

Comment on ROWIP & consultation Page & section	Comment made by:	CCC Response	CCC Additional feedback
The questionnaire is long and contains jargon. It would only be understood by those with a strong interest in public rights of way to take the time or have the technical knowledge to complete this document.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Comments would all be addressed in any new questionnaire. Questionnaire was long in order to address all the assessment criteria required.
No glossary of terms – this could exclude majority of users of the network.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Comment will be addressed in future consultations.
No explanation of what LAF is or why they have given a weighting to the questions.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Explanation given on last page and website.
The plan covers a range of subjects in good detail – though this means that at times the message is lost in the detail. May be sections surrounding policies; statement of actions etc should be highlighted. If this document is to be used to influence policy and potential funding bodies then the message needs to jump of the page.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Will consider improvements to section layout.
In places the report touches on previous projects carried out by the Council. Short highlighted case studies throughout the document could summarise previous good practice. ROWIP is a good opportunity to explore what can be achieved and also to promote what had already been achieved proving results.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Will consider insertion of case study.

<u>The Plan</u> Quote at the top of the page “public consultation” could be explained in a footnote.	Countryside Agency	Agreed	Will amend.
Good summary of what a ROWIP is and what it’s aiming to achieve and how. Really enjoyed the poetry!	Countryside Agency		
Include information of the geographical area that the ROWIP will cover – the map implies the whole county.	Countryside Agency	Noted	It does – Introduction will be amended.
Introductory material well laid out and helpful. Despite poor Best Value Performance Indicator stats and depressing lack of improvement from year to year enthusiasm of compiler comes through strongly. Will be important to focus work carefully and will be watching to ensure network level of approach.	Ramblers Association		BVPI indicator is on a par with other counties.
Public pressure can cause problems of trampling, erosion, water quality, disturbance and damage to breeding bird numbers.	English Nature	Noted	Agreed but Cambridgeshire has to date experienced little evidence of this compared to other areas particular uplands. Any local examples would be helped.
ROWIP needs to take into consideration the needs of SSSI’s conservation and enhancement.	English Nature	Noted	ROWIP is not an explicit countryside enhancement document – that is the work of other departments – but we will consider the need for more reference to conservation aspects in relation to ROW.
The Plan is from the view of user, not protection of areas. The introduction should mention impacts on the countryside.	English Nature		See note above.

<p>English Nature has particular concerns that 4x4's are not in accordance with policy of quiet recreation. Unconsented use of off-road vehicles including 4x4s and bicycles and motorcycles is increasing problem to the management of SSSI's – significant damage caused to Cherry Hinton Pit. English nature expects this to increase and an urgent solution is required. Must be made clear that SSSI's are not the place for these activities and that cycle routes are situated where this will not be encouraged.</p>	<p>English Nature</p>	<p>Addressed in SOA8/11</p>	<p>Already referred to in SOA8 – of the report. Will review text. As Highway Authority the County Council has advaluable to both protect vulnerable sites but also to protect the interests of <u>all</u> highway users. Cherry Hinton Pit is private land over which the County Council has no jurisdiction.</p>
<p>Infrastructure SOA ref 1/1 1/5 1/12 4/3 4/4 6/3 8/9 The proposals seem to indicate a proliferation of signage and other infrastructure which may well have adverse impacts upon land management and offer increased opportunities for vandalism and litter within the countryside.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Any new signage or infrastructure will take into account the needs of land Managers. Well-located signage should help prevent inadvertent trespasses and damage by path users.</p>
<p>Proposals to upgrade the nature of access gates/stiles should not impose greater liabilities upon landowners in respect of initial costs or future maintenance.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Benefits should out weigh costs.</p>
<p>Safety SOA ref 2/1 -10 Works required for improving safety however meritorious in their own right should take place as part of an overall strategic approach to avoid proposals creating adverse impacts upon landowners and managers.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

<p>Improved and expanded access SOA ref 1/1 1/4 1/13 5/19 Proposals need to consider impacts upon land management and prevention of unauthorised access. Education of users will be vital to ensure that conflict with landowners does not result from ignorance. Surfacing of existing routes could have major impacts upon land management, if routes are inappropriately located, eg bisecting fields and should not result in greater liabilities being placed on landowners.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>Byways SOA ref 4/12 4/13 5/13 Increased provision of access for motor vehicles from the byway network causes great concern, magnifying the issues raised in respect of unauthorised access, theft, litter and general damage.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Fly tipping addressed in SOA8/5</p>
<p>Whilst management of byway users through education and TROs will be essential for existing routes, the provision of new routes will in most cases create unacceptable adverse impacts for landowners and managers.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>If new routes come about through Wildlife & Countryside Act s53 process then unable to prevent their being registered, but accept need to work with affected landowners and other parties to mitigate against adverse effects (howsoever defined)</p>
<p>New routes SOA ref 3/2 3/3 5/1 – 20 6/1 The provision of new routes where none exist is likely in almost every case to have adverse impacts upon landowners and managers. Provision of new routes should only be considered as part of a strategic approach under a Parish Path Reorganisation, with the agreement of all parties concerned.</p>	<p>Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>This should present an opportunity for land managers and users to resolve long-standing issues of conflict in some situations.</p>

The re-routing of paths away from farmyards and development, and around rather than across fields would seem in general to be of great merit.	Smithsgore – Senior Rural Surveyor	Noted	See note above.
Page 3 – Last paragraph. Didn't understand this sentence – think of the audience. Add in 'Notice has been taken where possible of the output from the Countryside Agency'.	Countryside Agency	Agree	Will consider revision.
Page 3 - A mention is made of regular progress reports, but little of this seems to have filtered down to Parish Council Level.	Little Shelford Parish Council		Annual reports. All Parish Councils will have received these.
Page 3 Milestones programme seems to have gone unnoticed as far as LSPC was concerned.	Little Shelford Parish Council	Noted	
Page 3 Which total path mileage is being referred to when all have not yet been identified recognised and recorded.	Little Shelford Parish Council		Registered paths. This will be clarified in text.
Pages 5,6 & 7 Making policy links is one of the most important sections of the ROWIP. It should summarise what the ROWIP will do and what it can do to deliver other related policies and strategies. It may be worth highlighting some of the policy links on pages 5, 6, and 7. This will be the section that policy makers and potential funders will focus on – make the benefits of ROWIP stand out.	Countryside Agency	Agree	Will consider revision.
Page 5-6 Policy Context should also include policy P7/3 that refers to Countryside Enhancement Areas.	English Nature	Agree	Will consider revision.

Page 5 – 6 Welcome reference to Cambridge BAP – duty under section 28G mention here?	English Nature	Agree	Will consider revision.
Page 5 Section 4 Does not identify Policy 7/3 on Countryside enhancement areas and we believe this to be a significant omission.	RSPB Conservation Officer	Agree	Will revise.
Page 6 - Section 4 Strongly support the conclusion that improved countryside access is a cost-effective means of providing better health. etc	Little Shelford Parish Council		
Page 7 - Rowing Together. The term 'better biodiversity' in Outputs column not clear. We suggest the term ' <i>net gains in biodiversity quantity and quality</i> '	English Nature	Agree	Will revise.
Page 8 Section 6 – Good review of related issues.	Countryside Agency		
Section 6 - 6.1 We also commend the statements that 'in the absence of other access provision, improving the rights of way network is uniquely important to the people of Cambridgeshire' and 6.3 that 'more still needs to be done to retain and improve key links in the path network.' Statement 6.11 that 'an analysis of parish countryside access provision has been undertaken.' We are not aware of any approach being made to us.	Little Shelford Parish Council		Reorganisations tend to be parish-initiated

Page 10 Section 6.5 Land Management – ‘Rows which cross SSSI’s and CWS require additional planning and management effort’ recommend insertion of phrase ‘in order to protect fragile habitats and sensitive species’.	English Nature	Agree	Will revise.
Page 10 - Section 6.8 Meaning of the sentence ‘timescales for heritage’ is unclear.	English Nature	Agree	Will amend wording.
Page 12 Section 7 Good to include the definitions of PROW that will be useful to new audiences.	Countryside Agency		
Page 12 Section 7 A range of opportunities are identified and these distinctions are unnecessary and confusing.	RSPB Conservation Officer	Disagree	Not sure what this means. Section seeks to provide definitions and basic summary of current opportunities for public
Page 12 Section 7.1 refers to buses into Cambridge – how is this a countryside access issue?	South Cambs DC	Agree	Text needs clarification – relates to use and access to countryside from Cambridge/other towns.
Page 15 – We welcome the reference to the importance of verges and urge the council to give further consideration to the management.	English Nature	Noted	Verges dealt with – see SOA2/4

<p>Page 15 – Verges The mention of use of verges by horse riders is welcomed. We note the comment that only protected verges are currently recorded. The Highways Act 1980 S71 requires local authorities to maintain verges for the safe use by equestrians and a S71 Verge Register has been compiled and is held within the county Council Countryside Access Department. To maintain a verge for horse riding simply means a level mown surface and large ‘scoop’ drainage gullies, which do not cause a horse to trip. Consideration also needs to be given to rider headroom with regard to signpost. Lamppost, overgrowth etc.</p> <p>Recommendation: The County Councils uses the S71 Register as a starting point for recording verges identified as important for road safety.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree	Register compiled by BHS requires more detail and prioritising to be a useful tool. The register is held by Highways rather than Access Team.
Page 21 7.5 The lack of way marking is understated.	Ramblers Association	Noted	Will review wording.
Page 21 – Paragraph 2. This is the first basic definition of LAF, although they are mentioned on page 1 and 7. Maybe there should be a brief paragraph early on in the document that summarises what a LAF is, why it is created and what they do.	Countryside Agency	Agree	Will amend text.
7.6 Could include a reference to countywide planning strategy	South Cambs DC	Agree	Add in.

<p>Page 22 - Lost Highways The definitive map is the document relied upon by authorities, land users/managers and the public. It is in all parties' interest that the document is as accurate as possible. We agree that the 151 lost highways under threat should be given priority, but based on the BHS recent experience of applying for two definitive map modification orders and waiting almost 2 years for the report we have reservations about the statement that a "creation rate of 10 per year is likely".</p> <p>Recommendation: The progress of recording 'Lost Highways' should be monitored and reviewed every two years. If the figure of 10 per year is not being met then the resources need to be adjusted at a very early stage to meet the 2026 deadline.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree	Timescale was due to exceptional staffing problems, which have now been addressed.
<p>Page 22 We thoroughly support the Lost Highways initiative – any additional officer time this could be afforded would have our backing.</p>	Little Shelford Parish Council	Noted	
<p>Page 23 'Input from local communities would be crucial to improving the overall rights of way'. We agree with this and would hope and expect to be kept fully in the picture.</p>	Little Shelford Parish Council	Noted	

<p>Page 26: Path Surface The comment is made that ‘horse and vehicle use can cause poaching and ruts’. It should be remembered that ‘poaching and ruts’ are just as problematical to riders as they are to other users. A horse may trip and injure the hoof or bones in the lower leg, or unseat the rider. A path that is not maintained is unpleasant to use, but sometimes can be the only route away from traffic.</p> <p>Recommendation: Council needs to be more robust in its surface management programme and look at drainage with a long-term view of protecting the path for future use.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree though with qualification	Requires more resources and may not always be possible due to soil type
<p>Page 27 7.11 There is no mention of waymarking at all. Ramblers Association surveying suggest that some paths overused and some underused, causing erosion and overcrowding in some areas and neglect and overgrowth in others – this is partly due to lack of waymarking.</p>	Ramblers Association	Agree	Amend text.
<p>Page 28 7.12 Harcamlow walk gets no mention.</p>	Ramblers Association	Noted	
<p>Page 29 7.14 We take issue with ‘wide range of countryside access opportunities’ – as a total area it is modest. Opportunities provided by development should be used to maximum advantage.</p>	Ramblers Association	Agree	Amend text.

<p>Page 29 What else is out there Neither of these sections mentions DEFRA Countryside Stewardship Scheme (though it is mentioned earlier on page 18).</p> <p>Recommendation: CSS to be included in 7.13.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree	Will amend text.
<p>Page 29 What else is out there Many locations are listed, but as these are not definitive routes it's unclear which access opportunities are available; most will be pedestrian only.</p> <p>Recommendation: The list needs to be expanded to identify which types of uses are welcomed.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree	But to qualify – is only meant as examples of other sources of recreation.
<p>Page 29 7.14 Reference made to the Wet Fen Partnership – this should be extended to identify all proposed sites. There should be a caveat that recognises these projects are long term and will not be available for instant access.</p>	RSPB Conservation Officer	Agree	Will consider inclusion.
<p>Page 29 7.14 Does not reference Fen Drayton, Little Paxton Pitts (could contribute to local BAP) that is a significant omission.</p>	RSPB Conservation Officer	Noted	Paxton is mentioned on p29; Fen Drayton should be added.
<p>Page 29 Change text 'is planning another at Coton' we are not planning one.</p>	Coton Countryside Reserve	Agree	Amend.

<p>Page 30 Making Money – Rural Businesses and Rights of Way This section overlooks the growing trend in equestrian tourism, which offers opportunities for farm diversification.</p> <p>Recommendation: Section 7.15 needs to be amended to recognise that riders who need bed and breakfast accommodation for themselves will also require additional accommodation – stable or field – for their horse.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree	Will amend text.
<p>Page 31 7.16 We would add to your final sentence that ‘ the availability of circular paths is important at an everyday level for promoting regular exercise and health.’</p>	Little Shelford Parish Council	Agree	Will amend text.
<p>Page 32 – This is the first time the reader is told what a LAF is and about the earlier public consultation. The public consultation is a big aspect of the ROWIP.</p>	Countryside Agency	Agree	Will amend text.
<p>Page 38 – We welcome the council’s preference to maintain paths by hand. Please recognise the importance of blackthorn to birds – cutting back does not eradicate.</p>	English Nature	Noted	
<p>Page 39 8.4 We would like to see more attention paid to the relative numbers of path users belonging to various categories – i.e. in 8.4 No indication is given to the various bodies represented. Information could be correlated with the relative costs of maintaining different classes or Row.</p>	Ramblers Association	Noted	Consider adding.

<p>'Access' for all a good catch phrase but some balance is needed – pedestrians are after all in the majority as path users. We are keen to see legal restraint of 4x4s such as seasonal traffic regulation orders (TROs).</p>	<p>Ramblers Association</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Highway Authority has a duty to protect and assert interests of <u>all</u> users. Council has an approved procedure for managing byways through the use of TRO's – application is resource limited.</p>
<p>Increasing permissive use of paths by cyclists is a concern. Off road cycling routes should be provided in addition to the footpath network and should not take over existing paths.</p>	<p>Ramblers Association</p>	<p>Agree</p>	
<p>Page 40 Wandlebury Country Park – not just Wandlebury.</p>	<p>Coton Countryside Reserve</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Amend.</p>
<p>Page 40 Research into strategic Open Spaces From the list of key findings it appears that equestrians were excluded from the 2004 Survey.</p> <p>Recommendation: Care must be taken to ensure that already disadvantaged groups are not overlooked.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>Page 43 9.3 We would argue that the Rural payments agency should withdraw payments for failure to comply with requirements of non-compliance.</p>	<p>Open Spaces Society</p>	<p>Agree</p>	
<p>Page 43 Section 9.4 Slow permissions protect wildlife – allowing time for surveys.</p>	<p>English Nature</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>Page 43 Section 9.4 Dogs – threat to ground nesting birds, and continued disturbance of birds during winter months is threat to survival. Dog excrement increases nutrient enrichment of soils – resulting in decline of biodiversity.</p>	<p>English Nature</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

Page 43 – 9.5 Just walking the dog. “Until Rover or his mistress gets too stiff to climb the stile”. This is an offensive comment which conflicts earlier statement of action to increase access to those people with limited mobility.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Will revise text.
Page 43 9.5 Control of dogs is a real problem – aggressive dogs at farms and buildings are a deterrent to access and dog waste is also a problem.	Ramblers Association	Noted	Dog Waste addressed in SOA8/9.
Page 43 – 9.4 and 9.5 dog related issues. Dog walkers represent at least 30% of those people visiting the countryside for walks – therefore care should be taken not to encourage negative attitudes towards all those people who walk their dogs in the countryside. The Countryside Agency is producing a new publication for dog walkers called ‘You and your dog in the Countryside’. Also have a look at the concordat that the Forestry Commission has signed with the Kennel Club. Further research on dogs in the countryside will be carried out by the Countryside Agency in the East of England in 2005.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Will consider amending text to incorporate suggestions and need to liase with Countryside Agency and Forestry Commission.
Like the idea of biodegradable bins – would like to know what you plan to do.	Countryside Agency	Noted	
Page 43 - 9.6 The term granny gears mock people with limited mobility and conflicts with statement of action 1.	Countryside Agency	Noted	Will consider revision to text.
Page 44 9.9 Local paths are for all not just locals – hence packages shouldn’t be in favour of them.	Open Spaces Society	Noted	

<p>Page 45 9.14 The overall costs of looking after rights of way is a tiny fraction of local authority costs. The three lines at the bottom of page 6 don't make much of a case.</p>	<p>Ramblers Association</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Consider expanding.</p>
<p>Section 10 Ideas are excellent and not much has been left out – however the effect is too many ideas bracketed together.</p>	<p>Ramblers Association</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>Page 46 Section 10 We suggest changes – ‘Maintaining and increasing biodiversity’ – not promoting and maintaining... ‘Increasing awareness of the countryside including land management and biodiversity issues and promoting responsible access opportunities.</p>	<p>English Nature</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Will amend text.</p>
<p>Page 48 Statement of Action 1 – There has been no mention in the previous chapters of wider diversity issues. Access to the countryside should encompass not just the more recognisable under-represented groups such as people with restricted mobility or those from ethnic minorities. Research shows that women and young people also face barriers to accessing the countryside. Have a look at the Countryside Agency Diversity Review Research. This is an area of work that is expanding over the next few years. Speak to Giles Merritt (giles.merritt@countryside.gov.uk) to find out what the Countryside Agency is doing on this work in the East of England region this year. The Diversity Review should be included as a related programme.</p>	<p>Countryside Agency</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Will take up suggestions and consider inclusions in text.</p>

Page 49 SOA1 – In areas of fragile habitats, management of users should ensure the conservation management is not compromised.	English Nature	Agree	
Page 49 Statement of Action SOA1 Making the Countryside More Accessible The actions listed under this section are unlikely to benefit equestrians. For example:	British Horse Society		
1/1 'replaces stiles with gaps and gates'. The terminology indicates that only footpaths are to be improved. Where gates are to be fitted on bridleways they must be horse friendly' i.e. operational from on horseback.	British Horse Society	Agree	Need to include line on including requirements of disabled riders
1/2 and + 1/3 promote disabled use but overlooks riding and driving for disabled.	British Horse Society	Noted	Consider whether can/should extend to equestrian access
1/4 selected surface improvement is welcomed; please include surfaces suitable for riding and carriage driving.	British Horse Society	Noted	
1/5 to 1/14 is largely focused on disabled and mobility impaired users whose needs should be met, but these actions are unlikely to improve equestrian access.	British Horse Society	Noted	Section relates to specific requirement under CROW Act 2000 s 60, which does include equestrians.
Page 51 Prevent the creation of 'crime alleys' – Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act is permitting LA to close routes by gating orders on grounds of reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. This needs to be evaluated in this report and if possible pro-actively tackled.	Coton Countryside Reserve	Noted	Not actually law yet.

<p>Page 51: We are pleased to see that difficulties faced by horse riders are well recorded. Between Jan and Sep 04 12 injury road accidents involving horses are recorded – and we should not forget the fatal accident at Meldreth in Dec 99.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>The reluctance of the Highways Agency to support provision of dedicated crossings at Cambourne A428 and Milton A14 are examples, which must not be duplicated in the future. No rider is going to risk him/herself on such roads simply to provide a statistic.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>Page 52 2/1 to 2/10 are all supported and all would help to improve the network for equestrians and other users. Minor diversions (2/2) would be supported if the outcome was a safer route or road crossing. 2/2, 2/3, 2/6 and 2/7 require the support of the Highway Agency. Despite the VRUXIP project the Agency's track record to date is poor and it is reasonable to expect the Agency to oppose such improvements.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>All Noted</p>	

<p>Page 53 –54 Statement of Action SOA3 57,000 new homes 3/1 to 3/4 are all supported. The continued growth in vehicular traffic just makes road riding less safe. While 3/2 mentions S106 funding no mention is made of S278 and this should be included as an additional mean of improving the network for all users, particularly where vehicular highways are created and impact upon the existing rights of way.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>s 278 rarely appropriate mechanism (relates to a highway authority carrying out works on the back of which another party can request benefits for which that party contributes.) Will add in s38 of the HA 80 - more relevant (enables highway authority to require developers to construct improvements to highways if related to development)</p>
<p>Page 53 SOA3 Important to provide quality environment and new public rights of way – support the reference to secure funding for offsite improvements and recommend early liaison with habitat creation projects. Doing this early can often avoid biodiversity being compromised by access issues.</p>	<p>RSPB Conservation Officer</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Part of our standard in-house procedure</p>
<p>Page 53 SOA3 – Pressures of sensitive SSSIs which are close to these areas – provision of sufficient and suitable natural and green infrastructure is essential – and for management of visitors to minimise their impact.</p>	<p>English Nature</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Add in comment on this to text</p>

Page 56 SOA4 This is an opportunity to raise awareness.	English Nature	Agree	
Page 56 – 57 Statement of Action SOA4 Knowing what's out there 4/5 & 4/6 are unlikely to benefit equestrians, 4/14 erroneously describes the Icknield way as a walking and cycling trail, and it is a definitive riding route.	British Horse Society	Agree	Will amend text.
Page 58 SOA5 Fenland has the poorest level of access at present. We recommend liaison with Wet Fens Partnership to identify opportunities for working.	RSPB Conservation Officer	Noted	
Page 59 – 60 5/8 Small area of land removed from access map.	English Nature	Agree	Will consider amending.
5/10 Waterside routes should not damage wildlife interest.	English Nature	Noted	
5/18 Strong objections to dual riverbank provision – see section 28G of CROW.	English Nature	Disagree	Cannot find this section. Real need for dual provision, however recognise that not necessarily appropriate everywhere
Page 59 SOA 5/9 Commons management strategy – we welcome this and wish to be involved.	Open Spaces Society	Noted	

<p>Page 58 – 60 Statement of Action SOA5 filling in the gaps 5/3 is probably the action, which will prove most beneficial to equestrians in reducing the dependency on road riding. Bridleways cater for cyclists and walkers also, so creating new paths with a well maintained all year surface will benefit a large proportion of path users.</p>	British Horse Society	Noted	
<p>5/4 Circular routes are needed by riders and cyclists yet this action ignores both user groups. The wording needs to be changed to read, “plan circular routes” rather than “plan circular walks”.</p>	British Horse Society	Agree	Will amend.
<p>5/11 Where rural cycle routes are planned consideration should be given to creating a route as a bridleway (and therefore multi user). BHS has a Cycling Strategy which can be found on our web site at www.bhseast.org.uk</p>	British Horse Society	Noted	Correct typo in 5/11 – ‘wide’ not wise
<p>5/14 Consideration needs to be given to surface maintenance where soft routes are proposed as cycle routes.</p>	British Horse Society	Noted	
<p>Page 61 SOA6 We support the identification of potential negative impacts of access on nature conservation interests. It identifies the need for better liaison with conservation bodies and we would welcome this as a real way of ensuring access provision can cater for the needs of wildlife and people.</p>	RSPB Conservation Officer	Noted	

Page 61 – 63 SOA6 We wish to draw attention to the need to consider the impact of the council's activities on protected wildlife both on SSSI's and land adjacent.	English Nature	Agree	
Page 61 SOA 6/1 We oppose change to routes – they are confusing and can mean loss of historic routes.	Open Spaces Society	Disagree	Reorganisations do not necessarily mean changes to all routes within a parish and loss of historic routes. Paths <i>are</i> looked at on individual merits as well as in context of connections.
Page 61 Statement of Action SOA6 Land Management Actions broadly agreed; however reorganisation packages can attract objections, but if the final outcome is an improved network and a gain for all, objections may be overcome by good communication and explanation prior to publishing statutory orders.	British Horse Society	Noted	
Page 62 SOA 6/11 We know of no requirement in the acts and also do not support change of cross field paths to edge field paths – Also oppose blanket statement and would look at each path on its merits.	Open Spaces Society	Agree	CROW Act does not explicitly say this but does say that landowners will have the right to apply for a diversion for land used for agriculture etc on the ground that it would be expedient for an order to be made.

<p>Page 65 SOA 7/6 We oppose this, as it is confusing to the public.</p>	<p>Open Spaces Society</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	
<p>Page 65 Statement of Action SOA7 Definitive Map & Records The Definitive Map is the key to countryside access for equestrians and the proposed actions are supported. A statement of priorities for modification orders and public path orders should be compiled and made available via the web site to better inform the public. The council's lists of streets should be included as a document showing routes open for public use. Work on the (7/5) lost highways project should begin as soon as possible.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Several projects are already underway to address these areas.</p>
<p>Page 68 Statement of Action SOA8 A better countryside environment 8/14 The review of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) should include restrictions imposed on carriage drivers as well as motorcycles.</p>	<p>British Horse Society</p>	<p>Agree</p>	
<p>Page 55 Stands at country shows – good opportunity for partnership working. Would you be able to promote recreational sites as well as perhaps the more linear access routes?</p>	<p>Coton Countryside Reserve</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>Page 56 – 4/6 Linked public transport. The Countryside Agency no longer has a mechanism to deliver rural transport projects. I'd suggest that you look to the Rural Transport Partnership Officer based at Cambridgeshire ACRE to deliver this target.</p>	<p>Countryside Agency</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

Page 56 4/9 – The Countryside Agency will produce Countryside Code related educational material for all schools in the country.	Countryside Agency	Noted	
Page 57 - 4/14 The Countryside Agency will continue to support the development and delivery of this project.	Countryside Agency	Noted	
Page 59 - 5/8 The Countryside Agency will continue to facilitate Open Access and will continue to communicate new access rights, responsibilities and restrictions both nationally and regionally. The primary source of information for public on open access (restrictions, countryside code etc) issues is www.countrysideaccess.gov.uk .	Countryside Agency	Noted	Will consider amending SOA 5/8 to include CA's role in communication.
Page 60 5/18 Dual riverbank provision - this allows an escape route where the alternative is down a steep bank.	Ramblers Association	Noted	
Page 65 - 7/5 The Countryside Agency will continue to support local authorities in providing resources for the Discovering Lost Ways Programme.	Countryside Agency	Noted	
Page 67 8/5 The idea of a responsive call out unit is a good idea.	Ramblers Association	Noted	
Page 69 10.2 Which actions are the quick wins? Identify these in the statement of action tables.	South Cambs DC	Agree	Already identified to some extent through costs, resources and timescale provided but suggestions as to quick wins could be made.

Page 76 Evaluation of landscapes. Public rights of way should go hand in hand with the wider landscape improvements – reference should also be made to the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines.	Coton Countryside Reserve	Noted	
The Trust gives the highest priority to options 3/1, 3/3, 5/1, 6/1, 6/7, and 7/1.	Woodland Trust	Noted	
Important regional documents have been included however the East of England Woodland Strategy <i>Woodland for life</i> has been omitted.	Woodland Trust	Noted	Will add in.

<p>Of relevance to the ROWIP are the following initiatives:</p> <p>QL1 - Ensure woodland is an integral part of wider green-space and access strategies and programmes.</p> <p>QL2 – Raise awareness of the benefits of woodland for health and well being.</p> <p>SP3 – Create greener road corridors integrated into the wider landscape.</p> <p>ED1 – Encourage an increase in woodland based tourism.</p> <p>EL1d – Improve interpretation at major woodland recreational sites.</p> <p>EL1f – Develop outreach work with minority, excluded and community groups to encourage woodland visits, structured guided walks, open days and similar participative events.</p> <p>NE2 – Promote woodland planting and management to help protect other natural resources as part of integrated sustainable land management.</p>	Woodland Trust	Noted	Will consider adding in.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	-------	--------------------------

<p>Only two Woodland Trust sites are mentioned out of the 22 that exist. If possible they would prefer that both the number of sites and the total area that they cover is included and is a more representative way of reflecting their interest in the County. Support reference to ancient woodland, but not that not all is accessible. It would also be relevant to include the figures of woodland cover in Cambridgeshire (proportionately, lowest cover of any county in England) 3.6% of area is woodland and 0.7% is ancient woodland.</p>	Woodland Trust	Noted	Will consider adding.
<p>Studies show that (MORI, 2002, The Environment: Who Cares) that access to woodland makes people feel good and improves health. The government has acknowledged this need. The Woodland Trust has Woodland Access Standard for local authorities to aim for and English Nature endorses this standard.</p> <p>The Standard recommends that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size and that there should be an area of accessible woodland no less than 20ha within 4km of people's homes.</p>	Woodland Trust		
<p>Random Comments from consultation</p>			
<p>What provision is there for carriage drivers?</p>			<p>Little explicit provision as yet. Will depend to significant extent upon regulations bringing in new legislation under CROW Act. Will certainly not be ignored.</p>

Why are carriage drivers not allowed on bridleways?			Classed as a vehicle and therefore illegal. Currently allowed on byways and will be allowed on new category 'restricted byway' being brought in by CROW Act.
8/14 'Review TROs regards motor cycles' - Include carriage drivers in this please.		Noted	
Require safe access to dead end paths? Improve access by opening up new PROW and joining up existing ones together into a network.			Recognition of need to make links between dead-end paths is in ROWIP. Currently public may not have right to access dead-end of path except along legal right of way.
Need to publicise paths more.		Noted	Dependant on resources.
Lack of safe cycling routes.		Noted	ROWIP does aim to address this problem
Too little ROW in area and no circular routes (Bottisham) Off road cycling facilities good, Bottisham to Cambridge and Bottisham to S.Bulbeck. Circular route from Bottisham dangerous due to speed of traffic on Heath Road and Newmarket Road. (Bottisham)		Noted	
Attention on the old railway line around Lode to include cycle routes and bridge over A14 would improve access into the city. Improve walking and cycling routes from Bottisham to Wicken Fen. Improve network of cycle paths separated where practical from footpath.		Noted	There is a joint National Trust/Sustrans/CCC project looking at this.

Horse welfare should also be considered. Horses are dying daily on our roads. A good bridleway system would keep horses off our roads and safe. Circular routes are preferable for daily use and action 5/4 ought to be amended to include bridleways too.		Noted	
Would like more bridleways please.		Noted	
Don't waste money on signage – spend it on Row and increase budget.		Noted	
Pushchairs don't have access keys.			Need to consider as part of proposed access projects
Take measures to minimise dog fouling particularly along footpath within villages.			
Why encourage more access when those already wanting it cannot be catered for!			Difficulty of resourcing current statutory duties with new ones and all interested parties' changing requirements sincerely recognised.
What is a TRO?			Traffic Regulation Order – will ensure that there is a definition in Plan.
Access for off-road motorcycles and separation from 4x4s.		Noted	Noted – very difficult to achieve.
A lot more emphasis should be put on the preservation and construction of sites, which lead to an increase in biodiversity. Wild things need places untainted by humans and their animals.			Unfortunately not a significant part of the statutory requirements of this Plan

Improvement of path network in Fenland. More money should be spent on this area, which has the least number of paths, bridleways and off-road cycle routes.		Agree	
Do not want the city developments coming into the countryside.		Noted	Unfortunately the decision of planners and governed by separate laws, but we do work closely with planners to mitigate against effects of development and where possible gain improvements/additions to rights of way as a result.
The wording on this form was inaccessible except to CCC ROW people.		Noted	
Maintain footpaths in rural condition and avoid ruination of natural surfaces and general urbanisation of the network.		Noted	
A ridiculously long and detailed questionnaire. Your responses will be biased as only those with time will bother to fill this out. Difficult dangerous or underused paths should be left to the wildlife to enjoy. The costs/benefits of spending taxpayers' money should be decided before doing large-scale general changes to all rights of way.		Noted	
Improvement at the end of Porters Way Bridleway needed.		Noted	
A1198 from Longstowe bridge to Red House pub is very dangerous as there is no footpath or kerb over the bridge.		Noted	