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Glossary of terms
SECTION 1: AIM OF THE PLAN

1.1 Medway has just over 177 miles (285 km) of public rights of way through both rural and urban areas. Medway Council has recently organised two walking festivals. The feedback from these events is encouraging, with participants impressed and often surprised by the areas beauty and interest, which is accessible through the public rights of way network. The primary aim of the Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP) is to ensure that the Rights of Way network is relevant to the people that wish to use it, and that the network meets their current and future needs whilst promoting access for all. How easy it is for people to use Public Rights of Way (PROW) is a key component of making the network a resource that is valued and utilized by as many people as possible. The accessibility of the network is determined by both the physical obstructions to movement that are generally recognized as barriers to the individual and subjective values determined by users, which are a psychological barrier to usage.

1.2 Improvements to PROW links contributes significantly to delivering Medway Council’s key six priorities, which are:

- A clean and green environment: by improving the quality and public realm of PROW, and increasing access to the countryside.
- Safer communities: by reducing the fear of crime on routes by opening up enclosed routes where possible.
- Children and young people having the best start in life: by providing increased opportunities for exercise and access to the countryside.
- Older and vulnerable people maintaining their independence: by providing increased accessibility to the countryside and increased opportunity for exercise.
- People travelling easily and safely in Medway: by providing increased accessibility on Medway’s PROW network.
- Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration: by improving existing routes and creating new routes in conjunction with new development.

1.3 Medway Council will strive to provide routes with the highest level of accessibility possible given budget limitations, and the environmental constraints of a working landscape. The RoWIP will also consider how information is provided to users of the network to allow informed choices on route availability and suitability to each user. By the provision of information on routes location, surfacing and gradients in promotional materials and targeted interventions to reduce barriers to movement, it will make the network available to as many people as possible.

1.4 Medway Council intends to provide accessible routes throughout Medway on the PROW network in accordance with our LTP target of 70% being accessible by 2010/11.
SECTION 2: INTRODUCTION

2.1 Public Rights of Way (PROW) were the transport network of the past that now provides access to the countryside through a mixture of picturesque routes and urban linkages. A guide to some of the types of Right of Way available, and the classification of the type of authorised user is provided on the DEFRA web site and is reproduced below:

- Footpath: Over which the right of way is on foot only
- Bridleway: Over which the right of way is for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists
- Restricted Byway: For all types of traffic except mechanically propelled vehicles
- By way: For all users including mechanically propelled vehicles

Further information can be obtained from the following web site: http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/issues/public/index.htm

2.2 Comprised of minor public highways, Medway has just over 177 miles (285 km) of Public Rights of Way, which have differing roles and types of authorised usages. Table 2.1 summarises the PROW in Medway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity of sectional routes</th>
<th>Length in miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byways</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridleways</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.6 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>152.2 (245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Used as a Public Path (RUPP)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>347 sectional routes</strong></td>
<td><strong>177.4 miles of PROW (285 kilometers)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Under the duty placed on local authorities by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, Medway Council is required to produce a 10-
year action plan that considers the current and future needs of the community that the network serves, and how rights of way will have to develop to accommodate changes in the area and community.

2.4 This is a new duty for all highway authorities and builds upon the current statutory duties of highway authorities to maintain, signpost and keep free from obstruction those routes, which comprise the PROW network, as well as the maintenance of the definitive map and statement.

2.5 The CRoW Act (Countryside Rights of Way Act) requires the council to assess the:

- extent to which local rights of way meet the present and likely future needs of the public
- accessibility of the rights of way network to those with sensory and/or mobility difficulties
- opportunities afforded for recreational use and exercise
SECTION 3: HOW THE PLAN WAS DEVELOPED

3.1 Medway Council has used the existing local consultation and discussion user groups to provide the core of the information to inform Medway’s Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP). This information was supplemented with additional targeted public consultation, officer discussion and literature review. This foundation of information has been supported by a complete condition survey of the network considering the fabric of the network and the physical barriers to usage.

3.2 The development of the RoWIP has been conducted in parallel to the development of a number of associated strategies that consider the wider environmental context together with the management, promotion and development of green space in the area. These documents include Medway’s Green Grid Strategy and the Countryside and Open Space Strategy, together with the adopted Local Transport Plan and emerging Local Development Framework.

Local Transport Plan 2006-2011

3.3 Medway Council’s statutory Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2006-2011 sets out the overarching strategic vision for transport in Medway. The RoWIP is one of a suite of supporting documents that builds on this core strategy and informs other supporting plans and strategies. Other LTP supporting documents that link directly to the RoWIP include the Medway Walking Action Plan, the Medway Road Safety Plan and the Medway Cycling Action Plan. Full details of these documents are contained on Medway Council’s web site.

3.4 The actions in the RoWIP and key targets in Medway’s LTP are closely linked. As part of this integration, it is considered that an improved quality of life for the people of Medway will be delivered by improved access for users with disabilities (where practical), and improved signage and waymarking on routes as required.

Links to other agendas

3.5 The Medway RoWIP contributes to delivering a number of wide ranging strategies covering other agendas within the Medway area that link to improving quality of life. These Medway wide strategies seek to deliver a series of improvements across a range of economic, environmental and social issues. Table 3.1 assesses the contribution the improvement plan makes to other agendas in Medway, which include:

- Medway’s Accessibility Strategy
- Medway Rural Action Plan
- Choosing Health in Medway
- Medway’s Community Plan / Local Area Agreement
- Kent and Medway Structure Plan
- Local Development Framework
- Medway Council’s Performance Plan
- Green Grid Strategy
- Countryside and Open Spaces Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Contribution of Medway’s RoWIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medway’s Accessibility Strategy</td>
<td>By promoting and supporting walking and cycling as healthy, sustainable forms of transport for utility and leisure trips. By supporting the implementation of a range of walking and cycling priority schemes that will encourage walking and cycling on the PROW network. By removing barriers to movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway Rural Action Plan</td>
<td>By supporting improved access to the countryside to enable rural areas to be enjoyed and valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing Health in Medway</td>
<td>By supporting partnership working with health professionals and encouraging lifestyle changes that would result in increased physical activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway’s Community Plan</td>
<td>By reducing barriers to movement for pedestrians. By encouraging walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent and Medway Structure Plan</td>
<td>By supporting improved access to the riverbanks along designated PROWs. By increasing opportunities for walking and cycling. By supporting the protection of rural lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
<td>By promoting access to the countryside and riverbanks by supporting the development of a green grid. By ensuring PROW are considered during accessibility appraisals linked to new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway Council’s Performance Plan</td>
<td>By promoting walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Grid Strategy</td>
<td>By supporting the development of a green grid throughout Medway and linking through the sub-region of the Thames Gateway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside and Open Spaces Strategy</td>
<td>By supporting increased access to countryside and open spaces in Medway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 The RoWIP also plays an important role in maintenance plans. Medway Council's emerging Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) will also take into account the RoWIP and ensure that inspection regimes together with reactive and proactive works are delivered to ensure enhanced access across the network for users.
SECTION 4: REGENERATION OF MEDWAY

4.1 The regeneration of Medway that is currently being progressed will fundamentally alter the built environment of our urban areas, which will place additional demands on infrastructure of Medway, including the PROW network. These future developments are set against a backdrop of increasing urbanisation in the southeast.

4.2 There are good opportunities to improve public access in many areas of Medway. For example Rochester Riverside, Temple Marsh and Chattenden will all include new access paths and improve on current levels of access. The waterfront regeneration sites can contribute to the creation and extension of a riverside path along the River Medway. This aim is recognised in the masterplans for the regeneration sites in Medway, giving attention to the importance in improving accessibility for walking and cycling.

4.3 In 2001 the overall density of residential development in England was 25 dwellings per hectare.¹ The Deputy Prime Minister’s Parliamentary Statement on July 2002 on sustainable communities detailed the intention to intervene in housing applications involving a density of less than 30 dwellings per hectare (dph), which has resulted in a corresponding rise in densities for new developments. The increase in required densities of new developments is now prescribed in PPS3, which sets indicative dwelling density ranges per hectare as follows:

- City centre: Above 70 dph
- Urban: 40 –75 dph
- Suburban: 35-55 dph
- Rural: 30-40 dph

4.4 Currently, Medway has an average density of 12.99 persons per hectare (ppha) with densities varying between 77 pp ha in Gillingham to 1.7 pp ha in the rural areas on the peninsular. The continuing drive for more houses in smaller spaces will increase the importance of accessible green space as a resource especially for those living in urban areas.

4.5 The importance of green space has received increasing attention over recent years with CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) being at the forefront of advocating the importance of green space in the built environment. Further information can be obtained at the following web site: (http://www.itsyourspace.org.uk/why_changeit.asp)

4.6 However, the importance of PROW as accessible green space and the contribution that these ancient highways provide to a range of issues has been less clearly defined. The adoption of this plan will formalise

the council’s response to the current and future users of the Public Rights of Way network. Natural England Strategy Direction 2006-2009 details Natural England’s responsibility to ensure that the natural environment is protected.

4.7 The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 sets Natural England a new purpose “to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development”. This new national perspective supports the process and aspirations for the PROW network in Medway and the administration and development of green space.

Population

4.8 Medway currently has a population of 249,448 this includes 30,057 living outside the main urban area. ²

4.9 Medway’s population is predicted to grow in number, whilst the age of our population is also set to rise. The projected demographic change is partly due to the provision of additional housing but also in response to the baby boomers born after the Second World War getting older.

4.10 The current composition of Medway residents is younger than the average for the United Kingdom with a mean age of 36 in comparison to 39 for the South East. Medway also currently has a higher proportion of its population aged less than 44 years of age compared to England and the rest of the South East.

4.11 Individuals aged over 65 comprise only 12.6% of the population of Medway compared to 16.4% for the South East.³ However, as the population of Medway ages the effects of the changing age profile must be accommodated in our future maintenance and development plans for the PROW network.

Health

4.12 The scientific evidence on physical activity is compelling. Physical activity not only contributes to well being, but is also essential for good health. People who are physically active reduce their risk of developing the major chronic diseases, such as coronary heart disease, stroke and type two diabetes – by up to 50 per cent, and the risk of premature death by about 20 – 30 per cent (Sir Liam Donaldson, Chief Medical officer, Department of Health).

“I have two doctors, my left leg and my right” (George Trevelyan 1913)

² Source: 2001 census.
4.13 However physical activity doesn't just help with physical health, it can have a positive effect on your mind, and is especially helpful in treating mild depression. A survey carried out by the charity Mind in 2001 found that 83% of people with mental health problems looked to exercise to help lift their mood or to reduce stress. Two-thirds said exercise helped to relieve the symptoms of depression and more than half said it helped to reduce stress and anxiety. Six out of 10 of the respondents said that physical exercise helped to improve their motivation, 50% said it boosted their self-esteem and 24% said it improved their social skills.  

4.14 In general terms, research has shown that walking in a green and pleasant environment is associated with increased longevity in older people and that attractive spaces and community amenities are just "good for us". In general terms, research has shown that walking in a green and pleasant environment is associated with increased longevity in older people and that attractive spaces and community amenities are just "good for us". 

4.15 Obesity and physical inactivity cost the country £11 billion per year. Natural England have adopted an objective of providing accessible space within 300 metres or a 5 minute walk of every home in England for exercise, relaxation and wellbeing.

4.16 PROW provide free access to leisure and recreation and assist in the council’s commitment to work in partnership with health providers, to improve the health of the residents of Medway, and support the new developments being championed at national level.

Promotion

4.17 Medway Council have produced a range of free dedicated walking and cycling publications that have received recognition for the information they contain and the their imaginative and artistic presentation. This information takes the form of a suite of general and targeted books, and leaflets considering general access to green space and specific events. This includes a document called ‘What’s On’ which is a general guide to events in the green spaces of Medway, such as Easter bunny hunts and bird cruises, targeted children’s events and guided walks, which are facilitated by the council to assist the public in its enjoyment of the Medway area.

4.18 Medway Council also produce publications to raise awareness of targeted events such as the yearly Medway Walking Festival, which provides free supervised walks. The walks range from one mile long for those new to leisure walking to joint events with the RSPB, Kent Wildlife Trust, Plantlife and the Ramblers Association focusing on specialist interest areas. For the dedicated walker we have challenging routes over the marsh areas made famous in Charles Dickens Great

---

4 Source: http://www.thesite.org/healthandwellbeing/wellbeing/lookingafteryourself/boostmentalhealth
5 Source: http://jech.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/56/12/896-a
Expectations to showcase the exceptional landscape of Medway over a 17 mile (27km) route.

4.19 The majority of the routes promoted as part of the walking festival utilise PROW. The benefit of the promotion of independent walking to health has been recognised by Medway’s Primary Care Trust by the formation of a partnership between Medway’s Walking Festival and the 4Life programme, which is a joint programme between Medway Council’s Health Promotions team and Medway PCT.

4.20 Cycling is also catered for by the free ‘Cycle Routes in Medway’ guide which details all of the cycle routes in Medway and its sister publication which shows the route of the 2007 Tour de France. This new publication allows the public to follow part of the route taken by the cyclists of the Tour. In conjunction with the RSPB, Medway Council has produced the Heron Trail leaflet, which shows both walking and cycling routes that incorporate rights of way that allow the public to visit the famous Herons of High Halstow (see images of covers below).
Access to information

4.21 Medway currently has a high proportion of residents with below average academic qualifications in comparison with the rest of England, as table 4.1 demonstrates. However, this is predicted to change due to the development of the Universities at Medway complex and the regeneration of the area. It is recognised that current publications could be improved for those with lower educational attainment, learning disabilities and sensory impairments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Comparison of qualifications of 16-74 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Levels as specified by Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.22 To address this issue, an ongoing review of Medway Council’s current walking and cycling publications is proposed. This review will consider the format and information contained in each document and how easily the information can be interpreted by those with learning disabilities, English as a second language or generally poor literary skills and also those with sensory disabilities.
SECTION 5: CONSULTATION

5.1 Consultation on Medway’s RoWIP consisted of focused consultation in 2006-2007 supported by a wider walking consultation undertaken in 2003. The focused RoWIP consultation included:

- Questionnaire survey in Medway Matters and on the web
- Direct mailing of approximately 140 questionnaires
- Direct engagement with interest groups
- Face to face engagement with the public
- Access questionnaire
- Landowners questionnaire
- Equestrian and motorised vehicle users questionnaire
- Direct consultation with Parish councils
- Regular representations and updates to Medway’s Rural Liaison committee.

5.2 Broader consultation was undertaken in 2003 in conjunction with the preparation of Medway’s Walking Strategy and provided input to Medway’s LTP 2006-2011; the consultation was called ‘Talking Walking’. This consultation had a high participation rate.

5.3 In some cases the results of the consultation run slightly counter to findings from other research. To a certain extent this is due to the differing interests or characteristics of the participants in the RoWIP survey; for example those who ‘self-select’ to complete a survey on PROW are more likely to be regular or occasional users of the network compared to the wider population of Medway. Another reason for a ‘skewed demographic’ in the RoWIP consultation is a lower participation rate compared to the ‘Talking Walking’ consultation. Recognising this issue, Medway Council have strived to obtain a broad range of views, including working directly with a wide range of interest groups.

Talking Walking consultation

5.4 The Talking Walking consultation was conducted by Medway Council in the autumn of 2003 and considered all aspects of the walking environment, and the relevant merits of each environment for improvement. This was a wide-ranging study that considered PROW within the context of all pedestrian movement and environments.
5.5 The results from this consultation feed into the development of the adopted Local Transport Plan, and support those views found in the dedicated consultation conducted for the RoWIP. The results allow the relative importance of investment in the infrastructure generally associated to PROW as gauged from the public perspective.

5.6 Regarding general areas requiring improvements to assist pedestrians, respondents indicated the priorities for council funding of improvements to assist pedestrians to be firstly on busy traffic routes (15%), secondly where pedestrian flows are high (12%), and thirdly at local facilities (9%). Although no specific question was asked that separates rural localities from the public rights of way network, the survey demonstrated that consultees consider investment in rural areas and routes used for leisure purposes as a lower priority than investment in areas with higher levels of usage or where there are perceived safety concerns. However, the upgrading and extension of pedestrian links particularly riverside routes, leisure routes/public rights of way and routes to stations is still considered an important issue by a significant number of respondents.

5.7 When respondents were asked to rank locations requiring improvement to pedestrian facilities in order of importance, 10% cited the Saxon Shore Way, which is a PROW that is used primarily as a riverside leisure route together with routes to stations as a priority for improvement.

5.8 The ‘Talking Walking’ consultation considered what factors respondents perceived as threatening. The majority of usage associated to rural public rights of way will be concentrated in the daylight hours and in respect of rural routes the routine provision of street lighting may not be suitable. Therefore concerns associated to personal safety including locating of routes in areas that afford good natural light and avoid enclosed spaces such as subways should be included in future route location and the improvement of the existing network.

5.9 During hours of darkness the major concern is associated to adequate street lighting. Many PROW afford convenient routes to local facilities, especially in the urban areas. The routine use of street lighting is not appropriate in many rural areas. However, where a right of way is the primary pedestrian route to amenities the improvement of surface quality, street lighting and the reduction of hiding places is an important contributory factor to increase patronage.

5.10 ‘Talking walking’ showed the importance of leisure walking to the public with 76% of respondents indicated that they ‘walked for leisure’ on a daily or weekly basis. When asked what would encourage respondents to walk for leisure, the responses were split quite evenly with ‘improved maintenance of routes’ (30%) regarded as most important, followed by ‘more accessible routes’ (27%). ‘Maintenance of routes’ incorporates
for example the adequacy of PROW surface, regular cutting back of vegetation and the maintenance of routes across farmland. ‘More accessible routes’ relates to the development of new routes that are more accessible to the public and the removal of obstructions to movement on existing routes such as stiles.

5.11 Full details of the results of the ‘Talking Walking’ consultation are reproduced at Appendix A.

**Specific RoWIP consultation**

5.12 Specific consultation was conducted for the RoWIP from December 2006 to February 2007. This consultation was multi-faceted, and designed to encourage public participation in the process. This included the use of a general questionnaire together with area specific questionnaires for landowners, access issues, equestrian users and off-road vehicle users. The methods used to obtain input to the development of the plan included:

- a questionnaire survey in Medway Matters, which is a monthly council publication that is delivered to every household in Medway. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix

- questionnaires posted directly to members of the Local Access Forum, consultees for the Local Plan and Local Transport Plan;

- engagement with interest groups, including ethnic minority and disability groups, including targeted distribution of consultation questionnaires to relevant groups and individuals;

- direct discussions with landowners together with the distribution of questionnaires to major landowners in the area;

- face to face consultation with members of the public on our most heavily used PROW routes;

- use of the council’s website to improve access to the suite of questionnaires.

5.13 The specific consultation conducted for the RoWIP considered a number of key areas related to the usage of the PROW. The relative level of usage of footpaths, bridleways and byways was generally comparable, although footpaths consistently have more regular usage and users than any other type of route.

5.14 The consultation established that many individuals identified information about routes, their location and how accessible they were as a major barrier. Personal safety was also highlighted as a concern.
5.15 With over a third more responses than any other category, leisure and recreation was identified as the main reason for using the PROW network. It could be argued that the second most popular reply; walking the dog, is also a leisure pursuit. Health is a primary motivating factor for a significant minority of respondents. However given the active promotion of walking and its health benefits, it is envisaged that awareness of the link between walking and health will significantly rise in the near future together with the number of people who walk to improve their health.

5.16 Generally the respondents found the council’s publications to be of an excellent standard. However, only 53% of those consulted were aware those publications were available and direct discussions with users of the network showed that this lack of knowledge was most prevalent in those with learning disabilities and ethnic minority groups. Traditional paper based leaflets and books proved to be most successful with the council’s website also receiving recognition.

5.17 Overall, the majority of users considered better maintenance of the existing infrastructure the highest priority. Improved signage and waymarking is the second highest priority for improvement. The first significant area for additional funding that could be considered an improvement rather than enhanced maintenance of existing provision is the request for surface improvements and removal of stiles. Both of these issues directly affect the physical characteristics of a route and their associated accessibility.

5.18 Full details of the results of the specific public Rights of Way Implementation Plan are reproduced at Appendix B.

Access Questionnaire

5.19 The access questionnaire was generally distributed and available on the Council website. It was also sent to organisations directly involved with sensory mobility and disability interests for consideration. Although it was hoped that comments would be received from organizations with an interest in disability issues the overall level of response was poor. The majority of responses came from individuals with an interest in improved accessibility. Respondents to the access questionnaire were asked to consider how they’d used the PROW in the last year. The majority of respondents to the access questionnaire used the PROW network one to three times per week. Usage of the network was well represented across footpaths, bridleways and byways.

5.20 In terms of access one of the most influential aspects that must be considered is the time of year and the networks response to the prevailing climatic conditions. For example spring time brings new growth, which could block some routes, autumn ploughing may make some routes impassable, if agricultural works are not correctly
managed. Spring and winter rains may change the character of an unsealed path to render some areas difficult to access during certain climatic conditions. Interestingly the access questionnaire showed a relative parity of usage across the seasons with a small but expected rise in usage during the summertime and a corresponding decline in usage during the winter.

5.21 The accessibility questionnaire asked the public to consider priorities for future investment. Better signage and way marking was a clear favourite for investment with improved maintenance the second highest priority. New footpaths and bridleways received comparable numbers of requests.

5.22 Interestingly given that the access questionnaire is primarily concerned with access improvements, removal of stiles was considered a lower priority than new footpaths or bridleways and no requests for surface improvements were recorded. However, it should also be noted that the level of responses from disabled groups and individuals was very low and may not be truly representative of all disabled users needs.

5.23 The respondents did not highlight smooth path surfaces or routes located in a country park as main reasons for using public rights of way. Given that Riverside Country Park has arguably the most accessible PROW in Medway this is an unexpected result.

5.24 Full details of the results of the Access questionnaire are reproduced at Appendix C.

Comments from the Open Spaces Society

5.25 The Open Spaces Society considers the accurate mapping of the public rights of way network as a priority. The Department of the Environments circular 2/93 paragraph 44 sets out Medway Council’s statutory duty as highway authority to provide a map and statement for the formally excluded areas of Chatham, Rochester and Gillingham. The Open Spaces Society would like to see this work undertaken and included in all relevant documents, which should be kept up to date and available at a reasonable cost to the public.

5.26 Medway Council acknowledges the recent Local Government Ombudsman findings. Progress updates will be prepared on completing the Project Plan for mapping rights of way within the excluded areas. This information will be provided to the Open Spaces Society every six months.
Comments from the Medway Access Group

5.27 The Medway Access Group did not complete a questionnaire but submitted their comments in the form of a letter. Overall the Access Group wanted the council to consider access in its broadest sense and not purely in terms of physical barriers. The Access Group highlighted the need for the general public’s concerns to not be considered in isolation but thought of in respect of an aging population and the impact on the disabled community. For example, good signage and maintenance helps all users but is of even more importance to those with a disability. The way in which improvements are delivered should be considered in terms of the added value that consideration of the disabled community would provide to the community at large.

5.28 One of the major concerns of the Access Group related to the quality of information currently provided. Although routes were clearly shown and described in terms of scenic views and historical merit the quality of surfaces, gradients, barriers and other factors that allowed disabled users to make informed judgments were not adequately provided. They would also like to see tailored routes that provide improvements for different types of access problem from the obvious physical constraints that can be removed by improved surfaces or the removal of a physical barrier to imaginative signage and way marking to assist those with learning disabilities and / or visual impairments.

Comments from the Kent Association for the Blind

5.29 The Kent Association for the Blind (KAB) would like to see improved information and signage provided to assist those with visual impairment. Improvements to maintenance and promotion to allow more people to access the rural areas using the PROW network would also be welcomed.

5.30 The KAB deals with 610 individuals who are registered blind, 850 who are partially sighted and also knows of 600 other individuals with severely compromised sight, who are not officially registered as blind or partially sighted. It should be noted that signs using symbols that can easily be followed may potentially assist more individuals with visual impairments than are currently recognised officially as having problems with their sight.

Landowner’s questionnaire

5.31 The landowner’s questionnaire received only seven responses. However, those respondents are all significant landowners with wide ranging land interests across the Medway area, and as such comprise some of the most significant and influential contributors to the development, and maintenance of the public rights of way network. Although respondents came from a wide range of areas they generally had an extensive knowledge of the land that they cared for and would
welcome positive steps to improve relations with users of the PROW network.

5.32 The landowners who responded to the questionnaire directly control the land that approximately 1/7th of the network is located upon. Landowners considered improved signage and way making as an area requiring further investment. Diversion of routes was seen by landowners as a way to encourage access by placing routes in more favourable locations for the user and landowner, thus reducing the potential for land management practices impinging on how easy a route is to use.

5.33 Improved engagement between the local authority and landowners to consider the suitability of existing routes and the potential for specific routes to be reclassified to improve continuity of route type. For example, the reclassification of footpaths to bridleways was highlighted as an area that potentially could be considered.

5.34 Interestingly landowners wondered what the motivation was when asked if stiles should be replaced with kissing gates as a stile was seen, as a good solution in terms of access provision, together with sensible maintenance needs. However it was accepted by the majority of respondents that on certain routes a stile might not be the best solution, and potentially complete removal of the obstruction could be the preferred solution.

5.35 The majority of landowners were prepared to replace stiles with kissing gates where appropriate if the gate was provided. However, approximately a third of respondents would be unwilling to remove stiles irrespective of whether a gate was provided by the local authority or directly by the landowner themselves. All the landowners that responded to the questionnaire were aware or very aware of their responsibilities in the care and maintenance of PROW.

5.36 In terms of promotion, all of the landowners were aware of council publications and had used them for information. However when asked if additional information should be provided for land owners to better understand their obligations, all respondents considered this course of action unnecessary. Overall users of the public rights of way network are viewed in a positive light by the landowners, who would like to see improvements to the council’s inspection regime and associated works for general maintenance especially of signage and way marking.

5.37 Landowners major concerns regarding the negative effects of public rights of way and their usage centred on illegal vehicle usage, vandalism, trespass and unleashed dogs worrying livestock. In terms of the adequacy of provision for different categories of users landowners felt that walkers were generally well catered for.
5.38 Equestrian users received mixed reviews with some landowners who thought equestrian users had good provision and others having a contrary view. Cyclists were considered to be difficult to assess and landowners held no strong views regarding cyclists using rights of way or the adequacy of provision for this type of user. Motorcyclists and 4x4 users received no comments from landowners in respect of the quality of provision for powered vehicle users and only raised concerns in relation to illegal vehicle usage.

**Equestrian and motorised vehicle users questionnaire**

5.39 The equestrian and motorised vehicle users questionnaire received only 12 responses with seven being female, and five male. Eight of the responses considered equestrian usage as their primary mode of usage. All of the respondents had used footways and bridleways in the past year, nine respondents had used byways which makes this the most utilised part of the network for this category of user and 3 individuals had used Medway’s RUPPs.

5.40 Equestrian users have concerns about the continuity of the network and the relative difficulty of parking horseboxes when using the network. One respondent had not used the network as they considered Medway’s network was not suitable for horses.

5.41 In general terms, equestrian users have more concern regarding the type and condition of routes than motorised users, with none of the respondents considering that the routes in Medway could be classified as very good.

5.42 Equestrian users expressed the most concern regarding motorised users and fragmented routes. Although some concerns have been raised regarding signage and way marking, this category of user has a lower level of concern compared to other categories of user. Details of equestrian and motorised users concerns are detailed in table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1 – Concerns expressed by Equestrian and motorised users regarding problems experienced with other users of the PRoW network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorised users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding my route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following my route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments from The British Horse Society**

5.43 The British Horse Society is concerned that their data shows that equestrian usage is approximately 7% higher in the Medway area than Medway’s Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan
the rest of the UK with the provision of routes approximately 30% lower than the average for the rest of the country.

5.44 The British Horse Society would like to see equestrian needs considered as part of future traffic schemes especially in relation to large-scale highway schemes and the provision of crossing points to facilitate continuous routes. The deliver of links by the creation of new bridleways and/or the conversion of other types of Public Right of Way to link existing provision to provide a continuous route.

5.45 Partnership working with Kent County Council to provide longer continuous routes through Cobham and Ranscombe Farm reserve for equestrian users is considered an achievable way of expanding the network. Consideration should also be given to the expansion of bridleways in Capstone Farm Country Park.

Comments from Toll Riders (off-road) Trust (TROT)

5.46 Toll Rides (Off-Road) Trust was established in 1990 by Dora Pilkington and some other like-minded riders, who were concerned at the growing amount of traffic on their local roads. Their approach to local farmers, with the help and encouragement of the NFU, the Country Landowners Association and East Anglian Farm Rides, led to the first toll ride being opened on agreed tracks and headlands. This initial work was later assisted by the award of a grant by DEFRA for the expansion and development of the project.

5.47 TROT are concerned about the lack of provision for horse riders in the Medway area and the poor continuity of the existing provision. The trust has expressed an interest in working with the local authority in the development of new routes for equestrian users who are part of the trusts membership and subscribe to the scheme.

Comments from the Local Access Forum (LAF)

5.48 The Medway Local Access Forum has highlighted a number of areas that they would like to see considered for the effective management of the PROW network. They have also outlined a number of measures that they feel may support and advise the council regarding the effective future development of the network. Their comments are reproduced below.

- Encourage the removal or redesign of barriers and recommend alternative solutions, which conform to good agricultural practice and enable access for disabled people. Work with Parish Councils to identify barriers and report them to the PROW Team.
- Ensure the maintenance of the PROW network including swift response to the reporting of damage or obstructions.
- Recommend the creation of long distance circular routes for equestrians, cyclists and mobility vehicle users. Work with
equestrians, cyclists and users of mobility vehicles to identify potential routes.

- Identify where safer crossings or diversions should be introduced on busy roads linking PROW. Work with Parish Councils to identify the priorities for safer crossings or diversions. ‘Behind the hedge’ paths should be negotiated where appropriate. Support schemes such as ‘Quiet Lanes’.
- Develop appropriate management and enforcement measures to prevent illegal use such as motorised vehicles, fly tipping etc and minimise the damage caused.
- Ensure that all landowners, developers and planners are incorporating sustainable access in all significant new developments and areas of urban expansion.
- Promote access for mobility and sensory impaired users.
- Identify areas of MoD land (if any?) that the Forum would like access to (even partial or targeted access) to increase areas of open access.
- Support the promotion and encourage the establishment of more voluntary agreements with landowners such as DEFRA’s Environmental Stewardship and the Toll Ride Scheme.
- Recommend that improvements be made to clearly link accessible land, country parks, reserves and greenspaces to PROW.
- Support initiatives identifying sites for off-road cycle, motorcycle and other motorised vehicle use.
- Encourage schools and colleges to promote good and effective use of the countryside through practical projects within their respective curricula.
- Work with landowner organisations to promote appropriate access management. Encourage more people (especially youth groups) to volunteer to enhance countryside access such as the Community Paths Partnership.
- Support the creation of appropriate promotional materials produced by the Council and other stakeholders.

**Feedback from Medway Walking Festivals**

5.49 Medway Council organised Walking Festivals in 2006 and 2007. Issues raised by participants included:

- People often unsure of how to access the countryside and the PROW network.
- Personal safety issues in walking alone, especially from women.
- Organised walking events have brought new visitors to the countryside and the PROW network. This indicates that a proportion of the population needs the confidence of a ‘packaged’ walk.
• Interpretation of local history and natural environment was a major draw for many participants.

• Negative feedback related to maintenance and condition of some PROW.

• Many people interested in experiencing the views and countryside location, but levels of fitness and expectations of path surfacing and gradient sometimes means routes may be ambitious.

• Would like regular organised events.

• Encouraged people to visit parts of Medway that they had not seen before.

• People were generally impressed, and often surprised, by the area’s beauty and interest.

• That walks gave people, especially women, confidence to walk in the local area, which they would not have visited alone.

• Walks were friendly and people enjoyed the company of others.

• Enjoyable form of exercise that appealed to a wide range of people.

• Encouraged people to return to the area for further walks.
SECTION 6: ACCESSIBILITY OF THE NETWORK

6.1 The Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) 178 relates to the percentage of PROW that are easy to use by the public. ‘Easy to use’ is defined at table 7.1; but in summary the criteria are judged against accessibility of provision; waymarking and signage. If one of these categories is deficient on a route, then the whole route is categorised as unacceptable and fails the BVPI test.

6.2 Vandalism can impact on the accessibility of the PROW network. Inadequate signage due to damaged or stolen signs will impact on the BVPI score and similarly fly tipping is a significant cost in maintaining the accessibility of the network.

6.3 Medway’s PROW BVPI indicates an improvement from the 2003/4 baseline of 42% to 54.9% in 2005/6 and 67% in 2006/7. Details of the BVPI 178 scores for 2003/4 to 2006/7 with corresponding Medway Local Transport Plan trajectory and target 4.3 are detailed in chart 6.1. This demonstrates Medway Council is exceeding the target trajectory and is well on the way to achieving the LTP target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 6.1 - BVPI 178 Comparison between sampled actual accessibility and target trajectory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of routes accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition survey of the Public Rights of Way Network

6.4 Medway Council commissioned an independent assessment of the condition and accessibility of the PROW network in the winter of 2006/7. This piece of work considered the physical condition, gradient, surface type and barriers on the whole of Medway’s PROW network. The information derived from this assessment will allow the improvement of our management practices and assist in the targeting of resources to improve access as quickly and cost effectively as possible.
6.5 This work has provided current data on the:

- location of all kissing gates and stiles and their current condition and requirement for maintenance or replacement
- surface type and the need for maintenance or upgrade of current facility to improve accessibility
- gradient of all routes to facilitate improved information
- location of barriers to movement, for example: steps
- location of other structures that facilitate movement, for example: bridges and seating
- areas that require higher levels of maintenance due to localized drainage conditions and/or the propensity for vegetation to restrict access
- complete review of the existing signage and waymarking of the network

6.6 This review has allowed a complete assessment of the relative accessibility of the network and highlighted key areas for improvement. The collation of this information will improve the quality and relevance of our publications for all users but especially for those with impairments so that the public can make informed choices. The results of this assessment work are detailed below in table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Raw Data</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total No of paths</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with accessibility issues</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with signage issues</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with waymarking issues</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with stiles</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with stiles in good condition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with obstructions</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with steps</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with bridge concerns</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths with gates that obstruct movement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paths considered satisfactory</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.1 – Results of PRoW network assessment**

*Notes on table 6.1:* The total number of paths represents a consolidation of the 347 sectional routes shown in table 2.1, because if one section of a route is unacceptable, then the entire route fails the BVPI assessment test and this impacts on the BVPI score.
6.7 The key conclusions of the condition survey have been used in conjunction with priorities derived from supporting documents and strategies together with the results of our consultation exercises to inform our statement of action.
SECTION 7: ASSESSMENT OF USERS NEEDS AND STATEMENT OF ACTIONS

Assessment of users needs

7.1 Medway Council intends to provide accessible routes throughout Medway on the PROW network in accordance with our LTP target of 70% being accessible by 2010/11 subject to available funding. Small-scale improvements to signing and waymarking will significantly improve accessibility.

7.2 Within the organisation of Medway Council, the responsibility for the accessibility, mapping, maintenance and improvement of PROW, together with the coordination of the LAF (Local Access Forum) rests with the Head of Highways, supported by two part-time PROW officers. As a result, the majority of the actions detailed in the PRoWIP are the responsibility of the Head of Highways to deliver.

7.3 After agreement and adoption of Medway’s RoWIP, Medway Council will develop an Implementation Plan, which will establish key officers for the individual actions detailed in this section. This plan will detail management structures and demonstrate how the council will build engagement and delivery with voluntary groups and other key stakeholders.

7.4 Accessibility can be considered as a measure of how easy an individual finds the relationship between themselves and their environment. By considering potential barriers to access and tailoring our response to local conditions we will improve the number of people able to use each type of right of way and provide specific information to allow informed decision making by the public. The RoWIP aims to make each PROW as easily accessible to as many people as possible, as easily as possible within the environmental constraints.

7.5 The existing network has a number of issues that require resolution to allow a higher level of accessibility to be achieved. Future works and developments will consider five overarching themes.

i) Review of the definitive map and statement to ensure records are accurate

ii) Resolution of existing barriers to movement

iii) Effective inspection and maintenance of the network to maintain improved accessibility

iv) The development of more inclusive promotion of the network
v) Identification of missing links in the network and the delivery of new links to provide continuous routes where practicable for public use.

7.6 These themes will be informed and supported by

- an open system for establishing priorities
- partnership working to facilitate the development of improved routes
- future developments and changes in legislation, which may fundamentally improve opportunities for access.

**Definitive map and statement**

7.7 The definitive map and statement provides a legal record, which determines where the public has a right to use the public rights of way network. The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 sets out procedures for the determination of routes that do not appear on the statement or where a route is recorded and additional rights may exist. Under the powers in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, a highway authority can test these claims and make a definitive map modification order to amend the map of statement and ensure that record are correct.

7.8 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 now places a time limit on the amendment of the statement based on historical evidence of the 1st January 2026. This time limit makes the accurate recording of the network a priority.

7.9 **Definitive map and statement actions will include:**

a) Complete review of the definitive map and statement to ensure information is accurate and records all routes by 1st April 2017, with six monthly updates to key stakeholder groups.

b) Review of the processes for the quick resolution of new PROW claims including the use of express dedication where appropriate for simple cases by 1st April 2009.

c) Review of the processing arrangements for definitive map modification orders including upgrades, downgrades and extinguishments by 1st April 2009.

d) Improvement of public access to the Map and statement by the provision of hard copies at all council libraries and offices, together with the definitive map being available via the council’s website by 1st January 2018.
Improved continuity of the network

7.10 The consultation exercise conducted for the RoWIP identified concerns regarding the continuity of routes especially those utilised by horse riders.

7.11 Section 1.1.6 of the DEFRA Guidance to Local Authorities on PRoWIPs states:

“the creation of new routes in carefully chosen locations would make a significant difference to people who use, or who would like to use, footpaths, bridleways and byways. In areas where rights of way are fragmented, new short links between existing routes would provide a substantially wider local network than exists at present.”

7.12 Improved continuity of the network actions: subject to available funding, the following actions will be pursued to improve the continuity of the PROW network:

a) Medway Council will support the making of diversion orders, which assist landowners in the safe and effective management of their land and are in the interest of users, subject to a contribution from the affected landowners to the costs of diversion orders.

b) Creation of new routes and / or the change of route classification will be progressed where route continuity can be improved and amenity will be enhanced with safety preserved.

c) Creation agreements and orders will be supported where there is an identified public need or benefit and / or the range of users will be increased.

Maintenance and Inspection

7.13 The consultation conducted for RoWIP highlighted maintenance of the network as the public’s top priority for improvement. Medway Council monitor the condition of rights of way in the local authority area that are easy to use by the general public in accordance with the CSS methodology as a benchmark standard. This standard is detailed in table 7.1.

| Table 7.1 – CSS methodology for monitoring the condition of PRoW |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Description                     | The percentage of the total length of rights of way in the local authority area that are open to use by the general public |
| Purpose/aim                     | To monitor the condition of rights of way, so as to increase the opportunities for access to, and improve enjoyment of, |
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| Definition | Authorities should use the CSS methodology as a benchmark standard, which is based on a minimum 5% random sample of lengths of rights of way. Easy to use means rights of way that are:  
- Signposted where they leave the road in accordance with section 27 of the Countryside Act 1968 and to the extent necessary to allow users to follow the path  
- Free from unlawful obstructions or other interference (Including overhanging vegetation) to the public’s right of passage.  
- Surface and lawful barriers (e.g. stiles and gates) are in good repair and to a standard necessary to enable the public to use the way without undue inconvenience. |
| Formula | \[ N = \left(\frac{a}{b}\right) \times 100 \]  
Where:  
a = lengths of footways which are easy to use  
b = total length of footway |

7.14 Appropriate maintenance regimes have to take into account land usage in the area, intensity of patronage and the time of year. The way in which these factors interact means that a standardised approach is not appropriate and therefore routes need to be considered and classified according to their individual circumstances. Appropriate maintenance also requires an appropriate inspection regime to facilitate quick response to unforeseen eventualities or environmental factors influencing the time of year when maintenance of vegetation is required.

7.15 Measured by the number of paths rather than overall length of path, in 2006/07 Medway had 111 paths out of a total of 305 paths that were deemed satisfactory in all aspects by an independent condition survey. Medway Council will use inspection data to inform future maintenance to meet our stated LTP target of 70% of all paths fully accessible (measured by length) by 2010/11.

7.16 **Actions associated with maintenance and inspection of PROWs in Medway will include:**

a) All public rights of way will be inspected following existing guidelines with due regard to our statutory responsibilities to users and the environment.

b) A review of the frequency that public rights of way are used will be undertaken by 2010 to determine which routes require enhanced maintenance regimes due to levels of usage or localised environmental factors.
c) Maintenance standards will be reviewed annually using the CCS methodology and benchmarked against comparable authorities to take into account best practise.

d) All maintenance of standing obstructions such as stiles, gates and fencing will be considered with removal of the obstruction as the first line of maintenance subject to agreement with landowners and social and environmental factors.

e) The 65 paths highlighted as having access issues by our independent inspection will be targeted for improvement.

f) The 35 stiles deemed of inadequate quality will be inspected, removed, repaired or replaced to ensure that identified deficiencies are resolved by 2010.

g) The 19 gates highlighted as having access issues by our independent inspection will have been resolved by 2010.

Signage and waymarking

7.17 Signage and waymarking were identified as the second highest priority for improvement on Medway’s PROW network. Safe and dependable signage and waymarking is important if the public is to have confidence in a route and their ability to follow it. This is especially important for vulnerable groups and for those following long distance routes where dependence on alternative methods of navigation due to loss of confidence in the signing of a route, may reduce enjoyment and potential future tourism.

7.18 The independent condition survey undertaken for Medway Council highlighted 67 routes with signage issues and 67 with waymarking issues out of a total of 305 routes in Medway. Some of these routes are double counted as they have both signage and waymarking issues.

7.19 Actions to improve signage will include:

a) All issues identified by the independent condition survey of the public rights of way network will be resolved by 2015 in compliance with relevant regulations and or guidance.

b) Medway’s PROW will have its signage inspected and maintained as part of the identified maintenance programme to allow compliance with LTP targets.

c) The use of additional information deemed necessary as part of Medway’s Green Grid strategy or associated health, tourism or specific council initiatives will be undertaken as required.
d) Inappropriate or illegal signage will be removed from PROW as part of our inspection regime and appropriate enforcement action undertaken as necessary.

7.20 Actions to improved waymarking will include:

e) All issues identified by the independent conditions survey of the PROW network will be resolved by 2015 in compliance with relevant regulations and guidance.

f) Medway’s PROW will have its waymarking inspected and maintained as part of the identified maintenance programme to allow compliance with LTP targets.

g) Waymarking will be improved to assist users and reduce unintentional trespass.

h) Medway Council will actively work with health authorities and other organisations to promote equitable access and the health benefits of walking.

Promotion of the Network

7.21 Medway Council already has a number of publications that have received recognition for their artistic merit and information. However, the breadth of the information provided can be improved. The independent condition survey conducted for Medway Council will be the foundation for enhanced information allowing users of the network to make informed choices. As well as improvements to traditional information sources Medway Council will actively promote electronic information sources. Information will be targeted at various user types, which will include:

- Tourists
- Local residents
- Walkers
- Cyclists
- Equestrian users
- Vehicle users
- Disabled users
- Landowners
- Adjoining councils and planning authorities
- Joint publications between Medway Council and key partners

7.22 Subject to securing adequate funding, Medway Council plans to promote the use of PROW network by the following actions:
a) The development of a Medway wide public rights of way map detailing routes, barriers and gradients will be produced by 2010 and updated every three years.

b) Following the success of the Walking Festivals in 2006 and 2007, aim to make this a regular yearly event.

c) The production of information for landowners detailing their responsibilities and how Medway Council can assist them in the discharging of their duties by 2009.

d) Aim to review and update existing publications as required with a focus on increasing disability information, which assists those with disabilities.

e) Aim for the re-printing or enhancement of current dedicated information leaflets for the Saxon Shore Way, North Downs Way, Darland Banks and the paths linking to Capstone Country Park. These routes were identified as the four most popular routes with the public during the PRoWIP consultation exercise.

Planning and regeneration

7.23 Medway is currently undergoing an unprecedented level of construction related to the regeneration of the riverside, primarily at Chatham and Rochester, and the new housing development at Chattenden. This level of change places conflicting pressures on PROW. The delivery of new developments can lead to the extinguishment or diversion of established routes, which may reduce continuity or directness of the route. It may also have an impact on visual amenity

7.24 The impact of a proposal on a public right of way is a material consideration during the planning process under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Medway Local Plan currently considers public rights of way, however with the development of the Local Development Framework, Medway undertakes to consider public rights of way in the future.

7.25 The following actions will be undertaken in conjunction with the impact of development on PROW:

a) The planning process will consider existing public rights of way in respect of any planning application submitted and contributions for improvements will be sought where applicable.

b) Where a PROW is affected by developments, the recovery of all costs associated with the reinstatement of that route will be sought at Medway Council’s discretion.
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Improvements for specific user groups

Walkers

7.26 The general level for provision for walkers in the Medway area is currently good in terms of the continuity and extent of the network. However, the quality of access that users would like to see as detailed through the consultation exercises is not always available in practice. In general terms, those routes, which are heavily used or in high profile locations are clear of obstructions and are maintained to a good standard. However routes in more rural locations, those co-located with agricultural operations and some urban routes are in a state of repair that does not facilitate usage.

7.27 Actions to improve conditions for walkers shall include:

a) Maintenance regimes and signage will be improved to facilitate usage and access across the network including those routes current deemed to be requiring improvement.

b) The 65 paths highlighted as having access issues by our independent inspection will be targeted for improvement.

c) The 35 stiles deemed of inadequate quality will be inspected, removed, repaired or replaced to ensure that identified deficiencies are resolved by 2010.

d) The 19 gates highlighted as having access issues by our independent inspection will have been resolved by 2010.

e) The development of links to health agenda to facilitate urban walking for short journeys will be progressed.

Equestrian users

7.28 The existing provision for equestrian users is currently fragmented and requires riders to use road linkages, which may be inappropriate. Overall the British Horse Society estimates that Medway has 7% more equestrian users than the national average with 30% less available routes. This situation of under provision is exacerbated by the fragmented nature of the available routes and the poor provision of horsebox parking in close proximity to longer distance rural routes.

7.29 The following actions are planned to improve conditions for equestrian users:

a) Medway Council will seek to develop a strategic bridleway network with appropriate facilities.
b) Medway Council will consider equestrian needs as part of future traffic schemes especially in relation to large-scale highway schemes and the provision of crossing points to facilitate continuous equestrian routes.

c) Medway Council will seek to deliver missing equestrian links by the creation of new bridleways and/or the conversion of other types of PROW to link existing provision to provide a continuous route.

d) Medway Council will seek to work in partnership with Kent County Council to provide longer continuous routes through Cobham and Ranscombe Farm reserve for equestrian users.

e) Medway Council will undertake a review of the existing equestrian facilities located in Medway’s country parks with a view to expansion of bridleways as appropriate.

f) Medway Council will initiate discussions with landowners to determine the potential for expansion of the bridleway network by the use of permissive rights and or the reclassification of existing routes.

g) Medway Council will provide up to an additional 5 Km of Bridleway by 2015 with a proportion being provided in Ranscombe Farm reserve if practicable.

**Cyclists**

7.30 Medway Council conducted extensive consultation with cyclists in 2002, which revealed a desire for a dedicated off-road mountain bike facility. In respect of cyclists using public rights of way they are currently allowed to use bridleways, restricted byways and byways open to all traffic. The dedicated consultation conducted for the RoWIP did not identify a desire for enhanced provision for cyclists. However as part of the improvement of existing literature and the bridleway network it is anticipated that cyclists will see an improvement in facilities.

7.31 Opportunities to improve off-road cycling facilities linking Medway’s strategic cycle network to off-road facilities in Cobham Country Park via Medway’s Ranscombe Farm reserve are currently being considered in Medway’s emerging Green Grid Strategy.

7.32 Medway’s PROW located in urban areas are generally unsuitable for conversion into cycle routes. However as part of the development of Medway’s strategic cycle network the use of suitable PROW as cycle routes will be given consideration.

7.33 The following actions are planned to improve conditions for cyclists using Medway’s PROW network:
a) Medway Council will seek to work in partnership with neighbouring authorities to provide off-road cycle routes as part of an overall strategic vision.

b) Opportunities will be sought to develop urban linkages, which support Medway Council’s strategic cycle network.

c) Appropriate surfacing of multi-user routes that contribute to utility and leisure cycling trips will be considered subject to appropriate consultation and associated costs including future maintenance.

d) The upgrading of existing public footpaths to bridleway status will be considered where they contribute to strategic objectives.

**Motorised Users**

7.34 Medway Council currently has intermittent representation from motorised users on the Local Access Forum. The dedicated consultation associated to the development of the rights of way improvement plan received a low level of response, which was generally negative in nature. The negative comments centred on a lack of provision of routes and poor availability of information. In respect of other users of the network, motorised users elicited the highest level of concerns predominantly from equestrians. Unfortunately Medway has a significant minority of illegal users who may have contributed to a general perception related to this users group.

7.35 The following actions are planned in conjunction with motorised users:

a) Medway Council will liaise with the Local Access Forum to determine how legitimate users of the public rights of way network can be encouraged to participate in the development and promotion of improved vehicle access.

b) Work will be undertaken directly with user groups, landowners and the police to combat illegal usage.

c) Work will be undertaken to assess areas where the introduction of physical barriers will facilitate work to reduce illegal usage and appropriate information may be used to raise awareness of legitimate usage.

**Accessibility improvements**

7.36 PROW should be available to all of the residents and visitors within Medway. From the 1 October 2004, part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 has required businesses and other organisations to take reasonable steps to tackle physical features that
act as a barrier to disabled people who cannot access their services. Medway Council recognises that not all PROW can be made fully accessible to all user groups. However, significant improvements may be achieved by targeted interventions.

7.37 Limiting factors for access can be wide ranging, obvious or obscure but all impact on the ability of users to enjoy the benefits the public rights of way confer. The disabled may be contained in all types of user and age group. Limiting factors may be related to physical limitations related to age, illness or physical disability. The introduction of improved surfaces and the removal of physical barriers may assist in improving access. However, visual impairment, learning disability or other less obvious restrictions to access may also determine how an individual can utilise the network.

7.38 The DEFRA statutory guidance for rights of way improvement plans includes the need to assess the accessibility for the blind, partially sighted and those with mobility difficulties. Improvements to the PROW network for the disabled community, if implemented with sensitivity to the environment, generally confer positive advantages for all users as they are inclusive and encourage the least restrictive option. Medway Council’s consultation exercises and discussions with the Medway Access Group and the Kent Association for the Blind demonstrated the desire for improved access but not at the cost of urbanisation or inappropriate infrastructure. It was generally considered that access for all members of society could be improved by intelligent targeted interventions.

7.39 The following actions are planned to improve accessibility to PRoW:

a) Medway Council will further improve links with the Medway Access Group and the Kent Association for the Blind with a view to using their experience to inform access improvements of PRoW.

b) In agreement with landowners, Medway Council will remove stiles where appropriate on routes designated as being highly accessible.

c) All maintenance of standing obstructions such as stiles, gates and fencing will be considered with removal of the obstruction as the first line of maintenance subject to agreement with landowners and social and environmental factors.

d) Medway Council will investigate the introduction of route designations or markers, which assist those with learning disabilities, English as a second language or those with visual impairments to follow the route.
e) Medway Council will use the condition survey conducted for the public rights of way improvement plan to determine where structures may be removed to improve access.

f) The development of a Medway wide public rights of way map detailing routes barriers and gradients will be produced by 2010 and updated every three years.

g) In order to make access with dogs easier and reduce the likelihood of owners injuring themselves when negotiating stiles with dogs, Medway Council will investigate the instillation of dog gates where a high level of dog walking occurs and the removal of stiles is inappropriate.
SECTION 8: FINANCE

8.1 The adopted Medway Local Transport Plan (LTP) puts high emphasis on improving Medway’s PROW. This is demonstrated by one of the 25 strategic targets setting a challenging aim to improve the percentage of PROW accessible to 70% by 2010/11.

8.2 Medway Council allocates revenue funding to the routine maintenance of PROW; a significant element of the revenue budget is used to cut back vegetation and removing fly-tipping. In addition, the LTP allocates funding to improve PROW and the delivery of Green Grid throughout the life of the plan. Medway Council will aim to deliver the actions detailed in Section 7 using the revenue and capital budgets set out in table 8.1.

Table 8.1
PROW funding allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROW routine maintenance</td>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to designated PROW</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the development and implementation of a Green Grid strategy for Medway</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 In addition, Medway Council will seek additional funding through developer contributions where appropriate and other funding sources.

8.4 Included below is Table 8.2 outlining the indicative spend on ROW over the lifetime of the plan. Funding allocated for 2006/07 has already been allocated and overall allocations are detailed in table 8.1. Key to the Table 8.2 is below also.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>LAF</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>NFU</th>
<th>CCG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>MTFG</td>
<td>Medway Towns Footpath Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>British Horse Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>Local Access Forum</td>
<td>TROT</td>
<td>Toll Riders Offroad Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Ramblers Association</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Medway Access Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFU</td>
<td>National Farmers Union</td>
<td>GGKM</td>
<td>Greening the Gateway Kent and Medway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG</td>
<td>Cuxton Countryside Group</td>
<td>KAB</td>
<td>Kent Association for the Blind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 (a)</td>
<td>Review and ensure records are up to date by 2017</td>
<td>£ 7000</td>
<td>£ 7000</td>
<td>£ 7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 (d)</td>
<td>Copies of definitive map and statement at libraries by 1/1/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.2: Statement of key actions and allocated funding**
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### 7.16

**Maintenance and Inspection of PROW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.16 (b)</th>
<th>Frequency of use assessment by 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£ 3000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.16 (e) 7.27 (b)</th>
<th>65 Paths with access issues improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£ 7000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 7000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.16 (f) 7.27 (c)</th>
<th>35 stiles removed, repaired or replaced by 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£2000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.16 (g) 7.27 (d)</th>
<th>19 gates removed, repaired or replaced by 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£2000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CCG, MTFG, RA, MAG, KAB**

### 7.19

**Action to replace signage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.19 (a)</td>
<td>All issues identified by condition survey to be resolved by 2015</td>
<td><strong>£5000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£20,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CCG, MTFG, RA**
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### 7.20
**Action to improve waymarking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.20 (e)</th>
<th>All issues identified by condition survey to be resolved by 2015</th>
<th>£5000</th>
<th>£5000</th>
<th>£5000</th>
<th>£5000</th>
<th>£20,000</th>
<th>CCG, MTFG, RA, LAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.20 (g)</td>
<td>Waymarking to be improved to reduce trespass</td>
<td>£3000</td>
<td>£3000</td>
<td>£3000</td>
<td>£3000</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>CCG, MTFG, RA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.22
**Promotion of PROW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.22 (a) 7.39 (f)</th>
<th>Development of a new PROW map for public promotion</th>
<th>£3000</th>
<th>£6000</th>
<th>LAF, GGKM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.22 (c)</td>
<td>Information for landowner by 2009</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAF, GGKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.29 (a)</td>
<td>Develop a strategic bridleway network</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.29 (g)</td>
<td>Implement up to 5 km of bridleway by 2015</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£4000</td>
<td>£4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BHS, TROT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.33</th>
<th>Improvements for cyclists</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.33 (b)</td>
<td>Develop urban cycle linkages</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>Actions in conjunction with motorised users</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.35 (a)</td>
<td>Development and promotion of improved access for motorised users</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non committed capital
- **Capital:** £46,000
- **Revenue:** £22,000

## Non committed Revenue
- **Capital:** £22,000
- **Revenue:** £23,000

## Rowip committed capital
- **Capital:** £34,000
- **Revenue:** £10,000

## Rowip committed Revenue
- **Capital:** £38,000
- **Revenue:** £9,000

## Total Capital
- **Capital:** £80,000
- **Revenue:** £32,000

## Total Revenue
- **Capital:** £60,000
- **Revenue:** £32,000

**Notes:**
- No LTP allocation set
SECTION 9: MONITORING AND REVIEW

9.1 The success of the plan will depend on the delivery of the actions set out in Section 7 of the RoWIP.

9.2 Monitoring and review will be undertaken through various processes, including:

a) Regular monitoring and inspection of Medway’s PROW network by the council’s highway inspectors.

b) Six monthly progress reports to the LAF (Local Access Forum), including progress mapping rights of way within the excluded areas.

c) Annual reporting of the progress in delivering the Local Transport Plan, including the target to increase the accessibility of the PROW network to 70% by 2010/11.

d) Annual reporting of Best Value Performance Indicator 178, regarding the ease of use of PROW by the public.

9.3 In addition, the key outputs identified by the emerging Medway Green Grid Action Plan will be used to monitor and review overall provision of public realm achieved as the Medway renaissance gathers momentum.

9.4 Medway Council plans to review the RoWIP in conjunction with the production of the replacement Local Transport Plan in 2011.
APPENDIX A: RESULTS OF ‘TALKING WALKING’ CONSULTATION

Talking Walking consultation

The Talking Walking consultation was conducted by Medway Council in the autumn of 2003 and considered all aspects of the walking environment and the relevant merits of each environment for improvement. This was a wide-ranging study that considered Public Rights of Way within the context of all pedestrian movement and environments and not exclusively within the isolation of PROW.

However the results from this consultation support those found in the dedicated consultation conducted for the PROW improvement plan and allow the relative importance of investment in the infrastructure generally associated to public rights of way as gauged from the public perspective.

Information about travel

34% of respondents indicated that the car is the main mode of travel during weekdays; walking was the second most popular main mode (23% of respondents). Further details are contained in Table A.1. It is interesting to note that Medway is an area with a well developed and provisioned rail network and has a high level of commuter based passenger movements. Whilst car and rail movements showed a significant change in usage (increase for car users and decline for rail passengers) walking showed a relatively constant level of engagement with only a 1% overall change between weekday and weekend participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information about your travel: Q1</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Mobility scooter</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Multiple modes ticked</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekdays</strong> *</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekends</strong> *</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total responses

Analysis of the results by age indicates that on weekdays the car is the most favoured main mode of travel by adults over 35 years of age, especially among the 35 to 44 age group. Although car is the main
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mode for 25 to 34 year olds, walking and train use are proportionally a close second main mode.

Walking is the main mode of travel for 16 to 24 year olds, and the second main mode of choice for all adults and proportionally gains in popularity as the age of the respondent’s increases.

Walking is the second main mode of choice for all adults as shown in Figure A.2 and cycle usage as a main mode during the weekend period is most prevalent by adults aged 35 to 44 years of age (16% of respondents).

For individuals travelling by train, a significant proportion of respondents walked to the rail station (58%) and many highlighted walking as a primary form of travel for short journeys of up to 2 miles with an average of 17 walking trips made per week.

Factors to encourage walking for short journeys

The “Talking Walking” consultation considered all aspects of walking in all settings and environments. Although improved pavement surfacing were considered to be important to 21% of respondents and most important issue by 31% of respondents, ‘more paths through green areas’ was a close second in the important category with 19% of responses. In terms of total responses across the important and very important category, “more paths through green areas” retains its second most important position, with 243 votes. When these results are viewed in the context of this consultation, the importance of walking in green areas including PROW is clearly demonstrated. Further details on the factors that encourage walking are detailed in Table A.2.
Table A.2
Factors to encourage walking for short journeys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information about your travel: Q6</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More pedestrian crossings across busy roads</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph zones in residential areas</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More pavements</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved pavement surfacing</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School initiatives (buses and campaigns)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More paths through green areas</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities for improvement identified in the “Talking Walking” Consultation

Regarding general areas requiring improvements to assist pedestrians, respondents indicated the following priorities for council funding of improvements to assist pedestrians:

- On busy traffic routes (15%)
- Where pedestrian flows are high (12%)
- At local facilities (9%)

Further information is provided in Table A.5.

Although no specific question was asked that separates rural localities from the public rights of way network, it can clearly be seen that consultees consider investment in rural areas and routes used for leisure purposes as a lower priority than investment in areas with higher levels of usage or where there are perceived safety concerns. This response is somewhat at odds with the desire for more paths through green areas as shown in table A2. However the upgrading and extension of pedestrian links particularly riverside routes, leisure routes/public rights of way and routes to stations is still considered an important issue by a significant number of respondents.

When respondents were specify asked to rank locations requiring improvement to pedestrian facilities in order of importance, 10% cited the Saxon Shore Way, which is a Public Right of Way that is used primarily as a riverside leisure route together with routes to stations as a priority for improvement.
Table A.5: Priorities for council funding of improvements to assist pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements for pedestrians: Q10</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Medium importance</th>
<th>Less important</th>
<th>Least important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At local facilities (local shops, doctor surgeries etc.)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On busy traffic routes (where crossing road is considered dangerous)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where pedestrian flows are high (town centres, employment areas and outside schools)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In rural areas</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In areas mainly used by leisure walkers (along the river or on rural footpaths)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning for movement

For walking on the Public Rights of Way network to be fully inclusive it is good practice to ensure that routes are ‘inviting’ and convey a feeling of safety whilst ensuring that the measures taken do not change the character of predominantly rural routes. The talking walking consultation considered what factors respondents perceived as threatening.

The majority of usage associated to rural public rights of way will be concentrated in the daylight hours and in respect of rural routes the routine provision of street lighting may not be suitable. Therefore concerns associated to personal safety including locating of routes in areas that afford good natural light. Areas not suitable include enclosed spaces such a subways; these should not be incorporated in future routes. Tables A.7 and A.8 provide more detail.

Table A.7: Areas where respondents feel threatened when walking during daylight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for movement: Q13</th>
<th>During daylight (important)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>During daylight (most important)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking in secluded areas that are not overlooked</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking through areas where there are places for people to</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During hours of darkness the major concern is associated to adequate street lighting. Many Public Rights of Way afford convenient routes to local facilities, especially in the urban areas. The routine use of street lighting is not appropriate in many rural areas however; where a right of way is the primary pedestrian route to amenities the improvement of surface quality, street lighting and the reduction of hiding places is an important contributory factor to increase patronage.

### Table A.8:
Areas where respondents feel threatened when walking during darkness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for movement: Q13</th>
<th>During darkness (important)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>During darkness (most important)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking in secluded areas that are not overlooked</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking through areas where there are places for people to hide</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking through subways and other enclosed spaces</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking through uncared for, rundown areas</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking through areas that have poor lighting</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking through multi-storey car parks and associated stairs, etc</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1767</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walking for leisure

The public rights of way network is a major contributory factor to Medway’s Green Grid Strategy and in the facilitation of green space access in Medway. Medway’s Green Grid Strategies development is being informed by the wider vision detailed in the government’s sustainable community plan and the ‘green in the gateway-Kent and Medway initiative. This joined up approach has already attracted £17 million in funding to consider a strategic approach to land management, green space and regeneration. The PROW network plays a vital role in the realisation of this strategy.

Talking walking consultation showed the importance of leisure walking for the public with 76% of respondents indicated that they ‘walked for leisure’ on a daily or weekly basis. The primary riverside walking route in Medway is the Saxon shore way, which is located in the Riverside Country Park. 45% of respondents indicated that they walked in ‘parks and country parks’ and ‘by the river’, it is assumed that the majority of these people will be in the Riverside Country Park given it is the primary riverside route. PROW also act as links between existing green spaces and therefore facilitate access to a number of green areas that respondents considered important for leisure walking. (Table A.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A.9: Areas where respondents walk for leisure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking for leisure: Q15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and country parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off road in the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the results by age indicates that overall, most adults aged over 65 years of age (35% of respondents) walk for leisure daily.

Most adults aged 45 to 54 and young adults aged 16 to 24 also walk for leisure daily, while other age groups mostly walk weekly.

When asked what would encourage respondents to walk for leisure, the responses were split quite evenly with ‘improved maintenance of routes’ (30%) regarded as most important, followed by ‘more accessible routes’ (27%) (Table A.10).
Table A.10: Encouragement to walk for leisure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking for leisure: Q16</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better signed routes</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accessible routes</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better leaflets showing routes</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of health benefits</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved parking at sites</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More organised walks</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved maintenance of routes</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1048</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the results by age indicates that all age groups consider ‘improved maintenance of routes’ as most important. The 25 to 44 age groups (23% of total respondents) also consider ‘better leaflets showing routes’ as important, while young adults aged 16 to 24 and the 55 to 59 age group consider ‘more accessible routes’ as important.

The Talking Walking consultation showed that the public consider leisure walking and Public Rights of Way to be a lower priority for expenditure in comparison to other pedestrian facilities located in highly trafficked urban locations. However in terms of overall priority leisure facilities were considered to have 20% of the ascribed importance for investment of the number one priority.
APPENDIX B: RESULTS OF SPECIFIC PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONSULTATION

Specific consultation was conducted for the PRoWIP from December 2006 to February 2007.

This consultation was multifaceted and designed to encourage public participation in the process. This included the use of a general questionnaire together with area specific questionnaires for Landowners, Access issues, equestrian users and off-road vehicle users.

The methods used included:

- The use of a questionnaire survey in Medway Matters, which is a monthly council publication that is delivered to every household in Medway.
- Questionnaires posted directly to consultees for the Local Plan and local Transport plan submissions.
- Engagement with Ethnic minority and disability groups associated to targeted distribution of consultation questionnaires to relevant groups and individuals.
- Direct discussions with landowners together with the distribution of questionnaires to major landowners in the area.
- Face to face consultation with members of the public on the most popular PROW routes.
- The use of the council’s website to improve access to the suite of questionnaires used for the public consultation.

The general consultation conducted for the PRoWIP considered a number of key areas related to the usage of the PROW Network.

Question 1 of the general questionnaire distributed in Medway Matters considered how people are using the network.

The relative level of usage of footpaths, bridleways and byways was generally comparable. However, discussions with people using the network showed that a majority of walkers used bridleways and byways as walking routes either as links to other footpaths or as discrete routes.
Question 2 considered the barriers that people felt had discouraged them from using the Public Rights of Way network in the past year.

Many individuals identified information about routes, their location and how accessible they were as a major barrier. Personal safety was also highlighted as a concern.
Question 3 asked respondents to give their main reasons for using the network.

With over a third more responses than any other category, leisure and recreation was a clear priority. It could be argued that the second most popular reply; walking the dog, is also a leisure pursuit. Health is a primary motivating factor for a significant minority of respondents, however given the active promotion of walking and its health benefits it is envisaged that awareness of the link between walking and health will significantly rise in the near future together with the number of people that walk for health.

Question 4 considered the frequency of usage and the type of routes that have the most regular use.

Footpaths consistently have more regular usage and users than any other type of route. The only anomaly to this trend is the monthly user, who tends to be using the bridleway network predominantly for equestrian purposes. It should however be noted that a large number of users of the bridleway and byway network are walkers.
Question 5 considers the awareness of council publications targeted and promoting the use of the PRoW network.

Generally the respondents to the questionnaire found the councils publications to be of an excellent standard however, only 53% of those consulted were aware those publications were available and direct discussions with users of the network showed that this lack of knowledge was most prevalent in those with learning disabilities and ethnic minority groups.
Question 6 considered what method of providing information has been most successful in informing the public about the network.

Traditional paper based leaflets and books proved to be most successful with the council’s website also receiving recognition.

![How do you find information on Public rights of way](image)

Question 7 considered how people use the Public Rights of Way network both in terms of proximity to their home address and the type of route they favored.

Circular routes that bring people back to their starting point are the most popular, closely followed by a mixture of both types of routes. Interestingly only 13% of respondents favored the route located most closely to where they live.

![Type of route you mostly use](image)
Question 8 considers the public’s priorities for the improvement of the Public Rights of Way network.

Overall, the majority of users considered better maintenance of the existing infrastructure the highest priority. Improved signage and waymarking is the second highest priority for improvement. The first significant area for additional funding that could be considered an improvement rather than enhanced maintenance of existing provision is the request for surface improvements and removal of stiles. Both of these issues directly affect the physical characteristics of a route, and their associated accessibility. Interestingly given the under provision of bridleways in Medway in comparison to the rest of England, targeted investment to provide new bridleways was not a high priority for the majority of respondents.
Question 9 asked the public for their favourite routes, the top twelve are shown below:

The publics twelve favourite routes or areas associated to the Public rights of way network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Country Park/Saxon Shore Way</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Farm Country Park</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Downs Way</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Bank</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff/Cooling</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lordswood Lane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton and Haling Downland</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Estate</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoo / Upnor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranscombe Farm</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredhurst</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 10 considered how the use of the PROW network can support tourism and introduce much needed financial support to small businesses such as café’s and farm shops used by the people using the Public Rights of Way network.

In 1998 the Countryside agency conducted a UK day visit survey, which considered the average amount each person spent during a visit to the countryside. The survey determined that each person contributed £6.50 to the local economy. Users of the PROW network in Medway working on a medium point of the spend range for each category gives a general spend per person of £10 for all those who buy something whilst using the network.
How much money do you usually spend when using the Public rights of way network

- Nothing: 124 people
- £0-5: 86 people
- £6-10: 33 people
- £11-20: 20 people
- £21-40: 13 people
- £41-59: 2 people
- £60+: 6 people
APPENDIX C: RESULTS OF ACCESS QUESTIONNAIRE

Access Questionnaire

The access questionnaire was generally distributed and available on the Medway Council’s website. It was also sent to organisations directly involved with sensory mobility and disability interests for consideration. Although it was hoped that we would receive comments from organisations with an interest in disability issues the overall level of response was poor. The majority of responses came from individuals with an interest in improved accessibility.

Three quarters of respondents to the access questionnaire were male, and only a quarter were female. However responses across the Medway area were relatively evenly distributed geographically as detailed below.

Responses by age were not well represented in the lower age groups with no respondents under the age of 24 or over the age of 75. The majority of respondents were in the 35-44 age group, which had eight respondents and the 55-64, which had seven, the remaining nine respondents were equally distributed across the remaining age bands.

Response by ethnicity did not reflect the ethnic mix of the Medway area with the majority of the respondents considering themselves to be white British with a small contingent considering themselves to have a white Irish or European background. No respondents identified themselves as having any other ethnic background.
Respondents to the access questionnaire were asked to consider how they’d used the PROW in the last year. Although the majority of users had used the footway network a significant minority had used the bridleways and byways. Details of respondent’s uses of the network are set out in the chart below:

![Public Rights of Way usage in the past year](chart)

The majority of respondents to the access questionnaire used the PROW network one to three times per week. Usage of the network was well represented across footpaths, bridleways and byways with RUPPs being the least favoured type of route. The graph below details the differing types of usage both in terms of frequency and type.
In terms of access one of the most influential aspects that must be considered is the time of year and the networks response to the prevailing climatic conditions for example Spring time brings new growth, which could block some routes, Autumn ploughing may make some routes impassable, if agricultural works are not correctly managed. Spring and winter rains may change the character of an unsealed path to render some areas difficult to access during certain climatic conditions. Interestingly, the access questionnaire showed a relative parity of usage across the seasons with a small but expected
rise in usage during the summertime and a corresponding decline in usage during the winter.

The accessibility questionnaire asked the public to consider priorities for future investment. Better signage and way marking was a clear favorite for investment with improved maintenance the second highest priority.

New footpaths, bridleways and the removal of stiles received comparable numbers of requests. Interestingly given that the access questionnaire is primarily concerned with access improvements, removal of stiles was considered a lower priority than new footpaths or bridleways and no requests for surface improvements were recorded. It was noted that some of the respondents to the equestrian questionnaire also replied to the access questionnaire, which may have skewed the type of response.

It should also be noted that the level of responses from disabled groups and individuals was very low and may not be truly representative of all disabled users needs.

The unexpected responses to the access questionnaire continued when respondents were asked for their main reason for using their favorite route. The most physically accessible PROW in Medway for all users with the exception of vehicles and equestrians is the Saxon Shore Way located in the Riverside Country Park. This route has a sealed surface, localised facilities and has had barriers to movement removed and replaced with ‘Three Valleys’ gates. This made the route fully accessible for authorised users. The respondents to the questionnaire have not highlighted smooth path surfaces or routes located in a country park as main reasons for using PROW. Given that
the Riverside Country Park has arguably the most accessible public rights of way in Medway this is an unexpected result.

What is your main reason for using the route you use

- Smooth path surfaces
- Lack of barriers
- Feel safe and secure
- Accessible facilities nearby
- In a country park
- Views
- Wide path
- Close to water
- Secluded area
- Provides a direct route
- Car park close by
- Places to rest on the route
- Visitors centre
- Good access to paths via ramps

Number of persons

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX D – LIST OF CONSULTEES

Age Concern Medway Ltd
Ahmadiyya Muslim Association
Alzheimers Society Rainham Kent Support Group
Apnar Ghar
British Horse Society
Chatham Memorial Synagogue
Church Commisioners
Church in Society
Country Land and Business Association
Cuxton Countryside Group
Disability Information, Disablement Services
Disability Rights Commission
English Nature
Environment Agency
Equal Oppotunities Commission
Ethnic Minority Forum
Ethnic Minority Senior Citizens Association
Friends of Berengrave
Frindsbury Hall Nursing Home
Hindu Sabha
Interfaith Network for the UK
Kent Association For Spina Bifida & Hydrocephalus
Kent Association For the Blind
Kent Association For The Disabled
Kent Bangladesh Welfare Association
Kent Ethnic Minorities Disabilities Forum
Kent Malayalee Association
Kent Multicultural Community Association
Kent Muslim Welfare Association
Kent Ramgarhia Darbar – Gurdwara Sikh Temple
Kent Refugee Action Network
Kent Turkish Welfare Association
Kent Wildfowling and Conservation Association
Mackays Court Farm
Medway Access Group
Medway Action Against Racial Attacks ( MAARA)
Medway Afro Caribbean Association
Medway and Swale Estuary Partnership
Medway Asthma Self-help
Medway Cultural Consortium
Medway Disabled Workers Forum
Medway Dyslexia Association
Medway Ethnic Minority Carers Forum
Medway Hindu Centre
Medway Inter Faith Action
Medway Ports
Medway Rehabilitation Team Manager
Medway Towns Footpath Group
Medway Arthritis Self Help
Open Spaces Society
Parish Councillors
Plantlife
Property Investment department
Public with Disabilities
Punjabi International Cultural Society
Ramblers Association
Trail Riders Fellowship
Wainscott Footpath Group
Youth House
APPENDIX E – SPECIFIC PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Public rights of way Improvement Plan survey

Medway Council is developing a Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This is in response to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

What is a public right of way?
A public right of way is a route where the public has a right to cross private land. They have three classifications:
- Footpath - on foot only
- Bridleway - horse, cycle and on foot
- Byway - motorised vehicles, horse, cycle and on foot

To help us get a better idea of how Medway's rights of way network can be improved, we are consulting with residents and interest groups.

If you want to help us do this, please complete this survey and send it to:
You can find this questionnaire and other surveys about access, recreation and landowner issues on the council's website at www.medway.gov.uk/prowsurvey. Or you can phone Neil Vincent on 331060 or email transport.planning@medway.gov.uk.

Q1: Have you used any of these in the last year? Please tick all the boxes that apply:
- Footpath
- Bridleway
- Byway
- None of these

If you answered none of these, please go to Q2, otherwise, please go to Q3.

Q2: If you have not used the public rights of way network, can you tell us why? Please tick all that apply:
- Don’t know where public rights of way are
- Don’t like walking
- Don’t like cycling
- Don’t like horse riding
- Mobility difficulties
- Feel unsafe
- No time
- Doesn’t interest me
- Insufficient information
- Please go to About you

Q3: How often do you use public rights of way in Medway? Please tick all that apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footpaths</th>
<th>More than once a day</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Two to three times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridleways</th>
<th>More than once a day</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Two to three times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Byways</th>
<th>More than once a day</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Two to three times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q4: What is your main reason for using Medway's public rights of way? Please tick one only:
- As a route to work
- Leisure and recreation
- As a route to school
- To improve my health
- As a route to the shops
- Walking the dog
- Other, please state

Q5: Are you aware that the council provides information about walking and cycling routes?
- Yes - Please go to Q6
- No - Please go to Q7

Q6: Have you used any of the following to find out about these routes? Please tick any:
- Leaflets
- Council’s website
- Cards
- Books
Q7: What type of route do you mostly use? Please tick one of these statements:
- I use a route that brings me back to where I started (a circular route)
- I just want to get from A to B in a roughly straight line (a linear route)
- I tend to use a mixture of both types of route
- I use the route that is closest to where I live

Q8: How would you like us to improve Medway Council’s public rights of way? Please tick the three most important issues to you and what priority you think they should be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Moderate priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better maintenance eg looking after what is there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better signage and waymarking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More promotion of the network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New bridleways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface improvements eg change from mud to tarmac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of stiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9: What is your favourite route or area on the public right of way network?

Q10: How much money do you usually spend in local shops and businesses when using Medway’s public right of way network?
- Nothing
- £0-5
- £6-10
- £11-20
- £21-40

About you
So that we can make sure everyone in the community has an opportunity of taking part in this consultation, we need to find out more about you. What you tell us will remain private and confidential and will not be used for any other purpose.

Are you: ☐ Male ☐ Female
Your postcode: ________________________________

How old are you? Please tick one:
- under 16
- 16-18
- 19-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75+

What is your ethnic group?
A. WHITE – ☐ British ☐ Irish ☐ Any other white background (please write in)
B. MIXED – ☐ White and Black Caribbean ☐ White and Black African ☐ White and Asian
☐ Any other Mixed background (please write in)
C. ASIAN OR ASIAN BRITISH – ☐ Indian ☐ Pakistani ☐ Bangladeshi
☐ Any other Asian background (please write in)
D. BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH – ☐ African ☐ Caribbean
☐ Any other Black background (please write in)
E. CHINESE OR OTHER ETHNIC GROUP – ☐ Chinese ☐ Any other (please write in)

Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits your daily activities or the work you can do?
☑ Yes, ☐ No

Thank you for completing this survey and sending it back to Medway Council.
The results will be used to inform our Improvement Plan that will be available next year.
Once completed, please send this survey to:
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Access Land
Land where the public normally has a right of access on foot for recreational activities, however farmers and landowners have a right to close the land for conservation, management and safety.

Best Value Performance Indicator
A national measure of performance set by central government that allows a comparison between authorities.

Byway Open to All (BOAT)
Byways open to all traffic over which there is a public right of way for mechanically propelled vehicles, but which is mainly used by the public for similar purposes as bridleways and footpaths.

Creation Order
An order made by a local authority to create a footpath or bridleway under section 26 of the highways act 1980.

CRoW Act

Definitive Map
The legal record of public rights of way, which provides conclusive proof of the location and status of the rights shown.

Definitive Statement
The written statement, which accompanies the Definitive Map, describing in detail the rights of way.

DEFRA
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Diversion Order
An order made by a local authority to alter the route of a footpath or bridleway.

Extinguishment Order
Orders made by a local authority to permanently close a footpath or bridleway.

Highway Authority
The authority responsible for managing the highway network (including public rights of way) in its area.

Local Access Forums
Prescribed bodies introduced by s94 and s95 of the CRoW Act 2000 to advise the appointing authority as to the improvement of public access to land.
Local Transport Plan
Plans produced by the local highway authority to co-ordinate and improve local transport provision. The RoWIP is a supporting strategy to the LTP and will assist in the delivery of the LTP’s objectives.

Permissive Access
A route that is not a public right of way but where the landowner has granted permission for public usage.

Public Bridleway
A public right of way that can be used by walkers and horse-riders. Cyclists also have a right of way, but must give way to walkers and horse-riders.

Public Footpath
A public right of way that can be used by walkers.

Public Right of Way
A way over which the public have a right to pass and repass.

PRoWIP
Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

Restricted Byway
A public right of way for walkers, horse-riders and nonmechanically propelled vehicles (such as horse-drawn vehicles). Restricted byways will be created when provisions in the CRoW Act are brought into operation.

RUPP
Road Use as a Public Path.

Signpost
Signposts are provided where public rights of way leave any metalled highway, and usually consist of a post and a pointer or arrow to direct people along the way.

Stile
Fixed device allowing the passage of pedestrians over or through a fence, wall or hedge, while forming a barrier to livestock or other animals, cycles and vehicles.

Traffic Regulation Order
An order made by a traffic authority to restrict or regulate traffic on a road. TROs are most commonly used to regulate or restrict motor traffic, for example, through speed limits or waiting restrictions, but can be used to regulate cyclists, horse-riders and walkers. A TRO may be permanent, temporary, seasonal or experimental.

Waymark
A small round disc used to direct people along a public right of way.