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Executive Summary

Background
The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 requires all highway authorities to produce a ‘Rights of Way Improvement Plan’ (ROWIP). The ROWIP is required to contain an assessment of the extent to which local rights of way meet the present and likely future needs of the public, the opportunities provided by local rights of way for exercise and other forms of outdoor recreation and enjoyment of the area and the accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted persons and others with mobility problems.

The statutory guidance also states that the ROWIP itself should not focus on detailed site specific assessments, but draw broader, generic conclusions, which are then the focus of a “statement of action” for the management of local public rights of way and for securing an improved network of paths.

The Process
The process of developing the plan has been influenced by a number of factors, including the statutory ROWIP guidance, the highway authority’s statutory duties and powers, Countryside Agency advice and wide ranging stakeholder consultations with Rotherham Local Access Forum, statutory agencies, path user groups and parish and town councils.

The delivery of significant improvements to non motorised transportation in Rotherham will be dependant on working in partnership. The contributions required from both internal and external partners are considered in detail.
The Assessment

The Rotherham ROWIP identifies and evaluates the needs of various users and summarises the current levels of public rights of way and recreational countryside access provision. Some of the key issues identified in the assessment were:

- The considerable scope and demand to develop facilities on the urban fringe and in rural areas,
- The network available to horseriders and cyclists is limited,
- The network of local rights of way are generally inaccessible to disabled users,
- The strong public demand to develop circular routes,
- Many vehicular routes which have to be crossed or traversed are not suitable for non motorised users,
- In areas the Definitive Map and Statement does not accurately depict the nature and location of public use on the ground.

The core of the plan is a Statement of Action, which outlines the work the authority proposes to undertake to secure an improved network of local rights of way and access opportunities.

Implementation

Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, Rotherham Borough Council has a statutory duty to prepare and publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan, but not to implement a plan. However, developing and publishing a ROWIP will enable the Streetpride Service to seek external funding for access improvements. Such funding would be in addition to existing central public rights of way funding which is used to undertake statutory duties.

The Government have indicated that ROWIPs will be an important step in working towards a more integrated and sustainable transport network. As a result ROWIPs have been identified in statutory guidance as becoming a distinct strand of the Local Transport Planning process with full integration expected from 2010 onwards.
Vision Statement

To develop, promote and protect a borough wide network of rights of way that meet the present and likely future needs of the public for the purposes of open air recreation, exercise and access to local services.

In particular the Rotherham Rights of Way Improvement Plan aims to:

- Provide a rights of way network which is correctly recorded, easy to follow, free from obstruction and safe to use.
- Develop a network which meets the needs of local users and visitors to the borough whilst retaining the character of the countryside.
- Make the most of access opportunities to enable the network to be accessed by the widest possible audience, with particular regard to those with mobility problems.
- Increase opportunities for sustainable travel, for leisure and access to work, school and local services.
- Ensure that proposals and schemes are prioritised and implemented to meet the needs and aspirations of the population to deliver maximum benefit within available resources.
- Promote and encourage respect and understanding between path users and occupiers in order to minimise conflict.
1 Introduction

1.1 Legislative Framework

1.1.1 Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, highway authorities must prepare and publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan by November 2007, which will be updated every ten years. Section 60(1) of the Act states that:

“Every local authority other than an inner London authority, shall within five years after commencement of this section, prepare and publish a plan, to be known as a rights of way improvement plan”

1.1.2 A Rights of Way Improvement Plan must assess:

- The extent to which local rights of way meet the present and likely future needs of the public;
- The accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted persons and others with mobility problems.
- The opportunities provided by local rights of way for exercise, and other forms of outdoor recreation and the enjoyment of the authority’s area;
- In order to do this, highway authorities need to consider the whole network of routes, not just definitive rights of way. They need to look at the whole spectrum of users and journey purposes, from disabled access needs to routes to open access land. There are many other routes and sites that are used by the general public that are not recorded as definitive public rights of way.

1.1.4 Rights of Way Improvement Plans should also include a statement of the action the Council proposes to take in the management of local rights of way and for securing an improved network, with particular regard to the matters dealt with in the assessment.
1.2 Geographical Context

1.2.1 The rights of way improvement plan will cover the entire borough of Rotherham.

1.2.2 Rotherham Metropolitan Borough is situated in South Yorkshire and covers an area of approximately 118sq miles. It shares boundaries with the boroughs of Doncaster, Barnsley and Sheffield and with the Counties of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. The borough incorporates a varied pattern of landscapes from dense industrial and residential areas to extensive areas of open countryside.

1.2.3 The land use patterns have largely been shaped as a direct result of the topography and geology of the area. Large areas of the Don Valley and Rother Valley have been extensively industrialised. Other areas in the borough have been subject to industrialisation mainly as a result of coal mining in the villages and satellite towns surrounding Rotherham town centre.

1.2.4 Despite the borough having a rich industrial heritage, 70% of its area is made up of land of a rural nature. The most extensive areas of countryside are situated to the east and south of the town and in an area to the north of the town centred around Wentworth. These areas are predominantly comprised of arable farmland and pasture land with pockets of deciduous woodland.

1.2.5 The countryside in the borough absorbs much of the recreational pressure from the surrounding built up areas. The borough’s 400km of definitive rights of way play a significant part in the public’s enjoyment of the wider countryside. In addition to the public rights of way network, the public have access to a number of linear routes and countryside sites. Towpaths, permissive paths and environmental stewardship paths all increase opportunities for members of the public and visitors to access attractive areas of countryside.

1.2.6 The public rights of way network is also part of the local transport infrastructure and provides paths away from busy roads linking residential areas and local facilities. Local rights of way are both a significant part of the borough’s heritage and a major recreational and transport resource.
2.1 The Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000

2.1.1 The Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) is a balanced package of measures that allow people to enjoy more of the countryside whilst providing safeguards for landowners and occupiers. It has created a new statutory right of access and modernised the rights of way system.

2.1.2 The act is divided into 5 parts;
- Part 1 - Access
- Part 2 - Rights of Way
- Part 3 - Nature Conservation and Wildlife Protection
- Part 4 - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Part 5 - Miscellaneous – Town and Village Greens

2.1.3 The statutory duty to produce a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) is included within Part 2 of the Act.

The Right to Roam

2.1.4 Part I of the Act gives people the ‘right to roam’ on foot across mountain, moor, heath and down, in addition to registered common land. More information relating to the provision of open access land in Rotherham can be found in section 5.5.9.

Changes to Rights of Way Law

2.1.5 Part II of the CROW Act changes public rights of way law in a number of ways including, introducing a cut off date for recording historic rights of way, providing greater access opportunities to existing routes for people with mobility problems and amending enforcement procedures to combat driving motor vehicles off road and failing to remove obstructions.
Local Access Forum

2.1.6 Part V of the CROW Act requires the highway authority to set up an independent Local Access Forum (LAF) for the borough which will provide:

“advice as to the improvement of public access to land in that area for the purpose of open air recreation and enjoyment of the area, and any other matters as may be prescribed”.

2.1.7 The forum members are volunteers drawn from a variety of local groups of walkers, cyclists, horseriders and disabled groups as well as farmers, landowners, and representatives of other relevant local interest groups.

2.1.8 The Rotherham Local Access Forum was established in May 2003.

2.2 Plans & Strategies

2.2.1 There are many plans and strategies in Rotherham that are relevant to the rights of way improvement plan (ROWIP). Some of the plans have a direct link to the ROWIP whereas others are more indirectly linked.

2.2.2 Identifying and reflecting the policies in other relevant documents will lend weight to funding bids from within the local authority and from bodies with complementary aims and objectives. It also provides opportunities for partnership working and the pooling of resources.

2.2.3 In establishing the strategic context of the ROWIP a wide range of other strategies, plans and sources of information have been examined, these included the relevant sections of:

- The Rotherham MBC Corporate Plan
- South Yorkshire Second Local Transport Plan 2006-11
- Rotherham Unitary Development Plan – Adopted version 1999
- Countryside Traffic Management Strategy
- Rotherham Cycling Strategy
- South Yorkshire Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Strategy 2006-2011
- South Yorkshire Forest Plan
- Rotherham Primary Care Trust - Physical Activity, Healthy Eating and Obesity Strategy
- The Milestones Statement for Rotherham
- Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan 2004
- Strategic Framework for the Future Management of Trees and Woodlands in the Yorkshire and Humber Region
2.3 The Corporate Plan

2.3.1 The plan sets out the policy direction for the Council’s activities and outlines the Council’s priorities. The plan directly supports the vision and overall objectives of the Community Strategy for Rotherham in its aims of shaping and improving service delivery and performance.

2.3.2 The Corporate Plan follows 6 broad themes;

- A Learning Council – which listens, learns and is progressive.
- An Achieving Council – demonstrating leadership and ambition for Rotherham.
- A Council which is alive, passionate and visionary.
- A Safe Council – demonstrating honesty and integrity.
- A Proud Council – proud of the borough, our work and our staff.
- A Council which will ensure sustainable development and fairness in all of our work.

2.3.3 At the heart of the Corporate Plan is a series of action plans for each of the vision themes describing what the main objectives, targets and actions will be over the period up to 2010. A number of these objectives will have a direct link to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

Achieving – In accordance with the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan, deliver an integrated transport system which is accessible, sustainable and promotes economic, social and environmental well being.

Alive – Increase the number of adult residents and young people participating in cultural activity who feel it improves their quality of life.

Further develop the use of country parks, urban parks and other leisure and cultural offerings.

Safe – Reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured on the roads in line with the targets set out in the Local Transport Plan.

Proud – Promote the borough to increase economic activity from tourism.

Sustainable Development – Ensure that sustainable development is integrated in all council plans, services and actions.

Fairness – Encourage the development of an inclusive and cohesive borough.
2.4 South Yorkshire Second Local Transport Plan 2006-11

2.4.1 In November 2002 DEFRA announced that, in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the rights of way network and to reduce the number of separate planning requirements, rights of way improvement planning would be incorporated into the local transport planning process from 2005 onwards.

2.4.2 Rights of way play an important part in the accessibility of both rural and urban areas, and the ROWIP will need to address how the LTP can support their maintenance and improvement in order to meet LTP objectives in rural, as well as urban areas.

2.4.3 LTP funding will be used to assist with the implementation of the plans where schemes are shown to contribute to meet LTP targets and objectives. Whilst the 4 South Yorkshire ROWIPs have a remit beyond the LTP there are a number of aspects of the ROWIPs that are relevant to the 4 shared transport priority themes. Also ROWIPs can deliver improvements in wider accessibility, and help social inclusion, through improving and exploring the network:

- Improving accessibility for mobility and sensory impaired use (e.g., by undertaking works on strategic routes to upgrade to full accessibility standard and improving wider accessibility especially in relation to social inclusion) through improving and exploring the network;
- Improving road safety through identifying, developing and promoting connecting cycle routes, safer routes to school and other walking and cycle routes;
- Assisting economic regeneration by developing South Yorkshire as a recreation and tourist destination;
- Improving quality of life by promoting use of the network as part of a healthier lifestyle.

2.4.4 Although the ROWIPs are specific to each of the South Yorkshire Partners, 25 aims have been identified to which all 4 ROWIPs subscribe. In addition the South Yorkshire ROWIPs share three main priorities:

- Ensure the implications of the Disability Discrimination Act, where it applies to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, are addressed.
- Develop the network of multi-user routes.
- Increase maintenance of the network.

2.4.5 The inclusion of Accessibility Planning in the Local Transport Plan has helped initiate a move from ‘transport’ in isolation towards an approach to access and transport as key enablers for successful and economic, social and environmental transformation.
2.5 Rotherham Unitary Development Plan and the Local Development Framework

2.5.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act introduces major changes to the way the planning system operates and the current Rotherham Unitary Development Plan will eventually be replaced by a new Local Development Framework. The Council intends to prepare a limited number of new development plan documents and save the most up-to-date features of the present UDP for revision in the coming years.

2.5.2 Rotherham’s operative development plan is the present Unitary Development Plan adopted in June 1999. With regard to transport the UDP aims to improve safety and design within the pedestrian environment, in order to help to encourage walking and cycling and create better access for people with disabilities.

2.5.3 With reference to non-motorised transport and outdoor recreation the relevant policies are:

Policy ENV 5
Urban Greenspace
The Council will seek to retain and enhance open space which is of importance from a recreation, conservation and amenity point of view, but which is not afforded green belt protection. The development of such land will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.

Policy T2
Major Road Schemes and Highway Improvements
Local highway improvements will be promoted which support traffic calming and amenity benefits in residential areas, create improvements for more vulnerable road users, including pedestrians, people with disabilities and cyclists and enhance road safety.

Policy T4
Traffic Management
The Council will promote comprehensive traffic management and road safety schemes as a means of increasing a safe environment for pedestrians, cyclists and achieving benefits for air quality.

Policy T6
Location and Layout of Development
In considering the location of new developments, the Council will have regard to the increasing desirability of reducing travel demand by ensuring that a range of services and facilities are available in local villages and local centres with safe and convenient access for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities.

Policy T7
Public Rights of Way
The Council will safeguard, maintain, promote and, where appropriate, create footpaths, cycleways and bridleways as a means of serving local communities, linking areas of urban greenspace and improving access to the countryside for recreation purposes. Proposals
for the diversion or rationalisation of routes will be supported if they are in the public interest and in keeping with local land management and planning requirements.

**Policy T8**  
**Access**
The Council will seek to meet access needs of people with mobility and sensory handicaps by promoting careful design and improved provision in both the refurbishment and development of buildings, open spaces, community facilities and transport networks through the development process and in the course of public delivery.

**Policy CR2**  
**Recreation Provision**
The Council will seek to enable a range of recreation and leisure opportunities to be realised through the local authority, private sector and local community partnerships, wherever appropriate to meet the aspirations of the resident population and in particular to provide for the needs of identified target groups including people with disabilities.

### 2.6.2 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy

**2.6.1** The Countryside Traffic Management Strategy aims to “develop a transport network and safer conditions for those who live, work and visit the countryside to help protect and enhance its character and communities”.

**2.6.2** The main aims of the strategy affecting non motorised traffic management are:

- Areas for dedicated Quiet Lanes and Greenways in Rotherham and South Yorkshire will be investigated and where possible, implemented.

- To produce a better environment for pedestrians in rural areas.

- To promote the rural cycle network to facilitate a modal shift from car to bicycle, and to encourage increased leisure cycling to improve health and boost the rural economy.

- To implement a high quality network of strategic horse routes and have regard for equestrian activities in all our working and activities.

- To reduce exclusion by developing and working towards a more equitable rural transport network.

### 2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy

**2.7.1** The overall aim of the cycling strategy is to encourage more people to cycle and reduce the over dependence on the private car. The strategy deals with the realities and possibilities of cycling in the borough based on what will be achievable on the local road and public rights of way network.
2.7.2 The Rotherham Cycling Strategy hopes to develop:

1. A cycling network that goes where cyclists want to go and provides a choice of routes to suit individual needs and riding abilities.

2. A network that meets the following needs:
   - **Direct** – direct routes to destinations with few detours.
   - **Safe** – road safety, social safety, safety of other vulnerable road users.
   - **Comfortable** – allow rapid flow with very few energy wasting stop/starts.
   - **Comprehensive** – a continuous route from journey start to journey end.
   - **Attractive** – make it pleasant to go cycling.

2.8 South Yorkshire Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Strategy 2006 - 2011

2.8.1 The Road Safety Strategy sets out a coherent approach to reducing road casualties and improving the safety of vulnerable road users. The strategy brings together the policies, projects and initiatives that will be deployed to tackle the various problems, builds on the South Yorkshire Safety Improvement Plan and the work on shared priorities completed in Spring 2004 and is intended to contribute towards achieving government targets for reducing road accident casualties.

2.8.2 The strategy is based on the policies set out in the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan and Tomorrow’s Roads – Safer for Everyone (the Government’s Road Safety Strategy) and is intended to contribute towards achieving government targets for reducing road accident casualties.

2.8.3 The Council will work towards achieving road safety targets by concentrating on vulnerable road user groups and on areas where road safety is a particular concern.

2.8.4 These include:
   - Children and Young People
   - Motorcyclists
   - Disadvantaged Areas
   - Urban Areas
   - Rural Areas
   - Workplace road safety

2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan - 2002

2.9.1 The South Yorkshire Forest Partnership aim to create high-quality environments by diversifying land use, revitalising landscapes, enhancing biodiversity and providing new opportunities for leisure, recreation, cultural activity, education, healthy living and social and economic development.

2.9.2 Rotherham Borough Council has already committed itself to working toward the South Yorkshire Forest Plan. The Unitary Development Plan Policy ENV6 “Community Forest: The Council will support the development of the South Yorkshire Forest.”
2.9.3 The plan recognises the current network of rights of way and missing links associated with industrial activity, the fragmented nature of the bridleway network and the lack of long distance and circular routes.

2.9.4 The aims of the South Yorkshire Forest Plan Recreation and Access Policies are to facilitate;

“Accessible countryside, and woodland in particular, with facilities, services and information that make formal and informal countryside recreation and sport available to all sectors of the community and contribute to a healthy society.”

2.9.5 The specific Recreation and Access policies are;

Policy R1
Develop an extensive and comprehensive network of access routes across the forest, particularly those linked with people’s homes and those designed for a range of users including bridle and cycle paths.

Policy R2
Ensure that every resident has access to woodland or wooded areas within easy reach of their home.

Policy R3
Promote the use of non-motorised access for work, commuting and leisure.

Policy R4
Promote informal outdoor recreation.

Policy R5
Increase opportunities for formal sport in the countryside.

Policy R6
Give particular encouragement to sectors of the community who have poor access to a high quality environment and to those who are under-represented in their use of the countryside for recreation and support.

Policy R7
Increase usage of existing local outdoor leisure and tourist attractions, improve accessibility and enhance the range of the facilities available.

Policy R8
Promote the health benefits offered by the recreational opportunities and conservation activities in the Forest.
3.1 Walking

3.1.1 Walking is the most popular recreational activity in the countryside. It is also a valuable alternative mode of transport in urban areas providing access to local amenities. The Rotherham rights of way user survey found that 74% of non motorised journeys in the countryside are on foot.

3.1.2 The UK Day Visits Survey 1996 found:
- There are approximately 652 million walking day trips each year
- Walking accounts for 18 times more journeys than cycling

3.1.3 The rights of way user survey found that most walkers undertake journeys of between 3 and 5 miles, although a notable number undertake longer journeys of between 6 and 10 miles. 94% of current walkers describe their map reading skills as being average to excellent.

Safety is a prominent issue and 65% of walkers prefer using segregated routes which are only available to pedestrians.

3.1.4 Over 76% of pedestrian journeys in the Rotherham countryside are for the purposes of recreation and fitness. Whilst motor cars are used as a means of gaining access to the start of a walk, most pedestrian journeys actually start from home.

3.1.5 Walking is an activity which a substantial proportion of the population undertake on a regular basis. Pedestrian access varies between rural and urban areas both in nature and use pattern. However there is an over all requirement for a traffic free environment. This is particularly true of rural areas where the absence of road side pavements in many areas presents a potential conflict.

Different users and their needs
between walkers and vehicular traffic.

3.1.6 Nearly all journeys involve some walking often to connect with other modes of transport. 78% of journeys of under 1 mile are made entirely on foot (National Travel Survey). To enable such journeys in urban areas pedestrians require safe routes to allow better access to attractions and facilities.

3.2 Cycling

3.2.1 In Rotherham the Rights of Way User survey found that 11% of non motorised journeys are made by cyclists. Cyclists generally travel greater distances than horse riders or walkers with 66% of cycling trips being in excess of 6 miles.

3.2.2 The UK Day Visits Survey 1996 found that:
- 32% of the population own a bicycle
- At least one bicycle is available to 50% of homes
- 1.6 million people ride daily
- 5.4 million people ride weekly

3.2.3 The fragmented nature of the public bridleway network prevents cyclists from undertaking a substantial journey without riding on busy vehicular roads. Even allowing for the network of lightly trafficked minor highways, it is generally difficult for cyclists to find attractive, convenient and safe networks of routes. Cyclists are often forced to cross vehicular carriageways at grade or cycle along the carriageway itself in order to connect to an onward route. This increases the potential for conflict between cyclists and vehicular traffic.

3.2.4 A diverse range of cyclists of varying abilities regularly undertake journeys from family groups to the more serious enthusiast. The needs of each group of cyclists are notably different and a wide spectrum of improvements are required including:
- The improvement of existing public bridleways
- The creation of additional traffic free bridleways and cycle tracks
- Safety improvements to vehicular highways
- The publication of promoted routes leaflets
- The creation of suitably long circuits and linear routes

3.3 Horse Riding

3.3.1 The Countryside Agency’s rights of way use and demand survey showed that 5 per cent of households have at least one member who participates in horse riding. The Rotherham rights of way user survey found that 10% of non motorised journeys are made on horse back.
3.3.2 The User Survey highlighted that the vast majority of horse riders ride at least once a week and undertake journeys of between 1 and 3 miles although a notable proportion of horse riders undertake journeys between 3 and 10 miles.

3.3.3 Despite 86% of horse riding journeys starting from home a substantial section of the horse riding community utilise a horse box and experience difficulties finding suitable parking sites.

3.3.4 Horse riders were asked for their opinion on ‘tolling riding’ in which riders would pay a private landowner a modest amount to use a network of paths on a permissive basis. The majority of horse riders indicated that they would be willing to pay to use additional routes, but in exchange they would require the use of an extensive network.

3.3.5 The survey also highlighted that horse riders have a greater reliance on the public bridleway network than cyclists. All of the horse riders who responded indicated that every journey involves riding on public bridleways.

3.3.6 It is likely that this is an indication of the vulnerable nature of horse riding and that a traffic free environment is the main priority. However, the fragmented nature of the public bridleway network, combined with the need to reach destinations lying close to or within built-up areas, means that

3.3.7 All of these factors increase the potential conflict with motor vehicles, not only for less experienced riders but also in some hazardous situations for more experienced riders on a reliable horse. Data collected by the British Horse Society indicates that nationally there is the equivalent of eight road accidents a day involving horses.

3.3.8 The requirements of horse riders and cyclists can be described in a similar way. However horse riders also require;

- Focussing efforts on areas surrounding stables and livery centres
- Horse box parking
- Gates of a type and condition suitable for opening without dismounting

3.4 Carriage Driving

3.4.1 The rights of way user survey found that only 1% of non motorised journeys in the borough’s countryside are made by carriage drivers. The network of suitable routes available to
carriage drivers in the borough is limited and even allowing for the network of lightly trafficked minor highways, it is generally difficult for carriage drivers to find attractive, convenient and safe networks of routes.

3.4.2 The limited network and dangers associated with carriage driving on busy roads may account for the low level of usage in the borough. Carriage drivers tend to be vulnerable users of the road due to their slow speed and width which they occupy on the carriageway making them a considerable obstacle to other vehicular traffic.

3.5 Disabled Access

3.5.1 Relatively few rights of way are currently suitable for use by those with mobility problems. A major limitation on use is the number of stiles, steps, heavy farm gates and narrow bridges on rights of way.

3.5.2 Opening up the countryside to disabled users will involve considering a range of disabilities from blind or partially sighted users and others with mobility problems. It will also be necessary to include parents with pushchairs and any able bodied users accompanying disabled users who are affected by the constraints of the network.

3.5.3 The nature of the working countryside and characteristics of the rights of way network itself means that there will always be barriers to some users on many rights of way. Routes in remote or hilly areas may be accessible by only the more mobile user and restrictive land use practices further limit the accessibility of many routes.

3.5.4 From October 1 2004 the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 classified public rights of way as a service. Service providers must take responsible steps to remove, alter or provide reasonable means of avoiding physical features that make it impossible or unreasonably difficult for disabled people to use a service.

3.5.5 However, it must be emphasised that disabled use is not restricted to just those who walk or use wheel chairs. Horse riding, cycling and motorised scooters are all methods of transportation used on the path network by those with physical disabilities.

3.5.6 Section 69 of CROW Act 2000 places a duty on local highway authorities to have regard to the needs of people with mobility problems when authorising the erection of barriers on footpaths or bridleways.

3.5.7 The accessibility of the network to all classes of users can be greatly improved by ensuring the least restrictive option when providing access structures. The modification of path furniture is a relatively straightforward way of increasing access to disabled users with less limiting disabilities, elderly users and family groups with pushchairs.
3.5.8 Increasing access to users with mobility impairment can often be as much about improving awareness, confidence and links with transportation as actual physical improvements to the network itself.

3.5.9 As a concept providing access to users with mobility impairment can be a wide ranging issue and consideration needs to be given to users with varying degrees of mobility. The rights of way user survey and information from disabled organisations highlights three general areas for attention:

- **Route Condition** – A good quality path surface of a suitable width, with minimal cambers and gradients and disabled friendly barriers and access features.

- **The provision of information** – Availability of publicity and information regarding the suitability of the network so that people with mobility problems are encouraged to make use of public rights of way and can make informed decisions about which paths are suitable for their degree of mobility.

- **Facilities** – Parking and toilets suitable for disabled users toilets and other associated infrastructure.

3.6 **Recreational Motoring**

3.6.1 Lawful public vehicular use is confined to only 5 per cent of the national rights of way network. The level of legitimate motor vehicle usage in the borough is low and the rights of way user survey did not identify any recreational motor vehicle users.

3.6.2 Many areas around the borough suffer from off road motor cycling on public rights of way and across private land. Such usage often alters the public and landowner perception to legitimate vehicle usage in the countryside.

3.6.3 Walkers and riders meeting legitimate vehicles often feel their presence in otherwise quiet rural areas is inappropriate and detrimental to their own enjoyment of the countryside. Visible surface damage by vehicles often leads to calls for the prevention of vehicular access. However, damage to the surface of lanes is not always caused by recreational vehicular users. Much damage is as a result of use by agricultural vehicles and private access and the damage would not be prevented by excluding recreational vehicles.

3.6.4 The provision and management of unsurfaced roads for motor vehicles often leads to difficulties not directly associated with legitimate vehicular access. Lanes on the urban fringe and in the adjacent countryside are
often used for fly tipping or as a place to dispose of abandoned vehicles.

3.6.5 There is now pressure from user groups for local authorities to work within the current legislative frameworks and for vehicular highways to be accurately recorded on the definitive map.

3.6.6 There is not significant scope to provide additional facilities for recreational motorists in the borough. It is more realistic to ensure that the current off road vehicular network is well maintained, signed and legally accessible to motorised users where appropriate.

3.7 Non Users

3.7.1 There are numerous reasons why some sections of the population choose not to use the local rights of way network. Participation would increase if users were provided with more information and improved facilities, whilst other non users have no desire to participate.

3.7.2 To enable potential users to enjoy the benefits of open air recreation it is necessary to first understand the reasons for not using the countryside.

3.7.3 It is difficult to identify non users of the countryside and examine the reasons why they choose not to utilise local rights of way. However, the rights of way user survey identified a number of reasons why current users feel reluctant to use the network and many of these reasons may also be relevant to non users. These issues can be separated into three distinct categories;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like walking across crops</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths obstructed</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy road crossings</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High traffic levels on rural roads</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of safe parking</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know where the paths are</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local network</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scared of getting lost</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel intimidated</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.4 The range of physical difficulties faced by individuals is wide ranging and encompasses a variety of reasons from specific disabilities to more general reasons such as the remote nature of rural locations. A significant proportion of the population are prevented by ill health from walking and riding.

3.7.5 Whilst the use of the rights of way network is free many low income families often have difficulties with the cost of travelling to access the countryside.

3.7.6 Ethnic minority groups are often recognised as being amongst the most under represented in the countryside. Very often minority groups are deterred from using the countryside due to language difficulties, or by a lack of understanding of their particular culturally related needs.
4  Use and Demand

4.1  Population Influence

4.1.1  The population of Rotherham is approximately 248,000 (source 2001 census).

4.1.2  Rotherham’s population is ageing with fewer people in many younger age brackets.

4.1.3  The unemployment rate at the last census date was 3.1% for the ‘white’ population and 7.5% for the ‘non-white’ population.

4.1.4  The population of black and ethnic minority groups varies throughout the borough. Black and ethnic minority groups constitute 3% of Rotherham’s population.

4.1.5  The borough’s population is generally centred on the Don Valley corridor. However a notable proportion of the population also live and work in a number of smaller satellite towns and villages throughout the borough.

4.1.6  The substantial urban population places great pressure on the countryside and the access network within it. It also introduces the opportunity for utilitarian use to work, school and local amenities.

4.1.7  Population centres in neighbouring borough’s and counties lying adjacent to the Rotherham boundary also provide additional demand on the borough’s network of local rights of way. This is particularly true of the Hoyland area of Barnsley, the Killamarsh area of North East Derbyshire and the Mosborough townships and Handsworth area of Sheffield.

4.2  Socio Economic Profile and Social Exclusion

4.2.1  Social Exclusion is the result of a number of factors which combine to prevent individuals from benefiting from the opportunities that most people take for
granted. These factors include low income, poor health, lack of education, difficulties in reaching services and no involvement in decisions which affect their future.

4.2.2 The traditional barriers to enjoying countryside access include:
- Unemployment and poverty,
- Lack of private transport,
- Lack of information
- Lack of public transport,
- Scared of the unknown.

4.2.3 According to the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) index of Local Deprivation, Rotherham ranks as the 50th most deprived Local Authority in England.

**Table 4.1 A Comparison of Key Population Statistics**
Source: 2001 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Population</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>England/Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households without a car</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with a long term illness</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Significant equalities exist between communities in Rotherham partly due to the economic legacy of mine closures and major industrial restructuring of the 1980s and 1990s. Rotherham contains 6 wards in the top 10% of national index of deprivation and these are considered as priority areas for regeneration. These areas are often characterised by lower educational attainment levels, employment rates, higher burglary and reduced life expectancy than the national average.

4.2.5 Paradoxically, whilst economically poor areas suffer from multiple deprivation, they often have good public transport reflecting low levels of car ownership. Low levels of car ownership in these areas also create a greater reliance on walking and cycling for local journeys.

4.2.6 Transportation is a key element in the regeneration process by providing access to employment opportunity and ensuring that new and existing employment is accessible without causing congestion. The overarching
themes of the LTP2 include the reduction of congestion and improvement of the efficiency of the transport network and the maintenance of a transport network to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people.

4.2.7 The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and Housing Market Renewal aims include;

- Narrowing the gap between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country,
- Providing everyone with a genuine opportunity to benefit from a better quality of life,
- Focussing action and resources into disadvantaged areas,
- Focussing on improvements against national and local targets covering jobs, education, unemployment, crime, health, housing and the environment.

4.2.8 Women comprised 41% of participants of the rights of way survey. The requirements of male and female users are generally very similar. However, the feeling of vulnerability is sometimes experienced by a small number of female users, especially those who walk or ride in remote rural areas. 9% of women indicated that they felt intimidated whilst in the countryside. It is likely that this figure is quite low because the majority of women (87%) walk or ride as a part of a larger group.

4.3 Recreation

4.3.1 The countryside is a popular and appealing location for a wide range of leisure activities. Nationally half of all visits take place within five miles of home, and with three out of the four people living in urban areas this demonstrates the importance of the local countryside around towns.

4.3.2 The countryside in the borough is a valuable recreational resource both for local residents and visitors to the area. The recent user survey indicated that many people make regular trips into the countryside surrounding the town.

4.3.3 In addition to countryside access on linear routes there is also a strong public reliance on countryside sites within the borough which attract many visitors. Rother Valley, Thrybergh and Ulley Country Parks, Roche Abbey and Wentworth village are all popular ‘honey pot’ destinations for day visits and offer a variety of activities.

4.3.4 Path users and visitors to the countryside also make a contribution to the rural economy in Rotherham. The user survey found that 41% of users spend between £1 and £5 and 16% spend between £6 and £10 on each trip. Users are often customers in village pubs and local businesses and shops.
4.4 Health

4.4.1 Use of the path network provides a free and accessible means of exercise available to everyone. It is widely acknowledged that as part of a healthy lifestyle, moderate, regular exercise is necessary. In particular walking and cycling are both popular forms of exercise which improve quality of life and increases the enjoyment gained from the countryside. Everyone can benefit from exercise regardless of age, size or physical condition.

4.4.2 An ICM poll commissioned by the Ramblers Association in 2000 discovered that 66% of the Yorkshire population walk as a main form of exercise. The Department of Culture, Media and Sport Strategy Unit Report 2002 indicates that nationally a 10 per cent increase in adult activity would save approximately 6,000 lives saving £500 million pounds per year.

4.5 Commuting and Utility Use

4.5.1 In Rotherham many people rely on the motor car as a means of travelling to work. Only 8% of people walk to work and 1% ride a bicycle to work (source 2001 Census).

4.5.2 Despite 30% of households not possessing a motor car, potential path users are deterred from undertaking walking and cycling journeys by a number of factors. These factors most notably include:

- Walking distances - The distance a person will be prepared to walk or cycle will always be the deciding factor.
- The dominance of motorised transport - For many years transport policy has focused on the provision for the private motor vehicle at the expense and neglect of other modes of transport, including walking and cycling.
- Increasing car ownership, car use and suburban lifestyles - The move to suburban housing locations brought about by greater income has distanced people from essential services.
- Declining travel by public transport - The increase in provision for the car has corresponded with a decrease in funding for public transport and a general deterioration in the quality of service.
- Personal security/crime concerns - Real or perceived fears of violence, particularly at night, encourages many people to use alternative modes of transport.
- Road safety issues - Increased vehicle volumes and greater speeds create barriers to pedestrian and cyclist movement.
- Driving children to school - Between the mid-seventies and the early nineties the proportion of 5-10 year olds being driven to school grew from 16% to 28%. Parental
concerns for safety and personal security are often cited as reasons for this trend. This has led to the school run phenomenon with heavy traffic around schools at opening and closing times.

4.5.3 In recent years the issue of how children travel to school has risen up the public and political agenda. The issues associated with the school run have led to a number of initiatives including school travel plans, safer routes to school and ‘walking bus’ schemes.

4.5.4 Utility use is recognised as being far less in rural areas than in urban areas. This may be as a result of the distance involved in travelling to essential services and the standard of routes available or simply that services are more likely to be provided in more densely populated areas.

4.5.5 In support of the overarching objectives for the sustainable economic regeneration of South Yorkshire the partners have identified the following as objectives for LTP2 with particular relevance to commuting and utility use:

- To improve access to services and opportunities, especially for those members of the community experiencing disadvantage,
- To reduce congestion and improve the efficiency of the transport network,
- To provide choices of travel mode that act as genuine alternatives to the private car,
- To improve safety for all travellers,
- To protect and enhance the environment,
- To maintain the transport network to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people.

By integrating with the land use planning process transport provision will ensure jobs, homes and services are accessible to all and in ways which do not contribute to increased congestion.

**Table 4.2  Proportion of people travelling to local services on foot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of people travelling to local services on foot</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Shop</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 **Children and Young People**

4.6.1 Children and young people under the age of 25 constitute 31% of Rotherham’s population. However, children and young people represent only 5% of path users.

4.6.2 The Rotherham Local Area Agreement aims to meet the needs of every young person from 0 -25 years, through the provision of high quality universal services and targeted services for those who experience barriers of life chances.

4.6.3 The document recognises that families, local communities, schools, colleges, employers and other partners have a significant contribution to make to improving the life chances and experiences of young people. The priorities for children and young people include the promotion of healthy lifestyles and providing access for young people to a range of leisure and recreational activities.

4.6.4 All South Yorkshire Authorities have successfully submitted a School Travel Plan Strategy to the national ‘Travelling to School Initiative’ joint project board. Significant progress has been made in engaging schools across the country to sign up to the project. The LTP2 will continue to engage with schools in order to meet the project target of 100% of schools with Travel Plans by 2011 and that to ensure that motivation amongst schools to implement existing Travel Plans is maintained.

4.7 **Older People**

4.7.1 Retired people constitute 14.5% of Rotherham’s population. 33% of participants in the path user survey were over the age of 65. The wards of Wingfield, Silverwood, Sitwell and Wales all have a much higher population of Older People than the Borough average.

4.7.2 The Rotherham Local Agreement (LAA) recognises that Rotherham has a growing population of older people which will need planning for in the coming years. It is therefore intended to use the LAA to address health inequalities and promoting positive health, promoting independent living and creating opportunities to participate in a wide range of activities.

4.8 **Latent Demand**

4.8.1 Latent Demand - Existing demand that has not yet been developed.

4.8.2 The Rights of Way Improvement Plan - Statutory Guidance requires that an assessment be undertaken of the nature and scale of the present and likely future needs of the public (both local people and visitors to the area) in relation to the rights of way network.
4.8.3 Current users were asked for suggestions as to how the rights of way network could be improved and developed in the future. The main suggestions primarily involved improving and securing the current network. In particular, respondents asked for enforcement and maintenance to become a higher priority.

4.8.4 The Rotherham Reachout survey asked the participants for reasons why they did not use the rights of way network. 35% of respondents did not know the locations of the local paths and 32% thought that there was a lack of information.

4.8.5 It is clear that the reasons which prevent increased activity amongst current users and non-users differ locally. The attitudes of current users are based on experiences gained whilst using the network whilst the perceived availability of attractive routes is an issue for non-users. However, it would appear that both groups initially desire the improvement and development of the current network, rather than creating new routes.

4.8.6 In addition, the lack of time is a factor suggested by many for the non-use of public rights of way.

4.8.7 A Countryside Agency commissioned Use and Demand survey in 2000 found that 70% of participants would increase countryside access activity if more routes were made available. The study also concluded that any increase in levels of activity is likely to be higher for those who already have an interest, although the level of increase amongst non-users would still be significant.

4.8.8 The research also revealed the provision of additional facilities would increase activity for a variety of journey purposes.

- For health/leisure/recreation 84%
- Travel to local shops and other amenities 20%
- Travel to work 11%
- Children travelling to school 9%

4.9 Conflicting Interests

4.9.1 Due to the linear and restrictive nature of rights of way there is a great deal of potential conflict between different users. Conflict can occur in a number of situations including:

- competition between different classes of user
- as a result high volumes of traffic on a route
- as a result of individual biases and prior experiences
- with landowners and land interest groups

4.9.2 In particular, walkers and disabled users experience conflict on routes with higher rights. The Rotherham User survey highlighted that 65% of walkers prefer to use segregated routes.

4.9.3 Disabled users also experience particular conflict on routes
carrying higher rights. Several national organisations of disabled people have emphasised the importance of providing physical segregation. The lack of segregation potentially has a negative impact on disabled people’s independence and mobility. The DfT has stated that physical segregation should be provided wherever possible and emphasise the importance of ensuring the safety of disabled pedestrians.

4.9.4 The use of mechanically propelled vehicles on public rights of way and in the wider countryside is a regular cause of conflict throughout the borough. In many instances this has led to an increasing level of security ie. boulders and barriers. This helps to protect rights of way, countryside sites and users from the continuing and worsening problems of off road vehicles. However, such actions also have the potential to deny access to more vulnerable users.

4.10 Landowning and Farming Interests

4.10.1 The involvement of the farming community is essential in the provision of a successful public rights of way network. In addition to involvement in the management of the current network the support and involvement of landowners will be required in the future provision of additional public access.

4.10.2 As a part of the ROWIP consultation process a Farmer Survey was undertaken to gauge the attitudes of local farmers towards countryside access. A broad spectrum of farmers participated in the survey representing both tenants and landowners and arable and dairy farming.

4.10.3 All of the farmers who responded reported at least one problem which occurred as a result of public access. Whilst it is likely that some of these problems would arise regardless of the presence of public access (ie. flytipping and unauthorised motorcycling), most farmers experienced problems as a result of the behaviour of a small number of path users. Unfortunately this leads to a perception that countryside access is problematic and as a result the majority of farmers are unwilling to create additional access.

4.10.4 Farmers Attitudes towards public access.

- I welcome public access across my land 0%
- I am happy to allow responsible path users 76%
- I would prefer to have no public access 17%

4.10.5 A more co-operative attitude must be developed between users and land managers if a significantly improved network of paths is to be achieved.
5.1 The Public Rights of Way Network

5.1.1 The public rights of way network provides the public with the greatest opportunity to explore the countryside. It enables people to get away from urban areas and enjoy large parts of the countryside to which they would not otherwise have access.

5.1.2 The public rights of way network has evolved over hundreds of years. Many public paths were originally used as a means of travelling to coal mines, churches or local markets. The network remains important and provides a convenient means of travelling in both rural and urban areas for a variety of journey purposes, including access to leisure.

5.1.3 Rotherham Borough Council became the highway authority in 1986, upon the abolition of the South Yorkshire County Council. As the Highway Authority the Council are responsible for the maintenance and management of the public rights of way network.

5.1.4 The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 introduced the duty for highway authorities to produce a definitive map and statement for their area. The definitive map and statement for the 28 parishes and 4 former urban districts of Rotherham were published in 1952.

5.1.5 At this time there was no duty to produce a definitive map for the Former County Borough area of Rotherham. The duty to produce a definitive map for previously unmapped areas was introduced by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and work commenced on the Former County Borough definitive map in the late 1980’s. However a significant number of outstanding issues still require determination. The completion of the Former County Borough Definitive Map is a substantial task and it is likely to take a number of years to complete.
5.1.6 The definitive map and statement provides an inventory of all public rights of way and records physical details of each path including length, width and path surface. The Countryside Access Management System also records each route in accordance with BS7666 the street, land and property gazetteer.

**Table 5.1 Rotherham’s Definitive Public Rights of Way Network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Available to</th>
<th>Length (Kms)</th>
<th>Number of Paths</th>
<th>% Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Footpath</strong></td>
<td>Walkers</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridleway</strong></td>
<td>Walkers, Horse Riders, Cyclist</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restricted</strong></td>
<td>Walkers, Horse Riders, Cyclist, (some available to horse drawn vehicles and Motor vehicles)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Byway</strong></td>
<td>Walkers, Horse Riders, Cyclists, Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>387.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>576</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1 Distribution of Public Rights of Way in Rotherham**

[Rotherham Rights of Way Improvement Plan Map with Public Footpath and Public Bridleway highlighted]
Walkers are legally entitled to use all of the definitive public rights of way network and horse riders and cyclists are legally entitled to use 17.2% of the network.

5.2 The State of the Network

5.2.1 In November 1993 the Countryside Commission (later renamed the Countryside Agency) published “National targets for rights of way: A Guide to the Milestones Approach” which they recommended as a way forward for all highway authorities. Central to this approach was the publication of a Milestones Statement by each authority setting out its progress towards the national target together with a strategy and programme of work to be adopted to meet the aim that all rights of way are:

- Legally defined,
- Properly maintained
- and Well publicised.

5.2.2 These principles are still relevant in the current management of the rights of way network and should provide the basis for the future development of the local rights of way network.

5.3 Legally Defined

The Definitive Map Review

5.3.1 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 places the Highway Authority under a duty to keep the definitive map under continuous review and determine any necessary changes. The definitive map and statement are the legal documents which provide the basis for all public rights of way work. It is therefore essential that they are kept up to date, to allow accurate information to be made available to the public, landowners and prospective developers.

5.3.2 The review of Rotherham’s Definitive map involves:

- Identifying and correcting errors and omissions to the definitive map and statement in light of new evidence.
- Investigating and processing claims of ‘20 years uninterrupted’ use by members of the public.
- Legal Event Orders. Modifying the Definitive Map to show changes which have already been made by diversion and extinguishment orders since the definitive map was first published in 1952.
- Completing a Definitive map for the previously excluded Former County Borough Area.
- Consolidation of the various definitive maps into a single legal document.
5.3.3 Although the Milestones Statement has provided a strategic framework for the management of the public rights of way network, the review of the definitive map has fallen behind the progress originally hoped for, primarily because the amount of incoming claims has exceeded original estimates. The Milestones Statement pre-dates the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and therefore it does not take account of the potential workload which may be generated as a result of the incoming legislation.

5.3.4 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has introduced a ‘cut off’ date for recording historic rights of way created before 1949. Historic footpath and bridleway rights that are not recorded by January 2026 will cease to exist, although there are some exceptions to this ruling. Failure to meet this target may result in some rights being lost forever and could limit the overall length of the network.

5.3.5 Outstanding Claims

A total of 158 informal claims have been submitted to add routes to the borough’s definitive map. Claims are continuing to arrive at a rate of approximately 5 per year. Whilst it is unlikely that all of these routes will be added to the definitive map, potentially many kilometres of route could be legally recognised.

5.3.6 Discovering Lost Ways Project

The Discovering Lost Ways project is researching historic rights of way not currently shown on the definitive map and submitting those, with enough evidence, to local authorities before the cut-off date of 2026.

5.3.7 Whilst the Discovering Lost Ways project will not create any new rights, it will gather historical evidence for what already exists but, for various reasons, are not shown on the definitive map. On receipt of the evidence the highway authority will decide on the merits of each application to change the definitive map, based on existing procedures.

5.3.8 In order to find this evidence an Archive Research Unit (ARU) has been set up. This unit is systematically trawling through historic documents held in over 100 national and local archive offices. A staged roll-out will continue until full national coverage has been achieved in 2012. It is anticipated that South Yorkshire will be one of the final areas to be researched.

Legal Event Orders - LEO

5.3.9 After the confirmation of a creation, diversion or an extinguishment order, or a dedication agreement, a Legal Event Order must be made to record the change on the definitive map. The LEO process was introduced nearly 30 years after the original Definitive Maps were produced. This substantial gap has caused a backlog in recording legal changes on the definitive map.
### Table 5.2 Outstanding Claims by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Claim Type</th>
<th>Total Claimed Paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former County Borough</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Urban District of Maltby</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Urban District of Rawmarsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Urban District of Swinton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Urban District of Wath</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anston</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston-Cum-Aughton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton Brierlow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinsworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catcliffe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnington</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firbeck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gildingwells</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harthill - with - Woodall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooton Roberts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooton Levitt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letwell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgreave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Salvin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidworth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurgroft and St. John's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treeton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todwick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales and Kiveton Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiston</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickersley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodsetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.10 Since the publication of the definitive map and statement in 1952 very few Legal Event Orders have been made in any of the parish areas of Rotherham. A total of 156 Legal Event Orders now require making to bring the definitive map up to date.

5.4 **Wider Network of Linear Access**

**Rural Unclassified County Roads**

5.4.1 The list of Rural Unclassified County Roads contains a total of 84 routes in all parts of the Borough. Although the word ‘road’ might imply vehicular rights, all that can be deduced from the term, is that the route is a highway maintainable at public expense.

5.4.2 The majority of the roads shown on the list in Rotherham are metalled highways which are suitable for general vehicular traffic. The remainder are unmetalled routes and display the physical characteristics of green lanes. There is scope to add some of these routes onto the definitive map as public byways or in some instances as public bridleways.

**List of Adopted Highways**

5.4.3 The Highway Authority is required to make, and keep up to date, a ‘List of Streets’ for its area of highways maintainable at public expense. A ‘street’ is defined in the Highways Act 1980 as any road, lane, footpath, square, court, alley, or passage.

5.4.4 Whilst there is a degree of overlap between the definitive map and the List of Streets, generally the two documents are separately managed and maintained. However, the adopted footpath network is an essential element of the non motorised transport network in urban areas.

5.4.5 There are a number of unsurfaced public roads throughout the borough which provide useful links in the countryside access network. Some of the roads in question do not benefit from regular vegetation clearance, maintenance or appropriate signage. It is often difficult for users to identify such routes or gain information as to the extent of public rights. The lack of integration with the public rights of way network prevents users from taking full advantage of the unsurfaced road network.

**Highway Verges**

5.4.6 The increasing volume of traffic on rural roads has turned some routes into unpleasant and often dangerous places for pedestrians and riders. Faced with broken networks walkers, horse riders and cyclists often have little choice but to use the carriageway.

5.4.7 The grass verges beside many rural roads provide safe and convenient places suitable for walking and riding. Grass verges beside metalled carriageways are recognised as being an essential element of the horse riding network. However margins are
very rarely maintained with countryside access in mind.

**5.4.8** Whilst not all margins would be suitable, an appraisal of the road network would help to establish the verges with potential benefit as rights of way links.

**5.4.9** Care should be taken to ensure that only suitable verges are maintained for public access. For example providing a strip immediately adjacent to some carriageways used by fast moving traffic would still maintain an element of danger to path users. 8% of pedestrian casualties occur whilst the user is on the apparent safety of the footway. Therefore some grass verge paths would require setting back from the edge of the carriageway. Managing identified grass verges for public access will have notable budgetary implications.

**Toll Riding**

**5.4.10** Toll riding involves horse riders paying a private landowner an annual fee to ride along private tracks. A limited Toll Riding scheme is currently operated by Fitzwilliam (Wentworth) Estates in the Wentworth area. Nearly 70% of horse riders surveyed in the rights of way user survey indicated that they would be willing to use a toll riding scheme.

**5.4.11** Whilst it is apparent that the toll riding scheme has a great deal of potential, the Wentworth scheme has a limited membership. The routes in question are not subject to regular maintenance and generally do not join up with livery centres or local bridleways. The cost of public liability insurance, which riders must gain prior to joining the toll riding scheme, can also be prohibitive. However, it is likely that the development and expansion of the current toll riding network would encourage usage and increase membership.

**Environmental Stewardship**

**5.4.12** The access created through the Environmental Stewardship Scheme (formerly the Countryside Stewardship Scheme) provides a useful means of supplementing the public rights of way network.

**5.4.13** Farmers may create public access through a ten year agreement with DEFRA, in return for an annual payment (plus an additional amount per linear 100m) depending on the type of access being provided. A number of environmental stewardship paths have been created in Rotherham.

**Table 5.3 Environmental Stewardship in Rotherham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of routes</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridleways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Permissive Routes**

5.4.14 A permissive path is a route which is used at the discretion of the landowner. Whilst users do not have any statutory rights to use them, the value of permissive access in providing additional opportunities for users should not be underestimated. A number of formal permissive paths have been created in Rotherham.

**Table 5.4 Permissive Paths in Rotherham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of routes</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Way</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.5 Site Based Access**

5.5.1 The public open spaces within the borough fall into six main categories:
- Country Parks
- Greenspaces sites
- Local Nature Reserve
- RMBC woodland sites
- Other Woodland Sites
- Open Access Land and Registered Common Land

Country Parks

5.5.2 There are three country parks in the borough at Ulley, Thrybergh and in the Rother Valley on the border with Sheffield and Derbyshire. The facilities available within the country parks are often a higher standard than the adjacent rights of way network. The path networks are generally well surfaced, signed and accompanied by interpretative panels and resting points. The difference in accessibility between country parks and the surrounding rights of way network was highlighted during a disabled access survey. An average of 80% of routes were accessible to wheelchairs in country parks compared to just 12% of routes in the surrounding network.

5.5.3 The country parks also provide additional facilities such as parking, toilets, a visitor centre, refreshments and a well managed environment. In addition to these sites attracting local visitors, they also draw users from a wider geographical area. However, there are limited opportunities for visitors to explore the surrounding public access network.

**Table 5.5 Access to Country Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Available</th>
<th>On Foot</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Wheel Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrybergh Country Park</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulley Country Park</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother Valley Country Park</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenspaces Sites

5.5.4 The Green Spaces Unit manage a large number of unstaffed sites throughout the borough. These sites range from urban parks to amenity sites in rural settings. The levels of usage and public expectations tend to be notably lower than that of country parks. In addition to providing numerous opportunities for informal recreation, these sites sometimes provide important off road links in the rights of way network. Although there is potential to further integrate green spaces sites into the rights of way network.

Local Nature Reserves

5.5.5 The seven unstaffed sites are mainly owned and managed by Rotherham Borough Council. All seven of the sites provide informal public access to a variety of habitats types from washlands and open water to woodland and grassland. Many of the sites connect with the public rights of way network.

RMBC Woodland Sites

5.5.6 The Streetpride Trees and Woodlands Team manage the Council’s woodland estate. The Authority has improved the amount of accessible woodland and people of all ages can now enjoy a wide range of activities including walking, horse riding, orienteering, picnicking, cycling and watching wildlife. One of the overall aims of management is to promote the enjoyment of these sites while providing for safe and appropriate public access and recreation. Many of the sites concerned provide important connections in the rights of way network.

5.5.7 The Council’s woodland estate includes many ancient semi-natural woodland sites. These places have been continuously wooded for at least 400 years and are nationally recognised as the most important woodland type in England for nature conservation. Such woodlands often represent a living record of the past reflecting the landscape, the industrial and social history of Rotherham. As a result some sites contain areas of considerable archaeological interest, including Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Also, Council woodlands are vital refuges for some protected wildlife species. For these reasons increased public access is sometimes inappropriate.
Table 5.6  Accessibility in selected Council Owned Woodlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodland</th>
<th>On Foot</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Wheel Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canklow</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholes Coppice</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassingthorpe</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treeton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hail Mary Woods</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbing Greave/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herringthorpe Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawks Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Woodland Sites

5.5.8 Other woodland sites with access include Wickersley Wood, Anston Stones Woods and Round Wood all of which are managed by Parish Councils. In addition, many former colliery sites are being restored as community woodland with open access. These include sites at Kiveton and Dinnington. These networks of new and improved woodland and other green spaces are helping to create a green infrastructure linking town and country.

Open Access Land and Registered Common Land

5.5.9 Part 1 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 grants a right of access on foot to mountain, moor, heath, down and registered common land.

5.5.10 The Area 8 maps of Open Country show just 4 areas of registered common land in Rotherham. These are located at: St. Georges Drive, Brinsworth Throapham Common Maltby Low Common Wood Lea Common, Maltby

5.5.11 All of the sites are connected to the highway network. In particular the two sites at Maltby are crossed by a number of public rights of way. However, Throapham Common is badly overgrown and as a result large areas are now inaccessible to the public. Whilst the sites in question offer limited access opportunities potential exists to maximise the recreational value of the land concerned.

5.6 Properly Maintained Statutory Duties

5.6.1 Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 places a duty on the Highway Authority to maintain all highways maintainable at public expense including footpaths and bridleways.
5.6.2 Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 places the highway authority under a duty to protect and assert the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of a highway.

5.6.3 The Best Value Performance Indicator Survey No. 178 ‘Ease of Use’ provides the most reliable indicator of the physical condition of the network. The survey highlights a variety of defects from signage and waymarking to surface condition and obstructions.

5.6.4 The national guidelines recommend the random survey of 2.5% of the rights of way network in May and 2.5% of the network in November. In Rotherham the entire network is surveyed at least once every 15 months and this provides a more complete picture as to the actual condition of the network. During 2005 the Ease of Use Survey achieved a figure of 95.6%.

Obstructions & Enforcement

5.6.5 Whilst the majority of the network is free from obstruction and in good condition, problems do occur from time to time. The types of issues concerned vary from seasonal obstructions such as the ploughing and cropping of public rights of way, obstructions placed on the path, locked gates or even buildings erected over the alignment. There are also offences relating to the placing of misleading notices and the intimidation of users. Where obstructions on the network occur, the Council has various powers available to it to secure the removal of the obstruction.

5.6.6 The public perception of the rights of way service is often gained as a result of the manner in which complaints are handled. Although standards encountered in the management of the network are high, complaints are rarely acknowledged and complainants are not informed when issues have been resolved. This leaves complainants unsure as to the progress of a complaint.

5.6.7 At present the rights of way team do not possess an enforcement policy relating to issues arising on the rights of way network in Rotherham. However, it is considered good practice to introduce an enforcement policy as a part of the ROWIP to ensure enforcement work is carried out in a fair and consistent manner and to improve current standards. Such a policy will not only enable problems to be resolved as quickly as possible and in a uniform manner but it will also act as a deterrent against the committing of such offences in the first place.

5.6.8 The Enforcement Policy can be found in Appendix A.

Ploughing & Cropping of Public Rights of Way

5.6.9 Much of the countryside surrounding the town is arable farmland and this has an impact on the rights of way network. After the war field sizes started...
to increase substantially to accommodate larger machinery and allow for the more efficient use of land. Many public paths which once followed field headlands now ‘zig-zag’ across large prairie fields making them impossible to reinstate, follow or manage. The re routing of these routes would be a logical move.

5.6.10 Where a ploughing or cropping problem arises on a right of way it is often resolved on an advisory basis. Unfortunately, in a small number of cases where discussions fail to reach a satisfactory conclusion the highway authority take further legal action. During the period from 2003 to 2005 approximately 20 legal notices were served on farmers under the Rights of Way Act 1990.

5.6.11 The farmers survey indicated that 90% of farmers are aware of their legal responsibilities in relation to the ploughing and cropping of rights of way. There has been a reduction in the incidence of ploughing and cropping of rights of way in recent years. However complaints relating to ploughing and cropping issues are still one of the most frequently reported issues by path users. The situation requires regular monitoring to ensure that the small number of persistent offenders comply with their legislative requirements.

5.6.12 It is the intention to treat all landowners and farmers equally and fairly. Developing and publicising a code of practice would provide farmers with a simple step by step set of instructions to clarify what is expected of them. It would also provide the highway authority with a useful enforcement tool and ensure that path users are aware of the standard of reinstatement which they can expect.

5.6.13 The Ploughing and Cropping of Rights of Way Code of Practice can be found in Appendix B

Maintenance

5.6.14 Maintenance plays a vital role on the level of usage of the network. Overgrown or badly eroded routes are unlikely to be well used. A well maintained network is one of the key components in the eventual success of the ROWIP.

5.6.15 Whilst there is a pressure to ensure that the rights of way network is adequately maintained, there is also a strong public desire to maintain the character of the countryside. In particular the surfacing of rural paths with inappropriate materials would be seen by many users as the unwelcome urbanisation of the countryside. Care must therefore be taken to ensure that the public rights of way network is maintained in keeping with the surroundings and that the environmental impact is fully considered.
5.6.16 In 1996 a vegetation cutting schedule was devised to enable a more systematic and structured method of clearing overgrowth from path surfaces. The number of routes included on the schedule has increased on an annual basis whilst man power has remained unchanged. This has resulted in a delay in clearing vegetation during the summer months at a time when most user activity takes place. The network condition survey carried out during Autumn 2004 identified 23 instances of paths obstructed by adjacent hedges and 142 instances of surface vegetation requiring attention.

5.6.17 The survey also identified 8.1kms of definitive public rights of way described as being either muddy, rutted or waterlogged. This figure represents 2.2% of the public rights of way network.

5.6.18 Despite annual increases the budget often fails to keep up with the continual pressure exerted upon it. As a result the maintenance of the rights of way network is becoming increasingly reactive with little opportunity to adopt a proactive approach. Significant gains have been made in the maintenance of the network in recent years, but there is still considerable scope for improvement which will only be achieved by identifying appropriate resources.

5.7 Well Publicised

5.7.1 Rotherham is well served by a varied range of promoted routes from short circular walks for families to long distance multi user routes for the more avid path user. These promoted routes have been promoted by a variety of organisations including Rotherham Borough Council, Ramblers Association, Chesterfield Canal Society and the Rotary Club.

5.7.2 In spite of the diversity of promotional information available, there is still a strong public demand for additional promotional information. The rights of way user survey highlighted the desire for additional organised events, more doorstep walks and rides and greater efforts to encourage young people to use the local countryside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finger posts</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiles/Gates</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.7 BVPI No. 178 ‘Ease of use’ - Infrastructure Condition**
5.8 Promoted Routes

Door Step Walks and Rides

5.8.1 There are now 14 titles in the door step walks series offering a variety of routes in the borough’s countryside of between 2 and 4 miles.

5.8.2 The Door step walk series has now established itself as a popular locally recognised brand. The recent user survey revealed that over 53% of the survey participants had used a Door Step Walk Leaflet and 90% of those who had used the leaflets found them useful and contained helpful information. The success of the leaflets has created a high public demand and requests are regularly received to produce leaflets for additional areas.

5.8.3 In view of the success of the walk leaflets a series of door step rides leaflets were launched in the spring of 2004. 2 doorstep rides have been produced which are suitable for use by walkers, horse riders and cyclists.

5.8.4 Despite the success of the door step walk leaflets the level of information available to other classes of user is limited. Most notably there is no information available to any users with mobility impairment. This has been identified as one of the main barriers to disabled people taking part in countryside access. There is also considerable scope to expand the doorstep series into health walks and translating into additional languages.

5.8.5 The need for information is a key issue that needs to be addressed and further research carried out into the requirements of target groups.

Trans Pennine Trail

5.8.6 The Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) is the country’s first purpose built multi-user network. It runs coast to coast between the ports of Liverpool and Hull, linking with the seaside resorts of Hornsea and Southport. The main route of the TPT passes through the north of the borough at Wath upon Dearne. Rotherham also lies on the southern link of the TPT, which runs from the Dearne to Chesterfield via the town centre and Rother Valley Country Park. This provides a number of links between Rotherham and the wider region.

5.8.7 Walkers and Cyclists can use the whole 350 miles with horseriders too on many sections. Easy gradients and surfaced paths make much make of the Trail suitable for some people using wheelchairs or pushchairs.

5.8.8 Rotherham Borough Council is responsible for the management and publicity of the trail in Rotherham and has published a guide to the TPT in the Rotherham area.
Rotherham Ring Route
5.8.9 The Rotherham Ring Route is a long distance footpath promoted by the Ramblers Association. The 50 mile circular route around the boundary of Rotherham follows existing public rights of way. The route information is supplied in ten guide leaflets which are available from the Ramblers Association.

Cuckoo Way
5.8.10 The Cuckoo Way runs along the tow path by the side of the Chesterfield Canal. Despite 10 miles of the canal awaiting restoration the Cuckoo Way is available to walkers throughout its 46 mile length. The route forms a link between the Trans Pennine Trail and the Trent Valley Way.

5.8.11 The majority of the route which passes through Rotherham runs on permissive footpaths along the canal towpath. Where possible the legal status of the route requires clarifying to secure the route for the future. Attempts should be made to add the route to the definitive map or formalise any existing permissive arrangements. It would also be beneficial to investigate the viability of developing the Rotherham section of the Cuckoo Way as an easy going trail.

Rotherham Round Walk
5.8.12 The Rotherham Roundwalk is a 25 mile long circular footpath which was first developed by the Maltby Rambling Club. The route, which largely follows existing rights of way, is promoted by the Rotherham Borough Council Green Spaces Unit.

National Cycle Network
5.8.13 One third of the national cycle network runs on traffic-free paths, with the rest running on quiet minor roads and traffic-calmed streets. These routes provide notable leisure opportunities, as well as links into towns for schools and work.

5.8.14 Three routes pass through the borough. A spur of Route 6 runs from Shireoaks to Rotherham Town Centre, the southern link of the TPT has been designated as Route 67 and the main section of the TPT has been designated as Route 62.

5.9 Other Public Rights of Way Network Promotion

Adopt-a-Path
5.9.1 The Adopt-a-Path scheme was launched by South Yorkshire County Council. It enables path users to become involved in the management and protection of the rights of way network. The scheme encourages volunteers to inspect paths in their local area and assist in their upkeep to ensure that they are in a
satisfactory condition for the whole community. The scheme currently has approximately 150 members.

Rotherham Walking Festival

5.9.2 The walking festival, which is organised by the Tourism Unit, takes place every July.

5.9.3 Participants are attracted by a varied range of walks including historical walks, family walks and woodland walks. The walking festival has now become established as a popular event in Rotherham’s tourism calendar and is one of the main mechanisms for encouraging visitors from outside the borough onto the local rights of way network.

Pathways

5.9.4 The Pathways newsletter is produced on a regular basis to give details of latest news and forthcoming events. The newsletter is distributed to Adopt-a-Path members, at meetings/events and will soon be available electronically on the rights of way web page.

Public Rights of Way Web Page

5.9.5 The rights of way team have developed a comprehensive rights of way web page covering all aspects of rights of way procedures and locally relevant information. The web page provides information regarding rights and responsibilities, frequently asked questions, the definitive map, diversions and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Users also have access to applications forms, online complaint reporting forms and are able to download Door Step Walk leaflets.

5.9.6 The rights of way web page can be accessed at www.rotherham.gov.uk/prow.
5.10 **Wider Network Publicity**

5.10.1 There are many areas of land and paths in the borough, to which the public have access, which are not recorded in any formal manner and not publicised or promoted. This wider network of access is generally not promoted with the rights of way network due to it being managed by a range of public and private bodies. The differing standards of signposting and promotion, often leads to a lack of awareness of the existence of the wider network. The user survey highlighted the lack of information as a deterrent to use and many users were unaware of the extent of the local paths.

5.11 **Public Transport**

5.11.1 The countryside in Rotherham is generally well served by public transport. A number of bus services radiate out from Rotherham town centre towards the surrounding satellite towns, regional towns and cities. Many of these bus services pass through rural areas on route to their destination providing walkers with opportunities to access the countryside.

5.11.2 For example the Rotherham and Worksop Quality Bus Corridor provides immediate access to a large area of countryside between Wickersley and the borough boundary to the east of Woodsetts.

5.11.3 24% of non motorised journeys in the Rotherham countryside involve the utilisation of public transport. The use of a linear route can often provide additional opportunities for path users, as the start and end point of a walk are not fixed as is the case with a circular route.
5.11.4 Whilst the bus network is quite expansive in its geographical spread, users who utilise public transport to access the countryside require additional information to enable them to undertake a successful journey.

5.11.5 The South and West Yorkshire Rural Transport Partnership (RTP) is a scheme established by the Countryside Agency to develop and support community based transport initiatives. The RTP aims to improve access to jobs, services and social activities to rural communities in addition to enhancing visitor access to the countryside. Local forums based on existing rural initiatives undertake the RTP function in South Yorkshire, including South Rotherham Rural Transport Forum.

5.11.6 The Rural Links Network is successfully achieving Local Transport Plan performance targets. Research has shown that 86% of passengers using the network are either fairly or very satisfied with the service, exceeding the LTP target by 11% (the figure provided is a countywide figure for both urban and rural bus services).

5.11.7 The Local Transport Plan rural performance indicator requires 95% of rural households to be within 800m of an hourly or better bus service. In 2005/06 93.6% of rural households were within 800m of an hourly or better bus service. The improvement of services to rural areas will also represent a substantial improvement for visitors to the countryside.

5.11.8 The LTP2 aims to promote sustainable alternatives to the car, led by improvements in public transport, particularly the bus, and through Travel Planning. The LTP2 identifies congestion and delay as an issue with the potential to become more widespread. To address this, a specific focus on Key Routes has been proposed, particularly where the busiest bus routes operate. The Key Routes will provide the core access to South Yorkshire’s commercial centres and places of economic opportunity and accommodate the majority of existing and proposed future Quality Bus Corridors.

5.11.9 The rail network to rural areas within the borough is generally quite limited. The Rotherham to Doncaster railway line offers a frequent service to Swinton and Mexborough railway stations. However, the local rights of way network in the area is fragmented with no direct link from either station into the surrounding countryside.

5.11.10 The Sheffield to Worksop service has a number of local stops at Kiveton Bridge, Kiveton Park and Shireoaks. The local stops at Kiveton Park and Shireoaks are now providing a means of accessing the newly restored Chesterfield Canal.
6 Assessment and Evaluation

6.1 The Need to Evaluate the Network

6.1.1 Rights of Way Improvement Plans are intended to be the prime means by which local authorities identify the changes to be made in order to meet the Government’s aim of improved access to the countryside.

6.1.2 The Rights of Way Improvement Plan statutory guidance sets out that local highway authorities should:

(a) study the definitive map and statement of rights of way;

(b) collate and consider data on applications for modifications to the map and statement;

(c) collate and consider data on requests for improvements to the network;

(d) collate and consider data on the condition of the network;

(e) undertake a survey to assess the nature and scale of the present and likely future needs of the public (both local people and visitors to the area) in relation to the rights of way network; and

(f) identify any other relevant information, including other plans and strategies for the area.

6.1.3 Scrutiny of the definitive map and statement will allow an assessment to be made of:

- The extent to which routes and networks are available to different groups of users;

- Areas which are deficient in rights of way for all or particular groups;

- Obvious inconsistencies or anomalies in relation to individual rights of way;

Rotherham Rights of Way Improvement Plan
And, other opportunities to improve the network, including the restoration of severed rights of way due to road building.

6.1.4 The highway authority must look at the definitive map in conjunction with the wider highway network. This overall assessment will help to highlight those rights of way that might be used in conjunction with unclassified roads and other lightly trafficked minor highways. It will also assist in identifying those rights of way which are effectively unusable or put users at risk because they can only be reached along heavily trafficked roads without an adequate verge or footway.

6.1.5 In making an assessment under section 60(1)(a) and 60(3)(a), local highway authorities must consider the needs and circumstances of people with a range of expectations, interests and levels of ability. The assessment should take account of the needs of both local people and visitors to the area. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan Statutory Guidance highlights a number of individual assessments which enable the adequacy of the local network of rights of way to be gauged. These form the basis for the assessments of users’ needs.

6.2 The Assessments

Assessment 1
The availability of access to and within attractive areas of countryside which might currently have few rights of way such as watersides and woodlands, or access to a particular viewpoint, feature or other attraction.

Countryside access varies throughout the borough. In some areas the network of rights of way is dense and well used, but there are a number of areas where a fragmented network and general lack of countryside access prohibits and restricts public access.

Most notably these areas lie in the north of the borough, with limited access to the countryside to the north of Wentworth and surrounding the extensive Cortonwood housing development. Brampton Brierlow lies at the junction of the main route and the southern link of the Trans Pennine Trail. However the countryside surrounding Brampton Brierlow and West Melton contains no network of public rights of way.

There are three country parks in the borough at Ulley, Thrybergh and in the Rother Valley on the border with Sheffield and Derbyshire. The facilities available within the country parks are of a higher standard than the adjacent rights of way network.

Despite the high standards available at Thrybergh Country Park the nearby countryside is largely inaccessible to park users. The corridor beside the River Don from Mexborough to Dalton, a distance of approximately 5kms, contains little public access. This severely limits access from Mexborough, Swinton and Rawmarsh to Thrybergh Country Park.
Ulley Country Park is linked to the surrounding countryside by a number of public footpaths, but at present there is no rights of way network or countryside access to the west of the country park. Increased public access in this area would allow path users to enjoy an attractive recreational corridor beside the River Rother and Ulley Brook from Boston Park through Canklow Woods and Whiston Meadows to Ulley Country Park.

The wooded valley running from Dalton to Listerdale contains very little countryside access. The surrounding area is heavily urbanised and continues to be subject to further large scale development. The roads in this area are generally used by fast moving traffic and are not suitable for walking or riding beside and this further restricts the public’s enjoyment and utilisation of the local countryside.

The area to the west of Dinnington extending from the A57 at South Anston to the B6060 at Laughton Common lacks any form of countryside access. Countryside access is also limited travelling east of Dinnington from Lodge Lane to Langold Country Park.

Significant improvements have now been made to the Chesterfield Canal. British Waterways have restored the section of canal and towpath from Shireoaks to Kiveton and this has provided walkers with extensive additional opportunities.

The consultation exercise revealed a strong latent demand by the public to establish additional routes in the countryside. Participants suggested the creation of 66 additional footpaths and bridleways throughout the borough.

Limited opportunities also exist to develop and improve access to land included on the Area 8 maps of access land and registered common land. Whilst the sites in question currently offer limited access opportunities, potential exists to maximise the recreational value of the land concerned at Throapham.

Conclusion 1
Some countryside sites do not connect well with the rights of way network.

A fragmented public rights of way network limits countryside access opportunities in some areas of the borough and this has created a high level of latent demand for additional routes.

Assessment 2
The availability of attractive routes in order to support local tourism and economic regeneration.

Two sections of the Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) pass through the borough. The Trail is the principal promoted route in the borough and is actively publicised nationally.

In places the southern link of the TPT follows three different alignments suitable for walkers, horse riders and cyclists. A notable length of the trail uses the metalled road network. Whilst it is problematic to avoid using the road network this deters vulnerable users using some sections of the trail. The division of the route for different categories of user may also produce navigational problems for some users who have limited map reading skills.
The consultation exercise showed that there is a public demand for additional multi user routes and improving existing facilities. There is an identifiable demand to promote more links to the TPT from the surrounding residential areas and to create circular routes from the trail into the surrounding countryside.

The borough contains large areas of industrial land. A number of large scale reclamation projects on former colliery sites have significantly improved public access at Kiveton, Thurcroft, Manvers, Pit House West and Dinnington. However, both active and disused industrial sites often have the effect of forming a barrier to public access e.g. at Aldwarke and Maltby.

Rotherham contains 6 wards in the top 10% of the national index of deprivation including Maltby, Dinnington, Rotherham East and Rawmarsh. Rawmarsh has been selected as a ‘showcase’ Housing Market Renewal area to proceed with Accessibility Planning Activity. Local Centres and facilities have been identified in the Area Development Framework and potential transport routes to improve access identified.

Gap analysis of existing cycling and walking facilities has also started, with further work required before schemes can be designed and costed.

It is proposed to examine four other Housing Market Renewal Areas during the course of the Second Local Transport Plan.

Transportation is a key element in the regeneration process by providing access to employment opportunity and ensuring that new and existing employment is accessible without causing congestion. This requires engagement with the planning process to ensure that physical developments are planned with sustainable access from the start to enable the transition from policy and strategy to large scale delivery. In particular there is a need to plan and develop cycle routes and footpaths to enable access to local facilities.

The Accessibility Planning Programme complements the concept of ‘Key Routes’ and aims to develop the potential for walking and cycling. It is intended that the ‘Key Routes’ approach linked with improved local access, will benefit the ‘target’ deprived communities identified in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies.

Therefore there is an identifiable requirement to prioritise and develop local pedestrian and cycling facilities to provide enhanced access to Key Routes and facilities in identified areas.

**Conclusion 2**

_Tourism_ - There is a public demand for further traffic free multi user routes.

_Regeneration_ - The reclamation of former industrial sites often provide notable improvements to non motorised users.

_Regeneration_ - There is considerable scope to develop access in conjunction with Housing Market Renewal with particular regard to Key Routes._
Assessment 3

The opportunities for cycling, harness-horse driving, horse riding, walking, disabled journeys and recreational motoring other than on roads used mainly by motor vehicles;

A. Walkers –

Most footpaths in the countryside and on the urban fringe are used primarily for recreational purposes, whilst the footpath network in urban areas tends to be different, both in type and also use patterns. In the main they link one street or road to another, passing between urban buildings and as such their use is mostly for pedestrian transport.

The borough is generally well served by existing public footpaths providing a widespread network. Despite walkers’ entitlement to use all classes of local rights of way, there is still scope to improve the provision of pedestrian facilities. In particular pedestrian opportunities are limited;

- To the north of Wentworth including Cortonwood and Brampton,
- The river corridor from Parkgate to Mexborough,
- The Sandbeck Estate, including the area to the north of the estate in Doncaster MB,
- The valley to the west of Ulley Country Park,
- The countryside between Brampton Common and Dinnington,
- The countryside surrounding Thorpe Salvin,

In other areas whilst the rights of way network is relatively dense paths do not join up to create circular routes and some residential developments and roads have created barriers which makes some areas of the borough inaccessible. This is particularly true of the countryside on the urban fringe.

Conclusion 3A

There is considerable scope and demand to develop pedestrian facilities on the urban fringe and in rural areas.

B. Horse Riders -

The bridleway network in Rotherham is fragmented to such an extent that it would not be possible to undertake a substantial journey on horseback without riding on busy vehicular roads. Even allowing for the network of lightly trafficked minor highways, it is generally difficult for equestrians to find attractive, convenient and safe networks of routes.

The network of routes available to horse riders is fragmented to such an extent that it is simpler to describe the areas which benefit from a reasonable network of bridleways. These areas generally include;

- The countryside surrounding Scholes village.
- The countryside surrounding Hooton Roberts.
- The Morthen area incorporating areas of Whiston, Upper Whiston and Ulley.
- The corridor running from Laughton-en-le-Morthen to Firbeck, Letwell and Langold.
The corridor extending from Dinnington to Woodsetts and the Nottinghamshire County boundary.

The Fitzwilliam (Wentworth) Estate offers a number of linear routes across the estate on a toll riding basis (not part of the public rights of way network).

Even journeys in these areas involve crossing busy roads and riding on unsuitable roads.

The lack of available facilities has encouraged many horse riders to use public footpaths and tracks which have no formal bridleway status. This practice is common place especially in areas which have a limited network of bridleways or where riders wish to avoid busy stretches of road. The consultation exercise revealed a strong demand to improve countryside access for horses, especially around stables and livery centres.

The availability and use of many unsurfaced public roads are often limited due to inappropriate maintenance regimes and lack of information.

Work is now underway to create two strategic bridleway routes in the borough, namely an eastern route from Woodsetts to Conisborough and a western bridleway route from Rother Valley Country Park to Brampton Brierlow. Significant gains have now been made in the development of the eastern route in the Dinnington area.

C. Carriage Drivers –

Carriage drivers are entitled to use restricted byways and byways open to all traffic in addition to vehicular highways. In Rotherham the main resource available to carriage drivers or harness drivers are unsurfaced public roads.

Some of these routes do not benefit from regular vegetation clearance, maintenance or appropriate signage. It is sometimes difficult for users to identify such routes or gain information as to the extent of public rights. In the absence of such tracks and roads the lack of suitable routes encourages users onto busy roads.

At present there is no meaningful network of suitable routes in the borough available to carriage drivers.

Conclusion 3C

There is no meaningful network of routes available to carriage drivers.

D. Cyclists

The availability of local rights of way and off road facilities for cyclists varies throughout the borough but most cyclists experience difficulty in finding safe, attractive, and sufficiently long routes away from busy roads, for which there is increasing demand, both in urban and rural areas.

The distribution of off road bridleway facilities for cyclists can be described in a similar way to that described for horse riders. Again the network is severely fragmented and cyclists are faced with difficulties in planning suitable routes. These difficulties are further compounded by the fact that cyclists are able to cover a greater distance in a
shorter period of time than a horse rider or a walker.

**Conclusion 3D**
The facilities available to cyclists are limited especially in rural areas.

### E. Recreational Motoring
In Rotherham the main resource available to off road recreational motorists are unsurfaced public roads. At present there is no meaningful network of routes available to recreational motorists. Again some routes do not benefit from regular vegetation clearance, maintenance or appropriate signage and it is often difficult for users to identify such routes or gain information as to the extent of public rights. These factors often act as a barrier to use and prevent users from taking full advantage of the unsurfaced road network.

**Conclusion 3E**
There is no meaningful network of routes available to recreational motorists.

The public awareness and utilisation of the network of unsurfaced public roads is often low.

### F. Users with mobility problems-
The rights of way user survey identified that 2% of non motorised journeys are undertaken by disabled users. However, the inaccessibility of the network affects a broad range of users from wheelchair users, partially sighted users, users with push chairs and elderly users. Family and friends who accompany people with mobility problems are also affected by the accessibility of the network.

A study of the network centred on the three country parks in Rotherham revealed that 80% of access within country parks is available to wheelchair users. However in the surrounding countryside only 12% of routes are available to wheelchair users and 30% of paths are available to users with less limiting disabilities. Even the routes accessible to disabled users in the surrounding network cannot be incorporated into a meaningful circular route due to missing links and inappropriate routes. In addition they are often shared with other categories of users and this often leads to conflict.

Whilst access within country parks is often to a high standard the surrounding network presents difficulties to disabled users. Most notably the hilly topography, unmade surfaces and land use patterns

#### Table 6.1 A Comparison of Disabled Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Network available to wheelchair users</th>
<th>Surrounding Rights of Way network (within 2km radius)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulley Country Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrybergh Country Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rother Valley Country Park</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Accessibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
severely restrict access to disabled users. Paths passing across agricultural land constitute a considerable proportion of the network in some areas of the borough and in these areas surfacing works would be unviable.

Users with less restrictive disabilities who are able to negotiate moderate gradients and unmade surfaces are often restricted by inappropriate access features. In particular stiles present difficulties to many disabled users. In many situations stiles could be removed or replaced with kissing gates and this would enable an increase in the accessibility of the network.

Initially the lack of information prevents users planning trips into the countryside and making informed decisions as to which areas are suitable for them to access. In particular, disabled users require information relating to gradients and the location of rest points.

The provision of associated facilities is also of great importance to disabled users and a number of disabled users commented that the lack of toilets and parking limited their enjoyment of the countryside.

Even those rights of way which are free from barriers, and which could be incorporated into an easy-to-use circular route or a local network of paths, are not generally managed, promoted or maintained with the needs of people with mobility problems in mind.

**Conclusion 3F**

The rights of way network is generally inaccessible to wheel chair users.

The presence of stiles severely limits the accessibility of the network.

There is an absence of accurate information to enable disabled users to make informed decisions of the accessibility of the network.

**Assessment 4**

**The provision of routes from centres of population, the presence of links creating circular routes and routes which can be used in conjunction with public transport allowing people to gain easy access to the countryside from where they live.**

The consultation exercise revealed a strong demand to improve access to the countryside surrounding built up areas. 85% of users gain access to the Rotherham countryside directly from home. Suggestions for improvements for this group included:

- The provision of more cycle routes from residential areas,
- Routes from population centres allowing easy access from communities,
- Creating circular routes around residential areas,

The lack of available routes from population centres appears to be an issue for all categories of path users. One of the most defined trends of the public consultation was the desire to create more pedestrian facilities adjacent to residential areas. It also highlighted a
demand for improved access to work (industrial/urban areas) and to schools, although the safer routes to school scheme is working towards this goal.

Historically the rights of way network connected villages, farms and churches. As a result the network in many areas radiates outwards from a particular point eg, a village or a farm. In some areas this makes it difficult to create short circular walks and rides as there are many missing links.

The development of public access in Rotherham has continued to be somewhat ad hoc and a strategic approach to public access has only recently been adopted. Again the consultation exercise indicated that all categories of path users are affected by the lack of circular routes.

The provision of suitable circular routes primarily facilitates the use of the countryside for recreational purposes. Much of the demand for circular routes exists around population centres where path users require a varied range of circular routes in order to meet their needs. Many opportunities also exist to both integrate and develop the many ‘country’ type paths which exist in the countryside and on the urban fringe.

Different forms of access are often managed in isolation and this provides users with difficulties in planning journeys. For example, the public rights of way network is not generally considered alongside access offered by Environmental Stewardship schemes. There is therefore, a demonstrable need to adopt a strategic approach in the development and provision of circular routes for all categories of users.

At present 24% of users utilise public transport as a means of accessing the countryside. The consultation highlighted a public desire to place more emphasis on gaining access to the countryside using public transport.

Users have expressed a desire to create closer links between public transport and the provision of promoted routes. The provision of choices of travel mode that act as genuine alternatives to the private car is also a theme of the LTP2.

**Conclusion 4**

There is a strong public demand to develop a variety of circular routes on the urban fringe.

There is a public desire to make greater use of public transport as a means of accessing the countryside.

**Assessment 5**

The availability of routes to help ameliorate the effect on people’s enjoyment of the countryside of a motorway or other major road and the provision of convenient and safe road crossings.

Countryside access in the borough is increasingly affected by the vehicular road network. Whilst suitable crossing facilities are sometimes provided, path users are often forced to negotiate hazardous carriageway crossings or walk along the carriageway itself.

The problem is not confined to primary routes and main roads. It is apparent that many hazardous road crossings throughout the borough are located on minor roads. In a number of cases the highway authority has erected warning
signs to highlight the potential danger to motorists. However, rarely have public paths been amended or additional paths created to lessen the effects of busy roads.

The grass verges beside many rural roads would provide safe and convenient places suitable for walking and riding. Grass verges beside metalled carriageways are recognised as being an essential element of the public access network. Despite this fact and the increasing need for a traffic free environment highway margins are very rarely maintained with countryside access in mind.

A study on the effect of the road network on access in Rotherham has identified a number of potentially hazardous crossings and connecting sections of road which are not suitable to walk or ride beside.

The roads were selected due to;

i) unsuitable junctions/ crossings between roads and public paths

ii) unsuitable sections of road which must be negotiated to travel between public paths.

The consultation exercise indicated that road safety is considered a significant barrier when accessing the countryside and has the effect of deterring some users from undertaking journeys. 26% of respondents were reluctant to use the countryside due to busy road crossings or high volumes of traffic on some roads. Cyclists and horse riders both indicate that the provision of more off road routes as their main priority for the future development of countryside access.

A large proportion of the highway network is rural in nature. The South Yorkshire Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Strategy indicates that on these roads the majority of injuries are to motor vehicle occupants, although this could be due to the relatively low number of people walking, cycling and horse riding in these areas due to road safety concerns associated with the speed and volume of traffic.

**Conclusion 5**

Many roads which have to be crossed or traversed are unsuitable for non motorised users.

**Assessment 6**

The current rights of way network such as ways ending in cul-de-sacs or routes carrying different rights along their lengths.

Whilst the majority of routes included on the Definitive Map are accurately depicted, the map and statement contains a number of errors and anomalies.

Some of the original Definitive Maps were not carefully compiled, some rights of way were omitted, wrongly mapped or the status of the paths wrongly recorded. Despite the presence of errors on some maps and the evolving nature of the public rights of way network as a whole, a full review of the map and statement has never been completed.

As a part of the preparation for the Milestones Statement a survey highlighted in the region of 160 discrepancies between the Definitive Map and those routes used by the public.
In addition to the submission of a substantial number of informal claims for additional routes, the Definitive Map also contains:

- 4 dead end public footpaths
- 5 dead end public bridleways
- 1 gap in the network between existing public footpaths

Nearly all of the anomalies listed are as a result of discrepancies between parishes and neighbouring boroughs at the time of publication of the Definitive Map.

Although the Milestones Statement has provided a strategic framework for the management of the public rights of way network, the review of the definitive map has fallen behind the progress originally hoped for and the amount of incoming claims has exceeded original estimates.

It has become apparent during the review of the definitive map that extensive research and investigation will be required in order to complete the Definitive Map review. It is likely that the Discovering Lost Ways project will identify additional routes which may require adding to the Definitive Map and Statement and will assist in the review process. However, the projected completion date for the Lost Ways Project in Rotherham is 2012. It is therefore important to manage the review of the Definitive Map and Statement in order to meet the 2026 cut off date for recording historic rights of way.

It is recognised that improvements made to public access close to a borough boundary can have a beneficial effect on public access in the neighbouring district. For this reason effective consultation and liaison with neighbouring local authorities is an essential component in the improvement and development of public access. Increased and regular communication would also be required with neighbouring authorities in order to resolve current cross boundary discrepancies.

**Conclusion 6**

In areas the Definitive Map and Statement does not accurately depict the nature and location of public use on the ground.

There is potential for the Lost Ways Project to add certain identified routes to improve the connectivity of the network.

**Assessment 7**

*Availability of routes for local journeys, such as walking to work, to the shops, railway stations, doctors surgeries and other local amenities;*

As previously described the type of use varies greatly between rural and urban areas.

The majority of journeys in the countryside are made for leisure or fitness purposes and in urban areas the network is mostly used for transportation. The User Survey mainly identified non motorised journeys in the countryside. Only a small percentage (12%) of respondents undertook journeys as a means of gaining access to school, work or local facilities.

Utility use is recognised as being far less in rural areas than in urban areas. This is likely to be as a result of the distance involved in travelling to essential services and the standard of routes available or simply that services are more likely to be...
provided in densely populated areas. This trend is reflected nationally in the proportion of journeys to local services in rural and urban areas. The improvement of access to services and opportunities, especially for those members of the community experiencing disadvantage, is also an objective of the LTP2.

Potential path users are deterred from undertaking walking and cycling journeys by a number of external factors. These factors are described in Section 4.5.

In addition many urban definitive rights of way (1) are often maintained to a notably lower standard to those encountered on adopted footpaths (2) and this further deters potential users.

The consultation exercise also revealed a latent demand to develop strategic routes between and through built up areas to enable local journeys.

(1) Adopted Footpaths — Routes featured on the list of adopted highways with a tarmacadam surface and often illuminated by street lights.

(2) Urban Public Rights of Way — Routes featured on the definitive map with varying physical characteristics from tarmacadam surface to paths with an earth/ grass surface running through green spaces.

Conclusion 7
Scope exists to develop and improve the network of urban definitive rights of way.

Whilst the standard of urban adopted footpaths is high, scope exists to improve the network to encourage usage.

There is a latent demand to develop strategic routes between and through built up areas to enable local journeys.

Table 6.2 Reasons for making trips to shops on foot
National Travel Survey: 1999/2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for making trips to shops on foot</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like Walking</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No car available</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save time / short trip</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health reasons</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment 8

The availability of routes through or around heavily developed areas, to ensure that such development does not prevent or disrupt the continuity of the network.

Since the publication of the Definitive Map the countryside on the urban fringe has become increasingly affected by urbanisation. Routes which were once rural in nature now run through a built-up environment and this has not only changed the physical appearance of public access but has also changed patterns of use. Some paths which were once used for recreational purposes are now used to undertake shorter journeys to local amenities.

There is a recognised need to identify previously rural paths, which are now within the built environment and as a consequence require upgrading. Whilst some affected paths have been improved on an ad hoc basis as a result of recent development this is generally an issue which affects built up areas in all parts of the borough.

Conclusion 8

Urbanisation and development often blights the non-motorised network of routes, especially on the urban fringe.

Assessment 9

The condition of the network.

The Best Value Performance Indicator Survey No. 178 ‘Ease of Use’ provides the most reliable indicator of the physical condition of the network. The Ease of Use Survey conducted by the highway authority consistently achieves a figure in excess of 90%.

As a part of the ROWIP process Exegesis Spatial Data Management Ltd. conducted a full network survey during Autumn 2004. The survey provided a detailed assessment of the network including the associated infrastructure.

The Exegesis survey identified that nearly 200 sign posts require attention and waymarking is often either missing or misleading. The need for improving the provision of signposts and waymarkers was identified as a key issue in the consultation exercise as a whole. Poorly maintained sign posts and especially the absence of waymarkers discourage users.

Despite the notably high BVPI No. 178 score many users still consider the maintenance and enforcement of the current public rights of way network to be a priority. This is likely to be a reflection of increasingly high public expectations.

The network condition survey carried out during Autumn 2004 also identified the following issues;

- 5 bridges requiring attention
- 128 stiles and gates requiring attention
- 165 cases of overgrowth or upgrowth affecting public paths
- 8.1kms of public paths described as being either muddy, rutted or waterlogged
**Conclusion 9**

Users would like to see more resources targeted in the maintenance and enforcement of the public rights of way network.

The lack of way marking and signage in some areas is a barrier to countryside access.

**Assessment 10**

**The Publicity of the network and countryside access**

The Door Step Walk series has established itself as a popular locally recognised brand within a relatively short period of time. However, the consultation exercise indicated that 25% of current users are reluctant to use rights of way due to a lack of information and knowledge of the network. It is also likely that this figure is notably higher amongst minority groups eg. disabled users and black and ethnic minority groups.

Whilst this recognises the popularity of the Door Step series of leaflets it also highlights the continued public demand for additional publicity and the need to target publicity. The user survey highlighted the lack of information as a key deterrent to use and many participants were unaware of the extent of the local network of paths.

The wider network of access is generally not promoted or it is promoted in isolation from the public rights of way network by a range of bodies. The differing standards of signposting and promotion often lead to a lack of awareness of the existence of the wider countryside access network.

**Conclusion 10**

Despite the success of the ‘doorstep walk/ride’ series of leaflets there is high public demand for additional promotional information and in some cases the lack of information prevents potential users from using the countryside.

There is a lack of information regarding the wider network of public access.
7 Statement of Action

7.1 Statement of Action

7.1.1 The Statutory Guidance requires highway authorities to prepare a statement of the actions they propose to take for the management of local rights of way. It is intended that this should be a statement of how the highway authority proposes to take forward the management of public rights of way and how it will secure an improved network with particular regard to the issues highlighted in the assessment.

7.1.2 The assessments have enabled a number of conclusions to be reached about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the local rights of way network and to identify where action is required. These conclusions and the information gathered from the assessments forms the basis of the statement of action.

7.1.3 For each conclusion the highway authority must set out;

- The proposed action,
- The estimated costs,
- The key organisations that are intended to be involved in the proposed action,
- The timescale required to complete the proposed action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Policy Link</th>
<th>Proposed Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and develop access opportunities to land included on the Maps of Open Country and Registered Common Land with particular regard to Throapham Common.</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>Policy R4, R7</td>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>Country Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fragmented public rights of way network limits countryside access opportunities in some areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 7.1</strong> Statement of Action</td>
<td><strong>Rotherham Rights of Way Improvement Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 2</td>
<td>Routes to support tourism and regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong> - There is a demand for further traffic free multi user routes. <strong>Regeneration</strong> - The reclamation of former industrial sites often provides notable improvements to non motorised users. There is considerable scope to develop access in conjunction with Housing Market Renewal with particular regard to Key Routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Actions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy Link</strong> (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</td>
<td><strong>Proposed Completion Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Partnerships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Estimated Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong> - Carry out feasibility study for the development of a single traffic free route of the Rotherham Section of the TPT southern link suitable for all classes of user.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP2 2.5 UDP – Policy CR2 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy 2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4</td>
<td>Aug 2008</td>
<td>TPT Team Planning &amp; Transportation Service Landowners</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, develop and promote links from the TPT into surrounding urban centres and tourist destinations</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP2 2.5 UDP – Policy CR2 2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4</td>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>Landowners Planning &amp; Transportation Service TPT Team</td>
<td>£60,000 (or £10,000 per km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Partnerships</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Proposed Completion Date</td>
<td>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</td>
<td>Routes to support tourism and regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path user groups</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Identify and prioritise strategic routes between urban centres for utilitarian and leisure use. (See Also Key Actions 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 SYLT2</td>
<td>Develop and promote the Cuckoo Way and community link paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 UDP – Policy T4, T6, T7</td>
<td>Carry out feasibility study of creating additional linear access beside waterways – River Rother from Rotherham Town Centre to Rother Valley Country Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Regeneration** - Work with the Planning & Transportation Service and other stakeholders to maximise opportunities provided by reclamation projects. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy ENV5, T6, T7, | Ongoing | Planning and Transportation Service  
Developers  
Landowners | – |
| Work with farmers and other stakeholders to maximise access opportunities offered by farm diversification. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.5 UDP – Policy T6 | Ongoing | Farmers  
FWAG  
Green Spaces Unit | – |
| Identify and prioritise ‘Green Corridors’ and links to ‘Key Routes’ in the Rawmarsh Housing Market Renewal Area. Carry out a feasibility study of identified routes and establish detailed costings. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T6, T7, CR2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4, R6 | Sept 2008 | Transportation Pathfinder Project  
Landowners | – |
### Conclusions

There is considerable scope and demand to develop pedestrian facilities on the urban fringe and in rural areas.

### Key Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify, develop and promote pedestrian routes, especially on the urban fringe. (See Also Key Actions 4) | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T6, T7, CR2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4 | Oct 2012 | Path user groups  
LAF  
Landowners  
Primary Care Trust | £80,000 |
| Identify opportunities to provide additional pedestrian access to the areas highlighted in the assessment as having limited pedestrian facilities. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T6, T7, CR2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4 | June 2008 | Path user groups  
Landowners | – |
The opportunities for horse riders

### Conclusions

The network of routes available to horse riders is very limited.

### Key Actions

| Identify, develop and promote bridleway links, creating off road routes especially in areas with a high density of livery stables. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R3, | Apr 2014 | Path user groups  
Landowners  
Livery stables  
LAF | £80,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Develop and promote strategic eastern and western bridleway routes. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R3, | Apr 2010 | Chesterfield Canal Society  
Doncaster MBC  
Sustrans  
Landowners | Schemes to be costed individually |
| Produce an index of desired and missing links for potential creation as permissive routes a part of the Environmental Stewardship scheme. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R2, R3, | Oct 2008 | Green Spaces Unit  
Landowners  
Path user groups | – |
### Assessment 3C

#### The opportunities for carriage drivers

**Conclusions**  
There is no meaningful network of routes available to carriage drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify, develop and promote the use of Quiet Lanes to the benefit of all non motorised users. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T4  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy | Mar 2007 | Planning and Transportation Service  
BHS  
SY Police | Schemes to be costed individually |

### Assessment 3D

#### The opportunities for cyclists

**Conclusions**  
The facilities available to cyclists are limited especially in rural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify opportunities to develop and where possible create cycle routes with particular regard to those routes connecting the urban fringe with rural areas. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T7, CR2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R3, | Apr 2014 | Planning and Transportation Service  
Landowners | £80,000 |
### Assessment 3E

#### The opportunities for recreational motorists

| Conclusions | There is no meaningful network of routes available to recreational motorists. The public awareness and utilisation of the network of unsurfaced public roads is often low. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry out a condition survey of UCRs and unmetalled adopted highways.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy</td>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>User groups Network Maintenance</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with stakeholders to identify and manage legitimate vehicular use of the countryside and the rights of way network.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy</td>
<td>Apr 2012</td>
<td>User groups Landowners</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile a list and digital map of all rural un-metalled Unclassified County Roads.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R4</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>Network Maintenance</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conclusions**

The rights of way network is generally inaccessible to wheelchair users. The presence of stiles severely limits the accessibility of the network. There is an absence of accurate information to enable disabled users to make informed decisions of the accessibility of the network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Carry out an access audit of the Rights of Way Network and principal access sites. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T8, CR2  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R6. | Dec 2010                  | Path user groups LAF    | –                        |
| Improve access across the rights of way network, adopted footpaths and public open space by using least restrictive access guidance. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T8, CR2  
2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R6. | Dec 2016                  | Path user groups Landowners ROW contractors LAF | £5,000 per annum          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP2 2.5 UDP – Policy T8, CR2 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R6.</td>
<td>Path user groups Landowners LAF</td>
<td>Nov 2016</td>
<td>£50,000 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP2 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R6.</td>
<td>Path user groups Design studio Landowners Tourism Unit</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>£1,500 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP2 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R6.</td>
<td>Web team</td>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opportunities for user with limited mobility

Identify, prioritise and carry out works on strategic routes to upgrade to full accessibility standard.

Produce 6 ‘Easy Going Trail’ Leaflets (Least Restrictive Access) (See also Key Actions 10)

Publish disabled access information for inclusion in the Public Rights of Way Web Page. (see also Key Actions 10)
### Conclusions

There is a strong public demand to develop a variety of circular routes on the urban fringe.

There is a public desire to make greater use of public transport as a means of accessing the countryside.

### Key Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Aug 2012</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Schemes to be costed individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 SYLTP2</td>
<td></td>
<td>SYPTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and develop key routes on the urban fringe with the aim of providing additional access opportunities. (See Also Key Actions 3A)</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
<td>Path user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 SYLTP2</td>
<td>Path user groups</td>
<td>SYPTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 UDP – Policy T6, T7,</td>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>£10,000 per km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R3, R4, R7</td>
<td>SYPTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 5</td>
<td>Routes to ameliorate affects of major roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Many roads which have to be crossed or traversed are unsuitable for non motorised users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</td>
<td>Proposed Completion Date</td>
<td>Key Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake safety audits to identify improvement works. Investigate options to secure funding and safety improvements.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and list highway margins suitable for use by non motorised traffic. Prioritise according to safety benefits and investigate options to secure improved access and funding.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 6</td>
<td>The current rights of way network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions</strong></td>
<td>In areas the definitive map and statement does not accurately depict the nature and location of public use on the ground. There is potential for the Lost Ways Project to add certain identified routes to improve the connectivity of the network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify and prioritise the status of claims considered to offer the greatest potential benefit to the network. Where appropriate make DMMOs to add additional public rights to the definitive map. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.7 Rotherham Cycling Strategy  
2.8 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R2, R7 | Jan 2016 | Parish Councils  
Path user groups  
Discovering Lost Ways Project  
Legal & Democratic Services | – |
| Prioritise and manage the review of the Definitive Map to enable the completion of the definitive map and statement by January 2026. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.8 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R2, R7 | Ongoing | Legal & Democratic Services  
Parish Councils  
Path user groups | – |
| Utilise the mapping data gathered during the PROW condition survey to identify the areas where the definitive map differs from the network of routes physically used by the public. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy  
2.8 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R1, R2, R7 | May 2008 | Path user groups  
LAF | – |
### Assessment 7

**The availability of routes to local facilities**

#### Conclusions

*Scope exists to develop and improve the network of urban definitive rights of way.  
Whilst the standard of urban adopted footpaths is high, scope exists to improve the network to encourage usage.  
There is a latent demand to develop strategic routes between built up areas to enable local journeys.*

#### Key Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify, develop and promote strategic routes between urban centres for utilitarian/leisure use.</td>
<td>See Conclusion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, develop and promote safer routes to school. Every school in the Borough must have a school travel plan in place by April 2011.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.4 SYLTP2</td>
<td>Apr 2011</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation Service, Schools, Parents, Children, Governors, Education, Primary Care Trust, Travelwise (SYPTF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment 8

The availability of routes through and around heavily developed areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Urbanisation and development often blights the non-motorised network of routes, especially on the urban fringe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Work with the Planning & Transportation Service and developers to ensure that the rights of way network remains relevant to local use and demand. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy ENV5,T2,T4, T6,T7,T8, CR2 | Nov 2007 | Planning & Transportation Service  
Developers  
Landowners | – |
| Identify and prioritise urban routes which require upgrading to meet the utilitarian and recreational needs of users. | 2.3 Corporate Plan  
2.4 SYLTP2  
2.5 UDP – Policy T6,T7,T8, | Aug 2009 | Planning & Transportation Service  
Developers  
Landowners | – |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment 9</th>
<th>The condition of the network</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users would like to see more resources targeted to the maintenance and enforcement of the public rights of way network.</td>
<td>Adopt a regime of improved maintenance of the rights of way network, especially on those routes used by users with limited mobility or the visually impaired. To include increased seasonal overgrowth clearance and replacement of path furniture. See Appendix E- Routine Maintenance Works.</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>Apr 2007</td>
<td>Parish Councils, Path user groups, ROW contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement a programme of refreshing public rights of way signage throughout the borough.</td>
<td>£3,500</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
<td>Landowners, Path user groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt the protocols outlined in the Enforcement Policy (Appendix A) and the Ploughing and Cropping on Public Rights of Way – Code of Practice (Appendix B).</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>Landowners, Legal &amp; Democratic Services, Path user groups, Land representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment 10

#### The publicity of the network and countryside access

#### Conclusions

There is a high public demand for additional promotional information and in some cases the lack of information prevents potential users from enjoying the countryside.

There is a lack of information regarding the wider network of public access.

#### Key Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</th>
<th>Proposed Completion Date</th>
<th>Key Partnerships</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce 1 digital format door step e-walk each year.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4</td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>Design studio Landowners Tourism Unit Path user groups</td>
<td>£500 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce 1 digital format door step e-ride every 2 years.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4</td>
<td>Jan 2012</td>
<td>Design studio Landowners Tourism Unit Path user groups</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce 6 Easy Going Trail Leaflets (Least Restrictive Access).</td>
<td>See Conclusion 3F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise and publish closer look health walks for each door step walk route.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R8</td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>PCT Design studio Landowners Tourism Unit</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Policy Link (Chapter 2 Policy Context)</td>
<td>Proposed Completion Date</td>
<td>Key Partnerships</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop the Rotherham Rights of Way Web Page.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R3, R4, R7</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>Web Team</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the Rotherham Local Access Forum to maximise the development of Countryside Access and to encourage usage.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>£30,000 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce 5 closer look door step walk translations in additional languages as appropriate.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan 2.6 Countryside Traffic Management Strategy 2.9 South Yorkshire Forest Plan – Policy R6</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>Translation Co-ordinator Tourism Unit</td>
<td>£180 per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce “A plain speaking guide” – A common sense guide to countryside access.</td>
<td>2.3 Corporate Plan</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish disabled access information for inclusion in the Public Rights of Way Web Page.</td>
<td>See Conclusion 3F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 **Prioritising & Identifying Actions**

7.2.1 It is clear that the implementation of many of the identified key actions will require the allocation of substantial resources. This is especially the case for key actions requiring the addition or amendment of public rights of way.

7.2.2 There are however, some actions which may be delivered within a shorter time scale and within current resources. These actions are likely to be delivered within a shorter period of time as their implementation does not rely on identifying additional external funding. In broad terms the improvements which Rotherham Borough Council and its partners can best make progress on delivering are those within its control.

7.2.3 In prioritising the key actions, emphasis will primarily be placed on:

- Ensuring that the current rights of way network is well maintained and available to path users.
- Ensuring that the definitive map and statement is up to date and accurately reflects the physical network used by the public.
- Ensuring that the Disability Discrimination Act is implemented wherever reasonably possible.
- Developing the network of multi-user routes.

7.2.4 Other factors which will be considered when prioritising improvement schemes competing for the same source of funding will include the nature of the route, the benefit to users and social inclusion, source of the improvement request, cost and the current standard of local facilities.

7.2.5 The Scoring Matrix used to prioritise proposed schemes is shown in Appendix F ‘Prioritising Action’.
Appendix A

Public Rights of Way Enforcement Policy

Introduction

The rights of way network in Rotherham is managed and maintained to a high standard and the Best Value Performance Indicator No. 178 ‘Ease of Use’ survey consistently achieves a score in excess of 90%. Whilst the majority of the network is free from obstruction and in good condition, problems may occasionally be encountered.

As Highway Authority, Rotherham Borough Council has a duty under Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 to “assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of” and to “prevent so far as possible, the unauthorised stopping up or obstruction of” public rights of way.

Where problems arise on rights of way, attempts will initially be made to resolve them on an advisory basis. However, in cases where discussions fail to reach a satisfactory conclusion, the Highway Authority will take further action in order to meet its legislative obligations.

The Enforcement Concordat

The Public Rights of Way Enforcement Policy has been produced in conjunction with the Central and Local Government Concordat on Good Enforcement. By adopting the enforcement concordat we commit ourselves to;

Openness – We will provide information and advice in plain language on the rules we apply and we will disseminate this as widely as possible.

Helpfulness – We believe that prevention is better than cure and that our role actively involves working with landowners/Occupiers and business and advise with compliance.

Complaints about Service – We will provide a well publicised, effective and timely complaints procedure easily accessible to the public, landowners/occupiers and business.
Proportionality – We will minimise the costs of compliance by ensuring that any action we require is proportionate to the risks and the highway authority’s legal obligations.

Consistency - We will carry out duties in a fair, equitable and consistent manner.

Scope of Policy
Action will be considered wherever appropriate statutory powers exist to deal with situations that may lead to risks to the health and safety of the public or to the rights of users being infringed. The main areas to which this policy applies are:

1. Obstruction or unauthorised stopping up or diversion of a public right of way,
2. Failure to adequately restore a cross-field public right of way following lawful ploughing operations,
3. Unlawful ploughing or disturbance of a public right of way,
4. Obstruction or encroachment of a public right of way by crops,
5. Unlawful deposit of material or structures on a public right of way,
6. Misleading notices on or near to a public right of way
7. Vegetation overhanging a public right of way
8. Barbed wire likely to cause a nuisance to users of a public right of way,
9. Inadequate or unauthorised stiles or gates on public rights of way,
10. The unauthorised removal of signage,
11. Fences erected across a public right of way.

Courses of Action
There are a number of courses of action available to the Highway Authority depending upon the nature and circumstances of the offence.

1. Informal Action – Advice may be given when it is considered that the infringement is of a minor nature, and the Highway Authority is confident the owner or occupier involved will take corrective action. The owner or occupier will be requested to take appropriate remedial action within a given time period depending upon the circumstances of the case. Informal methods will be used to resolve the issue unless there is a risk to public safety, or the offender has repeatedly and deliberately obstructed a public right of way in the past.

If the landowner contacts the PROW Unit with valid reasons for non-compliance within the time-scale, then an extension may be given (confirmed in writing). If the works are still not carried out or the landowner does not contact the Unit for an extension prior to the deadline then formal action will then be commenced.

If a landowner cannot be identified a notice will be posted on the public right of way in the vicinity of the offence, stating whom to contact. If the landowner does not come forward or undertake the necessary works within the required time, the highway authority will take formal action in order to resolve the issue in question.
2. **Formal Action** – Before formal enforcement action is taken, officers will provide an opportunity to discuss the circumstances of the case and, if possible, resolve points of difference, unless immediate action is required due to public safety.

Formal action will be considered if informal action fails to achieve resolution of the offence or where the offender has persistently and repeatedly offended (e.g. in the case of crops or ploughing it may be an annual offence).

Formal Action will involve the serving of a Statutory Enforcement Notice on the offender by recorded delivery or on site if the offender is unknown. If the notice has not been complied with within the stipulated time the Highway Authority will take direct action to remove the obstruction or nuisance in order to reinstate the public right of way. All reasonable costs associated with the direct action, including administration costs will be recovered from the offender.

When immediate action is considered necessary, an explanation of why such action is required will be given at the time and confirmed in writing.

3. **Prosecution** - Prosecutions are normally considered as a last resort but remain an important part of the enforcement process. The circumstances that are likely to warrant prosecution may be characterised by one or more of the following:

- Where the offence involves a failure to comply in full or part with the requirements of a statutory notice,
- Where there is a history of similar offences,
- Where there is a history of non-compliance with statutory notices by the defendant,
- Where it is considered that a prosecution would be more appropriate than taking direct action, e.g. when a public right of way has been built over,
- Where the offence is potentially dangerous and a significant risk to public safety.

Certain offences require the service of a notice, before an application can be made to the Magistrates Court for an order to remedy the problem.

When circumstances have been identified which may warrant a prosecution, all relevant evidence and information will be considered, to enable a consistent, fair and objective decision to be made. Prior to making the decision to prosecute advice will be sought from Rotherham Borough Council Legal & Democratic Services.

Whilst the Highway Authority would normally commence enforcement action by giving informal advice and only escalate to a more severe course of action if that was unsuccessful, it reserves the right to issue an enforcement notice or to instigate prosecution proceedings immediately where it is appropriate to do so.

In exceptional circumstances a public path order may be considered as an acceptable alternative to enforcement action.
Prioritising Enforcement Action

Priority Action – Obstructions where one or more of the criteria set out in Policy PROW 2 are met. These obstructions will be dealt with as a matter of urgency by the rights of way team.

Routine Action – Obstructions which do not meet the criteria set out in Policy PROW 2 but have a negative impact on the public’s enjoyment of the path.

De-Minimis Obstructions – Obstructions which appear negligible in their impact on the public. These will be recorded on file but no further specific action will be undertaken. Resolution of the issue will be sought if an opportunity arises, for instance if development is proposed for the affected land.

Use of Public Path Orders

Some obstructions of the PROW network may be longstanding and of such a nature that successful enforcement action would not be realistic. An example of this may be the construction of buildings across a right of way sometime ago. In such cases the making of a public path diversion order may appear a more appropriate response.

However, in order to act as an effective deterrent the enforcement policy must not appear to condone the obstruction of public rights of way merely because it would be awkward or difficult to take direct action or prosecute. Therefore, making public path orders to deal with obstructions on public paths would be acceptable only in certain limited circumstances.
Rotherham Borough Council
Public Rights of Way Enforcement
Policy Statement

**Policy PROW 1**
Wherever obstructions or other limitations to the public’s enjoyment of a public right of way are identified, Rotherham Borough Council will utilise available legislation to protect and assert the rights of the public.

**Policy PROW 2**
In dealing with enforcement cases, priority will normally be given to cases where, in the view of Officers, one or more of the following criteria are met;

1. Where continuation of the obstruction provides an unacceptable health and safety risk;
2. Where resolution of the obstruction will provide a significantly enhanced PROW network,
3. Where resolution of the obstruction will contribute significantly to other Council objectives,
4. Where the obstruction adversely affects a promoted route,

5. Where a significant number of valid complaints have been received about the obstruction from a variety of independent sources.

**Policy PROW 3**
A Public Path Order will be considered as an acceptable alternative to enforcement action where one or more of the following criteria are met;

1. The obstruction does not appear to have been a deliberate attempt to interfere with the public’s use of the route,
2. The obstruction is not of recent origin,
3. An alternative route exists that will fulfil the requirements of the relevant Public Path Order Legislation.
Appendix B


Introduction

As Highway Authority, Rotherham Borough Council has a duty to assert and protect the rights of the public and to ensure that all public paths remain open and usable at all times. Farmers also have responsibilities for the public rights of way crossing their land.

The purpose of this code of practice is to explain what landowners are required to do in the reinstatement of public paths crossing arable farmland. It also provides a simple process which will be followed by rights of way officers when dealing with ploughing and cropping issues.

The Public Rights of Way Team enjoys a good working relationship with the local farming community and aim to treat all farmers equally and fairly. Where problems arise on rights of way, attempts will initially be made to resolve them on an advisory basis. However, in a small number of cases where discussions fail to reach a satisfactory conclusion, the Highway Authority will take further action in order to meet its obligations under the Rights of Way Act 1990.

Re-instating footpaths and bridleways during cultivation is a legal requirement, and only requires a little extra effort. It reduces trespass by keeping people to a defined narrow strip, thereby stopping path users wandering across farmland, uncertain of whether they are on the correct route.

The lack of use has no effect on the legal existence of a Right of Way.

Ploughing and Disturbing Rights of Way

Cross-field Paths - Farmers may only plough cross-field footpaths and bridleways if they cannot avoid doing so.

Any cross field paths which are ploughed out must be reinstated within 14 days of the first disturbance and within 24 hours of any subsequent disturbance. Basically this means that the surface of the path must be made good and the line of the path marked out.

Paths must be rolled with a tractor after ploughing, waymarked and safe to use.

Field Edge Paths - A field edge path must never be ploughed out or disturbed without the written permission of the highway authority.

Crops and Public Rights of Way

Farmers must not allow crops (other than grass) to grow on or overhang any public path at any time so as to inconvenience the public or obscure the line of the footpath.

Farmers should bear in mind that the width of path requiring clearance will sometimes differ depending on the type of crop involved. For example, towards the end of the growing cycle of oil seed rape it can form an impenetrable barrier to path users especially in situations where an adequate path width has not initially been left. Therefore crops of oil seed rape should be cleared to a greater width at an early stage. Alternatively a second cut will be required later in the cultivation cycle.
Paths must be restored to a standard which is reasonable for the public to use. In all cases the rights of way team will assert what is reasonable and if necessary will seek agreement with relevant user groups.

The width to be restored

In most cases the width to be restored is shown in the definitive statement. The definitive statement is the legal record which describes public rights of way in the borough. In other cases the following widths will apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Footpath</th>
<th>Bridleway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-field</td>
<td>1.0 – 1.8m</td>
<td>2.0m – 3.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-edge</td>
<td>1.5m – 1.8m</td>
<td>3.0m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum width is the minimum which must be reinstated by the farmer so that the path is reasonably convenient to use.

In instances where the local authority takes enforcement action, the maximum width may be reinstated.

The protocol for dealing with ploughing and cropping issues

This Code of Practice has been produced in conjunction with the Public Rights of Way Enforcement Policy and the Central and Local Government Concordat on Good Enforcement.

The highway authority regularly monitors paths crossing arable land to ensure that they are all open and available for public use. The majority of farmers are happy to reinstate public paths, unfortunately a small number of farmers do not reinstate paths across their land. Interference of public rights of way by ploughing and cropping is a serious issue and has a negative impact on the public’s enjoyment of the countryside.

In instances where problems arise the procedure outlined below will be followed in a reasonable and consistent manner.

In the event of a first offence a rights of way officer will informally explain the law to the offender and an advisory letter will be sent soon afterwards. The letter will set out the requirements for compliance with a time limit for completion of the necessary works.

After this period the path will be re-inspected. A legal notice will be served if the requested works have not been completed within the specified time. The legal notice will set out a final date for completion of the required works.

If on final inspection the path has not been reinstated, the Council will carry out the necessary reinstatement works and recover the total costs from the farmer or landowner concerned.

In the event of a second or subsequent offence, notices may be served immediately.
DEFRA have now amended the criteria for paying single farm payments to farmers. DEFRA are now able to withhold either part or in some circumstances all of the single farm payment if the farmer concerned fails to comply with his/her legal responsibilities. If a farmer declines to reinstate a public path within an adequate timescale DEFRA will be formally notified as a matter of course.

Advice and Information

The Rights of Way team will treat all landowners and farmers equally and fairly. Officers are available to provide further information and practical advice on the reinstatement of public rights of way.

The rights of way team can be contacted on 01709 822168.
### General Information

**Q1** How do you use the rights of way network?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on foot</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horse back</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycle</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabled</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horse drawn carriage</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2** Why do you use the rights of way network?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leisure</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel to work / school</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local amenities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fitness</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiting friends</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3** What type of route do you usually use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>circular</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4** Who do you travel with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as an individual</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small group</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family group</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organised party</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5** How do you gain access to the countryside to make use of public paths?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>start from home</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private vehicle</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public transport</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6  How much money do you spend on average per visit to the countryside?
Under £1  39%
£1 to £5  41%
£6 to £10  16%
Over £10  4%

Q7  How would you describe your map reading skills?
Excellent  30%
good  38%
average  26%
poor  5.5%
unable to read a map  0.5%

Q8  In which area do you live?
Rotherham  82%
Doncaster  2%
Barnsley  2%
Sheffield  6%
Chesterfield  1.0%
Nottinghamshire  0.5%
Yorkshire  4%
Derbyshire  1.5%
Leicestershire  0.5%
Cumbria  0.5%

Q9  What is your age?
Under 16  2%
17 to 24  3%
25 to 34  5%
35 to 44  13%
45 to 64  44%
Over 65  33%

Q10  Are you male or female?
Male  59%
Female  41%

Q11  What is your ethnic origin?
White  96.5%
Black - African  1.5%
Black - Caribbean  0%
Asian  1%
Chinese  0%
Yemeni  0%
Other  1%
Q12  Do you feel reluctant to use public paths because?

don’t know where the paths are 6%
don’t like walking across crops 19%
scared of getting lost 6%
feel intimidated 9%
no local network 7%
paths obstructed 25%
busy road crossings 11%
high traffic level on rural roads 15%
lack of safe parking 20%
paths too muddy 15%
lack of information 9%
other 6%

Walking
Q13  How often do you go walking in the countryside?

every day 17%
more than once a week 45%
more than once a month 30%
more than once a year 7.5%
less than once a year 0.5%

Q14  How far do you walk on average?

Under 1 mile 4%
1-3 miles 17.5%
3-5 miles 39%
6-10 miles 29%
Over 10 miles 10.5%

Q15  Do you prefer to use segregated routes, which are only available to walkers?

yes 65%
no 35%

Horse Riding
Q16  Do you go riding in the countryside?

yes 13%
no 87%

Q17  How often do you go riding in the countryside?

every day 28%
more than once a week 60%
more than once a month 8%
more than once a year 4%
less than once a year 0%
Q18  How far do you ride on average?
Under 1 mile  4%
1-3 miles  33%
3-5 miles  26%
6-10 miles  26%
Over 10 miles  11%

Q19  Does your journey involve riding on rights of way?
yes  100%
no  0%

Q20  Do you regularly use a horse box?
yes  54%
no  46%

Q21  Would you be willing to use additional routes on a toll riding basis?
yes  80%
no  20%

Q22  If yes how much would you be willing to pay for an annual toll riding pass?
£1 - £5  14.5%
6 - 10  33.5%
11 - 20  14%
21 to 30  38%
31 to 40  0%
over 40  0%

Q23  What length of riding circuit would you require?
1-3 miles  5%
3-5 miles  27%
6-10 miles  27%
10 - 20  41%
Over 20 miles  0%

Q24  In developing the network of routes available to horse riders, which of the following do you feel are most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distance</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of surface</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off road routes</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cycling

Q25 Do you go cycling in the countryside?
   yes 26%
   no 74%

Q26 How often do you go cycling in the countryside?
   every day 5%
   more than once a week 18%
   more than once a month 50%
   more than once a year 25%
   less than once a year 2%

Q27 How far do you cycle on average?
   Under 1 mile 2%
   1-3 miles 5%
   3-5 miles 27%
   6-10 miles 30%
   Over 10 miles 36%

Q28 Does your journey involve riding on rights of way?
   yes 87%
   no 13%

Q29 In developing the network of routes available to the cyclist, which of the following do you feel are most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>high</th>
<th>medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distance</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of surface</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off road routes</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disabled Access

Q30 Are you disabled?
   yes 7%
   no 93%

Q31 How often do you use public paths?
   every day 42%
   more than once a week 38%
   more than once a month 20%
   more than once a year 0%
   less than once a year 0%
Q32 How far, as a disabled user, do you travel on average?
- Under 1 mile: 21%
- 1-3 miles: 21%
- 3-5 miles: 21%
- 6-10 miles: 29%
- Over 10 miles: 8%

Q33 Which of the following limit your access to the countryside?
- Lack of parking: 0%
- Access features (stiles/gates): 20%
- Unsuitable path surfaces: 15%
- Gradients: 15%
- No on site facilities (toilets etc): 15%
- Transport to start of route: 5%

Q34 In developing/improving the provision of countryside access for the disabled place the following in the order of priority. 1 = high 4 = low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>1 = high</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 = low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More surfaced routes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of gates in place of stiles</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated parking</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of suitable routes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publicity

Q35 Are you aware of the 'Doorstep Walks' series of leaflets?
- Yes: 53%
- No: 47%

Q36 The Doorstep Walk leaflets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you find the leaflet useful?</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the leaflet contain helpful local information?</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the map easy to follow?</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the graphics clear?</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you find the route way marking useful?</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the standard of route good?</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the length of walk suitable?</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestions

Q37 Please state any other areas where you feel attention should be focussed in the improvement of the rights of way network

Responses listed below.

Enforcement

- Enforcement of ploughing and cropping legislation 7
- Path users should be encouraged not to walk through crops where there is an alternative. 1
- Increased enforcement action on rights of way 4
- "All walkers are not out to vandalise farmland" 1
- Enforcement of barbed wire alongside paths 1
- Aggressive dogs and bulls 1
- Rangers in the countryside 2

Definitive Map and Route Management

- Diversion of paths around field headlands where possible 1
- More work on defining the network and working towards the 2026 cut off date. 3
- More consultation where rights of way are to be created or diverted 1
- Conduct a survey to identify preferred routes with a view to extinguishing little used sections of route and concentrate on strategic routes. 1
- Improve networks between homes and schools 1
- Segregate path users 1
- Keep mountain bikes off footpaths 1
- All areas should be open to horses and cyclists 1
- Reducing speed limits on roads close to path crossings. 2
- Facilities for horse riders who wish to canter 1
- Additional paths 1
- Take cycle lanes off roads 2
- Create more circular routes which do not involve road walking 1
- More permissive paths over farmland 1
- Provision of safe road crossings 1
- More disabled facilities including parking 1
- Consultation with horse riders on suitable path surfacing 1
- More off road riding for horse riders 2
- More safety measures for the hard of hearing 1
Publicity
- More organised events 5
- More doorstep walks and rides 2
- Public forum at Rotherham Show 1
- Provision of Nature Trails 1
- Organise walks for school children 1
- More publicity (including local press, Meadowhall etc) 2
- Encourage young people to value rights of way 3
- Encourage ethnic groups to use rights of way 1
- Publication of local maps of rights of way 1

Funding
- Increase funding for rights of way 3

Signing
- Signposts to give destinations, path numbers and accessibility information (Colour coding of routes) 7
- More maintenance and provision of signposts 4
- More waymarking 5
- Road signs warning of horseriders and walkers on roads 2

Path Maintenance and Furniture
- Checking paths on a regular basis 1
- Owners and tenants to be kept up to date with path maintenance 1
- Keep paths clear of overgrowth 7
- Wider stiles and bridle gates required 2
- More maintenance of path furniture 2
- Replace stiles with kissing gates to enable less able users 3
- Install dog stiles 1

General
- Facilities and notices to be put in place regarding dog fouling and litter 6
- Litter on paths 2
- Tackle flytipping 2
- Dogs on leads 2
- More seating on walks 1
- Illegal shooting 1
- Use of routes by motor vehicles 9
- Cyclists must have bells on bridleways to warn other users 1
- Supply waste bins for picnic rubbish 1
- Swift removal of burnt out cars 1
Appendix D
Countryside Access in Rotherham - Farmers Survey

Q1 Would you describe yourself as a:
Tenant farmer 32%  Landowner 34%  Both 34%

Q2 Which of the following types of farming do you undertake?
Arable 52%  Dairy 0%  Mixed 45%

Q3 Is the land you farm best described as
Urban Fringe 31%  Rural 34%  Both 34%

Q4 Which age range do you fall in?
17 to 24 0%  25 to 34 7%  35 to 44 17%  45 to 64 66%  Over 65 10%

Q5 Do any of the following types of routes cross your land?
Public footpath 97%  Public bridleway 48%  Permissive footpath 21%  Permissive bridleway 10%  Countryside stewardship paths 3%  Other 10%

Q6 Have you suffered from any of the listed problems as a direct result of public paths crossing your land?
Trespass 76%  Damage to crops 79%  Worrying livestock 34%  Litter 76%  Fly tipping 66%  Unauthorised motorcycles 79%  Verbal abuse 45%  Out of control dogs 79%  Damage to boundary features 59%  Theft 59%

Q7 Which of the statements best describes your attitude to public access?
I welcome public paths across my land 0%  I am happy to allow responsible path users 76%  I would prefer to have no public access across my land 17%

Q8 Are you aware of your legal responsibilities for reinstating paths crossing cultivated land?
Yes 90%  No 10%
Developing Public Access

Q9 Would you allow any of the following types of public access to be created on your land in the future?

- Public footpath: 0%
- Public bridleway: 7%
- Permissive footpath: 3%
- Permissive bridleway: 7%
- Countryside stewardship paths: 10%
- None: 76%

Q10 Would you prefer cross-field paths to be diverted onto field headlands?

- Yes: 72%
- No: 14%

Q11 Would you allow stiles to be replaced by stock proof kissing gates?

- Yes: 69%
- No: 17%

Q12 Would you allow the paths across your land to be way marked? (This may help to reduce unintentional trespass)

- Yes: 76%
- No: 7%

Q13 Would you allow horseboxes to park close to your farm buildings in return for a daily fee?

- Yes: 38%
- No: 55%

Q14 How do you think public access to the countryside could be improved?

- Protecting footpaths from motor cycles and horses.
- Better waymarking.
- By educating the public to keep to footpaths/bridleways to respect that growing crops are farmers living.
- Educating the public of their responsibilities as well as their rights.
- Some users need educating on the ways of the countryside.

Q15 Do you have any specific suggestions for improving and developing public access across your land?

- Better waymarking of paths.
- Make people aware of their responsibilities.
- By educating public to keep to footpaths/bridleways to respect that growing crops are farmers living.
- Its hard to be enthusiastic about public access when every gate has to be padlocked and fields resemble motor-cross circuits.
- Bridlepaths created and maintained jointly between landowners and Local Authority allowing horses to exercise off road.
- Already sufficient footpaths available in this area. I welcome all responsible persons.
- We have five footpaths on fifty acres of land. Therefore there is adequate access to the countryside on our land.
- Local schools should give guided tours to children.
- All dogs should be kept on leads.
- Public access does not want developing on my land.
- Bridlepaths created and maintained jointly between landowners and Local Authority allowing horses to exercise off road.
- Better waymarking of paths.
Appendix E

Routine Maintenance Works

The Asset Management Framework for highway maintenance highlights the importance of taking a long term view of forward planning through the production of a forward work programme. It also identifies the link that needs to be established between the delivery of works and services and forward planning.

Good quality condition data enables the prediction of future maintenance schemes and their locations. The timing of non-condition related work can then be reviewed to ensure situations don’t arise where new look works are destroyed by subsequent tasks.

Long-term programmes are built on projections using currently available data and knowledge. As such there are limitations on the reliability of these projections, in particular in terms of the precise location and nature of individual projects in the later years of the programme.

The forward works programme will bring together all routine and condition related maintenance works planned on the public rights of way network during the next 10 years. It will not describe more specific improvement works which will be identified during the course of the implementation of the ROWIP.

Forward Routine Work Programme

Public Rights of Way Condition Survey – BVPI No. 178 ‘Ease of Use’-

The entire public rights of way network will be surveyed every 15 months using the BVPI No. 178 methodology. Any identified maintenance works will be prioritised and programmed into the public rights of way maintenance schedule.

Public Rights of Way Signage -

The public rights of way network contains a total of 759 signs of which 197 require attention. 24 sign posts will be replaced each year for the duration of the plan.

Any additional signage defects (including way marker posts) which are subsequently identified will be prioritised and programmed into the works schedule as appropriate.

Vegetation Clearance -

The public rights of way network will be subject to a programme of annual vegetation clearance. Herbicide will be applied to a total of 54 paths (20,643m) during April each year. A vegetation cutting schedule will also be implemented throughout the summer involving the clearance of 106 paths.

The vegetation cutting schedule will aim to achieve 4 cuts per season.

Additional complaints relating to paths not included on the vegetation cutting schedule, which are identified during the routine condition survey or originating from customer complaints, will be prioritised and programmed into the public rights of way works schedule as appropriate.
**Path Furniture -**

The public rights of way network contains a total of 644 items of path furniture. 128 stiles have been identified which require attention or replacement. The stiles requiring attention will be individually assessed and according to priority will be replaced at a rate of 13 per annum for the duration of the plan.

The following criteria will be used for the purposes of assessment;

- Stiles which are considered redundant and serve no purpose at the identified location will be removed.
- Stiles requiring attention on paths suitable for wheel chair users will be replaced with disabled accessible kissing gates where appropriate.
- Stiles requiring attention on paths suitable for less able users, but are not suitable for wheel chair users, will be replaced by pedestrian kissing gates.
- Stiles requiring attention on paths which are unsuitable for wheel chair users or less able users will be replaced with new stiles.

Any additional path furniture defects which are subsequently identified during routine condition surveys or originating from customer complaints will be prioritised and programmed into the works schedule according to safety and accessibility issues.

**Surface Condition -**

Surface condition defects are identified during the routine condition survey and as a result of customer complaints. Each year small scale surfacing schemes will be undertaken utilising the public rights of way budget. Additional surfacing schemes will be carried out depending on the identification of suitable funding. Surfacing works will primarily be assessed according to public safety.

**Bridges -**

The public rights of way network contains a total of 186 bridges. The Streetpride Highway Structures Section will carry out general inspections on all bridges every 2 years and major bridges will be subject to a principal inspection every sixth year. The Structures Section will arrange for any defects to be rectified according to priority and on identification of suitable funding.

**Appendix F**

**Prioritising Actions**

Proposed schemes will be individually prioritised according to the following scoring matrix as a guide.

1. **Nature of Route**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Route</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cul de sac</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Through Route, not accessing wider network or local amenities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Route connecting amenities and or communities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Primary access to local facilities or missing link</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Cul de sac routes providing access to points of interest or local amenities will hold additional priority weighting (2-4).
2. **Number of Potential Benefactors**
   
a) Limited benefit to users 1  
b) Encouraging local use 2  
c) Attracting wider use 3  
d) Attracting wider use and addressing social inclusion issues including DDA, attracting visitors or involving promoted routes 4

3. **Source of Request**
   
a) Single request from one individual 1  
b) Request from a group of individuals or landowners 2  
c) Request from a Parish Council, User Groups or via BVPI data 3  
d) ROWIP key action, statutory duty, DDA related 4

4. **Funding Source**
   
a) Significant proportion of internal budget with no other funding 1  
b) Internal budget only - less significant proportion 2  
c) Joint funding (internal budget and external funding) 3  
d) External funding source 4

5. **Achievability**
   
a) Landowner consent and/or Public Path Order/ DMMO required 1  
b) Whilst negotiation is required affected land in public ownership 2  
c) No landowner permissions required 3

6. **DDA requests to improve existing provision**
   
a) Adequate or acceptable alternative available 1  
b) Inadequate or no alternative available 4

**Scoring:** Out of a total of 23 – higher score = higher priority
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Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>A strip of land over which the public has a right to pass and re-pass according to its status. All categories of public rights of way and public roads are highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Footpath</td>
<td>A highway over which the right of way is on foot only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Bridleway</td>
<td>A highway over which the right of way is on foot, horse, leading a horse and on a pedal cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUPP</td>
<td>Road Used as Public Path. A highway over which the right of way is on foot, horse and on a pedal cycle. Some RUPPs are also available for use by motor vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAT</td>
<td>Byway Open to All Traffic. A right of way for all users including vehicles. Often referred to as byways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Byway</td>
<td>A right of way for all users including horse drawn carriages but excluding motor vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycleway</td>
<td>A right of way with a pedal cycle, and on foot unless segregated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Path</td>
<td>A route which may be used by the public with the permission of the landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane</td>
<td>A generic term for an unsurfaced track, usually bounded by hedges or walls /fences. Such a route may or may not be a public highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROW Act</td>
<td>Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>Disability Discrimination Act 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Email  
andrew.savage@rotherham.gov.uk
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01709 822932

Fax  
01709 373987

Post  
Rotherham MBC  
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Bailey House  
Rawmarsh Road  
Rotherham  
S60 1TD

Internet  
www.rotherham.gov.uk/prow
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