example with Racecourse Road in Southwell remains gated. My understanding was that agreement had been reached a long time ago to reopen it to walkers	Noted, Racecourse Road isn't a recorded public right of way. However, positive discussions have taken place with the landowner to provide public access.	No
	<p>Encouraging the council to work with volunteers on e.g. path maintenance as much as possible and to work in partnerships with local groups (such as Ramblers), as a way of keeping costs down and getting the best local knowledge about how the rights of way network is performing.</p> <p>Waymarking, as much as possible, should not just state whether it's a public ROW, but also that waymarks should state destinations/distances/directions to nearby locations.</p> <p>It's a shame the council is producing a plan to maintain but not to improve, as enhancing ROW brings increased benefits in terms of public health, sustainable transport, tourism and the local economy</p>	<p>Noted. See Aim 6.</p> <p>Noted. Local destinations will be considered where circumstances dictate and resource allow.</p> <p>Noted, there will continue to be improvements.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>
	Either future generations will have the countryside to enjoy or one will see more projects like, Lindhurst (housing) eat the land making much of, Nottinghamshire, into housing and industrial estates, with just a few park areas.	Noted. Reference is made in the Plan with reference to working with Planners and developers.	No
	<p>We have seen the submission from Notts Ramblers and endorse their comments.</p> <p>We support the main aims and policies of the ROWMP but note that it has deliberately been made less ambitious compared to its previous incarnation. We hope this reflects a realistic intention to implement the plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

	<p>We welcome the intention to keep the Definitive Map up-to-date and free of errors. As a Society we have been concerned about some lack of compatibility between the DM and OS maps. This makes it particularly important that paths are properly way-marked on the ground to avoid trespass and problems for walkers who rely on OS maps. When new paths are added to the DM we hope that these become certified and way-marked as soon as possible so that they are available on the ground.</p> <p>We understand the need to prioritise path issues based on health and safety and frequency of use. However, we consider it extremely important that lesser used paths are not neglected. Users have a right to expect that if a path is on the map it should be available. Neglect of paths soon makes them unwalkable and a vicious circle is created. We are concerned that a fairly large number of paths in the County are often difficult to walk because of under and overgrowth, obstruction by crops and difficult stiles.</p> <p>We hope that the policy of replacing stiles by kissing gates can become more assertive. Where stiles are retained we hope there can be an insistence that they conform to BS standards where possible.</p> <p>We hope that the work of the Countryside Access team can be assisted with volunteers with a firm commitment given to this. Activities such as surveying and vegetation clearance spring to mind,</p> <p>In general, NFPS welcomes the Management Plan and looks forward to the (continued) implementation of its policies. We greatly value the dedicated work of the Countryside Access and Via teams and fully understand the resource restraints under which it operates. However, we hope that the County Council fully recognises (in addition to its statutory obligations) the importance (from a leisure and health perspective) of access to the wide network of rights of way within Nottinghamshire.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed and noted.</p> <p>Agreed and noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>
	The use of road verges as a way of linking public bridleways needs to include the erection of barriers between motor traffic and the users. This has been done on the A5 in the Peak District where a promoted route uses a short length of A classified road.	Noted.	No
	<p>Mountain bike riders – 4.6.8 & 4.6.11: the Plan recognises the different needs of rural cyclists, but has no solution for their apparently irreconcilable preferences. I would suggest that, where possible, the aim for the majority of PRoWs available to cyclists should be to make them usable by most cyclists; mountain bikers wanting more challenging surfaces could then use these routes to access specific areas offering appropriately rough terrain such as Sherwood Pines, Manton Pit Wood, etc.</p> <p>Funding – 4.6.4: the challenge of improving cycling</p>	<p>Noted. There are a number of cyclists who enjoy riding routes due to their antiquity not for the challenge and wouldn't enjoy the artificial environment of purpose built trails.</p> <p>Noted. See</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

	<p>provision on limited budgets is recognised, but little connection seems to be made with infrastructure and/or funding being obtained from developers and other major projects. Every such opportunity should be grasped as a matter of consistent practice.</p> <p>Priority routes: given the above, key routes should be identified on which the limited resources available for each District may be concentrated for maximum benefit. These could follow the principles set out in the Cycling Strategy, i.e. linking centres of population both within the County and in neighbouring authority areas.</p> <p>DMMOs – if the process could be simplified, pro-active measures could be taken to divert in particular those PRowWs crossing cultivated fields so as to reduce the need for and cost of the reminder and enforcement processes mentioned in section 6.7.</p> <p>Minor points:-</p> <p>National Cycle Network: in addition to those Routes identified in section 4.6.3, the County also hosts Routes 48 (Hickling – Newark), 645 (Southwell – Bilsthorpe - Sherwood Pines/Vicar Water), 647 (Clumber South Lodge – Tuxford - Harby) and 648 (Shirebrook – Budby). The Dukeries Trail therefore comprises Routes 648, a section of 6 and 647.</p> <p>The Cyclists Touring Club (CTC) mentioned in section 4.6.10 is now known as Cycling UK.</p> <p>“Dumbles” referred to in section 6.18.4 (item 1) need to be defined, as this word is not in dictionaries.</p>	<p>Policy A1-11.</p> <p>The Deregulation Act 2015 introduces a number of changes to Row legislation aimed at simplifying the DMMO process.</p> <p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Noted and amended. It's a geographical feature – deep narrow banks of a watercourse.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
	<p>The plan correctly identifies that the recording of a footpath on the definitive map and statement does not mean that higher rights for cyclists and horse riders do not exist. Given that position I find it a matter of concern that the council has chosen to spend money on some footpaths to erect signs saying no Horse riding and no cycling. By definition there can be no certainty that those signs are accurate. Further even if they are accurate it is not for the county council to seek to obstruct the development of higher rights by way of long usage. The Landowner of course has that power but the council should not seek to prevent the organic development of the higher rights network. The Law provides for such development. The council should not try to work against the spirit of the law.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>I am pleased to see the plan makes clear that the inclusion of a footpath on the definitive map does to preclude the existence of higher rights. However I am aware of cases where the council has chosen to erect no horse riding and no cycling signs at the point where footpaths leave the road. It should not be the role of the council to erect such signs which have the effect of preventing the acquisition of such higher rights and the appropriate evolution of the network as provided for by</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p>

	the law.		
	<p>We welcome the thoughtful analysis of the problems and opportunities related to our ROW network and look forward to working with the Council to implement many of the policies suggested in the document.</p> <p>We agree that a well-used and well-maintained ROW network will bring many benefits to health and tourism in Nottinghamshire.</p> <p>We are glad that the importance of the following topics has been highlighted:</p> <p><i>Cooperation rather than confrontation with landowners in implementing change</i></p> <p><i>Upgrading the definitive map and streamlining procedures for modification</i></p> <p><i>Improved signage and waymarking</i></p> <p><i>Speedy resolution of ploughing/cropping issues</i></p> <p><i>Lack of publicity on permissive paths</i></p> <p><i>Difficulties crossing major trunk roads and railway lines</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance of roadside verges</i></p> <p>The following caused us some concern:</p> <p><i>We note the aspirational tone of the document but also note that no extra funds are to be allocated to the Highways Department</i></p> <p><i>There is some mention of using volunteers but this is significantly downgraded from the 2007 plan which mentioned volunteer "training days" and "task days"</i></p> <p><i>"Vegetation encroachment" is a major problem and needs greater priority. Overgrown paths are a major source of complaint to us. Does the Farm Partnership Scheme need reviewing? Children will absolutely refuse to walk through a patch of nettles and thistles. It is not enough to mow the grass once a year - ask any gardener!</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>There still is a commitment to continue to work with volunteers inc. surveying and suitable tack days.</p> <p>Over half of the Row budget is spent on cutting up growth because this is seen as a priority. Paths are cut twice a year and popular paths are cut three times a year.</p> <p>The Farm Partnership scheme has been reviewed (Spring 2018).</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>

	<p>Suggestions</p> <p>Ramblers has long been interested in volunteering to help with ROW maintenance. This is well-established in other areas of the country and we are constantly asked "Why not in Nottinghamshire?"</p> <p>This does not necessarily have to be "heavy lifting". The Management Plan contains mention of surveying. We can help with the programme of inspections of bridges and grass verges. We can also help with checking the accuracy of published NCC walks.</p> <p>Waymarking and signage need attention. As The ROWMP shows, this is a low priority for landowners. A ROW that is clearly marked out will minimise unintentional trespass, crop damage, etc. Is this something we can help with?</p> <p>A "mowing survey" similar to the present ploughing and cropping survey would be very useful. We would be happy to get involved.</p> <p>We are often asked if any action has been taken on reported problems. People also want to know if a problem has already been reported. A central website register, open to the public, would be helpful.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The ROWMP is an impressive and potentially very useful document. Thank you for seeking our opinion and we look forward to working with the County Council so that the objectives of the plan can be fulfilled.</p>	<p>Thank you. Discussions are ongoing with the Ramblers' and other user groups to look at efficient ways for volunteers to assist the County Council on its statutory functions.</p> <p>Noted. A reporting system is in place with the Ramblers'.</p> <p>Thank you and noted.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>Although our work as a cycle campaign group focuses mainly on the urban areas of Greater Nottingham we are also very keen both to see cycling promoted widely, because of its very strong environmental and health attributes, and also to achieve improved and more coherent links between rural and urban areas, particularly good quality and well-maintained traffic-free paths, with safe road crossings, to help attract a wide range of users, including less experience and confident cyclists and people who are new to cycling and likely to be most intimidated by cycling on routes shared with motor traffic.</p> <p>Pedals therefore much welcomes the Rights of Way Management Plan as the overarching focus for the protection, creation and enhancement of countryside access in Nottinghamshire and the role of the County Council continuing to develop and manage this countryside network for all, enabling opportunities for the widest possible type and number of users contributing to Nottinghamshire's economy, health, social well-being and environment.</p> <p>To start with in our response we would like to comment on some of 6 key aims;</p> <p><i>To improve access to the network for all by adopting the principle of the least restrictive option (and section 4.10).</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

	<p><i>We strongly endorse this aim since any kind of barriers, especially those of the A-frame and K-frame type, are very off-putting for cyclists (as well as other groups like tricycles, pushchair and wheelchair users as well as bikes with child trailers on the back), particularly when there are several of them close together. We are therefore very keen to see these barriers removed, or at least modified, wherever possible, and not just to see no new ones installed. For further information on this see Appendix A which includes the Policy on off-road path barriers which Pedals adopted in 2017 and which can be found at: http://pedals.org.uk/policy-on-the-use-of-barriers/</i></p> <p><i>To improve the safety and connectivity of the metalled road network with the rights of way network.</i></p>	Noted.	No
	<p><i>Cyclists often use a combination of roads and off-road paths for their journeys, especially for recreation and much appreciate coherent safe and well-signed routes, with as much priority as possible over motorised travel.</i></p> <p><i>To increase awareness of accessing the countryside and the understanding of the wider benefits arising from its use, such as leading an active and healthy lifestyle, and making a positive contribution to the local economy.</i></p>	Noted.	No
	<p><i>With the recent further publicity about the dangers of increased obesity and the role of active travel in helping to combat this and a range of other conditions such as coronary heart disease and Type 2 Diabetes, the role of cycling and walking, both as an everyday active means of travel and as a form of regular recreation have become all the more important. We also welcome the recognition of this in the recently revised County Health and Wellbeing Strategy. (paras 3.5.2 and 3.5.3)</i></p> <p><i>To enhance and increase community involvement in managing and improving the network, where resources allow.</i></p>	Noted.	No
	<p><i>We recognise the increasing difficulties in managing and improving the network arising from financial cutbacks but still think that this should be mainly up the County Council as local Highway Authority, working in close partnerships with other organisations. This could be helped by clearer and better publicised outlets, of various kinds, for reporting problems and suggesting improvements.</i></p> <p><i>Tapping a wider range of resources for rights of way improvements (para 4.6.4).</i></p> <p><i>At a time of greatly increased local authority financial cutbacks it is very important that every effort is made to harness contributions for rights of way improvements from other sources, including section 106 developer contributions, the Canal and River Trust, and Highways England funding in the case of schemes related to trunk roads, etc. Among the possible projects where</i></p>	Noted.	No

	<p>HE funding will be particular important is the Pedals proposal to provide a much safer route across the A52 (Gamston-Lings Bar road) between Tollerton and Edwalton, including the upgrading of existing rights of way on both sides of the A52. This would be of great value in the wider context of encouraging more walking and cycling between the existing (West Bridgford and Nottingham) urban area and the new housing areas to be developed in the Tollerton-Bassingfield areas, as well as providing an improved route to serve vulnerable road users from villages further out.</p> <p>The use of developer contributions (section 106 funds) for path improvements related to major new housing areas is also very important, not just in the Tollerton-Bassingfield areas but also in the Sharp Hill-Edwalton area and in the major new housing development which recently got planning consent for Fairham Pastures, south of Clifton. This will also need improved links to and from nearby villages such as Gotham and Ruddington as well as to routes within Clifton, Wilford and elsewhere in Nottingham City. Paths that connect across council boundaries must include consistent signing, including consistent use of destination and symbols on destination signs. Having specific destinations makes the paths that much more useful than when they just state 'public footpath' or 'public bridleway', etc.</p> <p>In the Sharp Hill-Edwalton area upgrading of the subway under the A52 south of Sharp Hill (a designated public footpath but with plenty of room for upgrading to shared use) is of particular importance, not just in terms of the new housing to the north of the A52 and around the A606 (Melton Road) but also to and from Ruddington to the south, including Ruddington village and Country Park. This needs close collaboration between the County and Borough Councils and Highways England, including attention to upgrading the approach paths / routes on both sides of the A52.</p> <p>With resources now being often increasingly limited it seems to us to make sense not only to maximise the use of such other funding sources but also to concentrate resources for improvements on paths in the vicinity of the main urban areas, particularly where major new housing development are proposed, because these are likely to have higher levels of usage and levels that are likely to grow considerably if improvements are made.</p> <p>The need for this wider harnessing of funds does not seem to be mentioned much in the draft Plan which also does not mention the new DfT system of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPS), introduced in 2017, which aims, in close consultation with a variety of stakeholders including LEPs (such as D2N2), Local Access Forums and User Groups, to produce a 30-year vision, a framework of an aspirational network, with short term priorities, and then used as a basis for seeking to obtain finance.</p> <p>In this area very important opportunity to get funding</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>of the Trent, is one of the main justifications for the proposed new foot-cycle bridge between Lady Bay and Trent Basin which Pedals is pursuing with several other local organisations, working closely with the County and City Councils, and Sustrans, and the need for which received the support of the Leader of Nottingham City Council, Cllr Jon Collins, in November 2017. Work is now in progress on the finalisation of the exact site revised north and south landings, the completion of our feasibility study, and stepping up the search for sources of funding.</p> <p>On the south bank of the Trent, as well as connecting to the Trent Valley Way and Route 15 of the Sustrans National Cycle Network, and many local routes, this bridge would also connect both to many new housing areas and important leisure attractions. As well as the NFFC City Ground, and Trent Bridge Cricket Ground these include Holme Pierrepont Country Park and Water Sports Centre, the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Skylarks Nature Reserve, the Grantham Canal towpath and the new Cotgrave Greenway, due for completion in April 2018. With growing use of ebikes this facility could encourage longer trips, both for leisure and commuting, including to and from Gedling Country Park, especially if the current plans for access improvements are pursued. Use of bikes in hillier area is likely to be that much easier and therefore more popular.</p>	Noted.	No

9.0 Copy of draft ROWMP consultation form