

Published response - individuals

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
12				
0	0	PROW signs should also state PROW number and contact details	Disagree	The demand for this is very limited and does not justify provision of extra signage
0	54	No mention of Greenways Project (Barrow)	Agree	Greenways will be mentioned in the Quiet Lanes section
0	74	Barrier reduction is valid for most user groups	Noted	Noted
0	106	The FMD comments are only partly true	Noted	The FMD section will be removed and published elsewhere as 'supporting documents' if possible
0	110	Consideration should be given to changing 'education' to 'birthright' or 'our heritage'	Disagree	Disagree - words such as 'birthright' and 'our heritage' are politically loaded
0	158	Maps of the PROW surveyed by Cumbria Lost Ways project would be useful	Agree	If a map of the parishes covered can be made, it will be included as a useful way of illustrating what was covered.
0	180	PROWs are fragmented by roads and traffic. Need greater integration.	Noted	Noted
9	4	Exec Summary. Less than satisfactory doc. Much of info factual. Poor colour contrast in some maps or limited scale.	Disagree	Much of a ROWIP is supposed to be factual. The quality of the maps will be improved.
16	34	Chapter 2. Preoccupation with PROW network as mainly tourist attraction.	Noted	Noted

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
17	37	Chapter 2. Comment that PROW is "complemented by minor road network" avoids the issue that much of present network evolved from other routes that public could use.	Noted	Noted
27	54	No mention of Cumbria Coastal Way, Cistercian Way, Limestone Link, Dales Way, Haematite Trail etc.	Agree	Clearer guidance on which long-distance routes are recognised and which are not will be available for the full ROWIP.
78	0	Education needs to stress responsibilities	Noted	Noted
78	0	Rangers need to be spread throughout Cumbria	Noted	Noted
25				
0	56	Bridleways are often unsuitable even for mountain bikes eg. Wampool to Powhill - 240548 to 237554	Noted	Noted
0	57	Sign posting in urban areas very poor eg. Cyclists still told to go wrong way up a no entry called Hartinton St, Carlisle. Cycle tracks too narrow or badly maintained	Noted	Noted
0	63	Much more development still needed to encourage safe cycling away from the traffic	Noted	Noted
0	64	When is something going to happen. Too much talk and not enough action.	Agree	The full ROWIP will include more information about implementation

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
26				
	5	0 Among the BVPI "Easy to use" criteria is "Waymarked to the extent necessary to allow users to follow the path" In a project concerned with "casual walkers" etc as well as "serious walkers" - does one size fit all.	Noted	Noted - your point is about the standard BVPI methodology
	7	0 List of streets. Is it in fact the case that the List always includes all the footpaths, bridleways etc. Does Cumbria List do so?	Noted	Noted - your point is about the relationship between the definitive map and the list of streets
	14	0 As someone involved in diff ways with two LAFs (LDNP & YDNP). Agree involved in early stage but how much have they been able to contribute to the draft statements of action.	Agree	The LAFs will have the opportunity to examine the document as it evolves over the next 6 months.
	18	0 Map is not clear. Need better legend.	Agree	The maps and legends will be improved for the full ROWIP
	22	Use and condition sureys carried out by volunteers outside the NPs may well be of more variable quality and reliability than those done by NP Rangers	Noted	The variability in the methodolgy was clear in the draft ROWIP. We are working on developing a common methodology for the future
	24	51 Use of superscript confusing. Footnote 11 is factually incorrect.	Agree	The latest information regarding the Pennine Bridleway will be updated on footnote 11.

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
26		Similar comments to above about unclear area boundaries. Legend has no line to correspond to "Footpath" and there needs to be more contrast between colours Footpath, Bridleway and Byway.	Agree	The maps and legends will be improved for the full ROWIP
27		In what sense is the bridleway network in the LDNP and East Cumbria "comprehensive"? Would the horseriders agree?	Agree	The word comprehensive will be changed
28	0	What is the "Pennine Cycleway"?	Noted	It is National Cycle Network route 68, from Derby to Berwick upon Tweed, via Penrith. The sustrans route numbers will be explained next to the map, in addition to 'terms explained'
36	85	Statement welcomed by many, so should be retained, even if members of the motoring lobby raise objections.	Noted	Noted
38	0	The two subjects of this chapter are useful background. Page 3 heading "Chapter 3" has been missed out.	Agree	'chapter 3' heading will be reinstated
50	0	One could argue about whether Needs and Preferences have been distinguished consistently according to criteria adopted.	Noted	Noted

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
51	0	It seems dubious to lump together under KA11 these very diff groups as "Others Users".	Noted	A valid point, but the research has already been completed and we cannot change the key audiences now
52	0	Can one seriously accept that "suitable places of workshop" are really a Need for BME groups to enjoy countryside?	Noted	Although it was identified as a need in the reasearch, this was felt to be beyond the scope of the ROWIP and so did not become and action in the SOA
53	0	Is it really possible to claim that the prioritisation mechanism is "objective". Many of the criteria in para 132 must have an element of subjectivity.	Agree	The word 'objective' will be tempered in the full ROWIP
54	135	What is the meaning? Whose assessment is it, and what is understood by "adequacy"? Para 138 is not entirely objective.	Agree	The fact that the 'action suggestions' consultation was the assessment of adequacy will be made clearer.
57	144	Seems to imply that certain matters which would constitute improvements will not be treated as ROWIP matters since they are part of CCCs annual targets.	Agree	The relationship between statutory responsibilities and improvements will be outlined in the full ROWIP
60	0	Difficult to see how Action 17 comes under "Opportunities for all" in the same sense as the preceding four.	Agree	This will come out into a separate action for 'water users'
62	156	People will be cynical when reading paras 156-7 whether anything is really likely to happen.	Agree	AM will have discussions with senior management (who requested the inclusion of this sentence in the first place) as to how it can be rephrased or removed

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
63	0	"Countryside Access Cumbria" are listed as potential partner for nearly every action, but is not clear to the general reader who they are.	Agree	As 'Countryside Access Cumbria' develops, greater detail can be added for the full ROWIP.
66	0	Should not Action 16 be listed under "Cyclists" as beneficiary?	Agree	CCC Action 16 will be moved as the whole SOAs are restructured
67	0	Action 25 (supporting land managers) would not seem to most people to be a matter of "social inclusion" as normally understood?	Agree	CCC Action 25 will be moved as the whole SOAs are restructured
69	160	Title "Cumbria Lost Ways Project" is confusing as footnote 49 acknowledges. The 2005 survey referred to in para 158 may have been inadequate in terms of nos of parishes.	Agree	The title of the CLW project cannot now be changed.
70	0	What counted as an obstruction? (natural and/or man-made?) What is meant by "incorrectly signed"?	Agree	Clarity will be added
72	0	What counted as "damaged by water"?	Agree	Clarity will be added
73	0	What counted as "obstructed" (see above)?	Agree	Clarity will be added
74	162	The "obstructed" fig for LDNP is higher than for Cumbria. This is hard to believe, and must be due to the fact that volunteers involved were trained (see para 162)	Agree	We will produce streamlined condition data for future ROWIPs

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
76	0	CCC have done more signposting recently, but the dramatic rise from 2004-05 in signposts present must be due partly to sampling error?	Disagree	The BVPI methodology is applied very stringently and it is unlikely that a sampling error has taken place
86	0	It is disappointing to see the absence of suggested footpath imps in W Cumbria and also in the Penrith-Kirkby Stephen corridor.	Agree	Projects can still be submitted if you are aware of areas where the network is inadequate
88	0	The same remark applies to cycle ways.	Agree	Projects can still be submitted if you are aware of areas where the network is inadequate
28				
	0	Please build a bridge over New Water. OS Map Landranger 86 and ref 579515. Would allow easier access to the walk between Newbiggin & Jockey Shield and enable people to do a complete loop.	Noted	Specific projects will be added in an annual scoring process
29				
	0	Likes idea of cycle tourism hubs and welcomes proposal that Keswick should be one. Could link with dev of single track mountain bike routes in Whinlatter Forest. C2C using old railway should stay rather than be made back into a railway	Noted	Noted
31				

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	"PROW" requires inclusion in glossary.	Agree	The 'rights of way' section in the glossary will be expanded
0	0	Cost of printing for a draft.	Disagree	This is a statutory responsibility
0	0	Improvement Plan could be a lot simpler.	Agree	Extra text will be placed in the appendices where possible
0	0	Having two separate action plans can lead to some confusion it seems to me.	Agree	Under discussion
0	0	Action 20 talks of guided walks. It needs to be made clear who the guides are intended to be as my understanding is the LDNP has ceased this activity.	Disagree	The LDNPA has not ceased to provide guided walks
0	0	In the LDNP action plan "opportunities for all" and "education and promotion" are not beneficiaries. These need re-defining as cyclist, walker, horse-rider etc.	Agree	We will redesign these headings, to match beneficiaries
0	0	Would like to see much greater emphasis on public transport integration, provision of cycle-ways that genuinely privilege the cyclists over the motorist	Noted	Noted
0	0	I consider that the maps included in the plan give insufficient detail.	Disagree	The maps are not intended to be that precise, merely to give an overview of the resource / adequacy.

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	I consider the publicity and implicit endorsement given to a commercial enterprise in para 73 to be inappropriate in a document of this nature.	Agree	The link will be removed and the paragraph rephrased
0	0	If existing paths are to be upgraded could this result in the introduction of unplanned negative effects	Noted	Noted
0	0	Rather than giving the "policy link" in general terms, it would be better if this could point to any specific documents by title and possibly section to assist understanding of the whole picture.	Noted	The policy links will give the references but it will be up to individuals to go back to the original documents.
0	0	None of the actions have any costings attached.	Agree	Full costings will be in the full ROWIP (this was only the draft)
0	0	Would expect that the impact of NERC on green road driving will have been assessed by the time of the final publication and that a policy which firmly restricts any expansion of such activities will be endorsed.	Agree	The assessments coming out of the NERC Act will be included

40

0	51	The CROW Act 200 is extremely misguided in respect of dog owners. Finds large tracts of land on the Upland Fells of the Pennines with a total dog ban for 10 years.	Noted	Noted
---	----	---	-------	-------

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
	0	52 I would like to bring attention the impending Planning App for 12 wind turbines, 118 high east of shap. These will be visible for C2C walkers for a considerable distance and will also be detrimental to visitors to the Eastern Fells.	Noted	Noted
43				
	0	0 As a volunteer who completed a survey of over 38 pathways my only comment is related to allocation of resources to upgrade pathways etc. Nature of land usage and settlements has changed considerably. Many paths go to non-existent settlements ie farm-to-farm - recommend these paths should be abandoned.	Noted	Noted
50				
	0	0 Expensive looking document - is this necessary?	Noted	Noted
	0	0 Content fine	Noted	Noted
52				
	0	3 Chpt 1 - for clarity should add after 1st sentence "it is not a duty to implement"	Disagree	This concept is mentioned in para 19 and has already attracted criticism
	0	6 Add horse riders to the list of users given in sentence 2	Agree	Para 6 (and executive summary as a whole) will be altered.

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	12	Where we talk of recreational vehicle users should we be saying "4 wheel drive/motorised wheelchairs for the disabled?"	Disagree	MPV users are not exclusively disabled people although it is one way that disabled people can access the countryside. The words 'recreational vehicles' will be substituted for 'mechanically propelled vehicles' to be clear.
0	18	I thin the second bullet point should also refer to cul-de-sac routes	Agree	This point will be added to para 18
0	25	Do we need 'local' in the first line?	Disagree	The word 'local' is taken from DEFRA guidance and introduces a new concept of PROW, which is to include off-carriageway cycle tracks.
0	34	Line 3 & Para 36 - I think we should refer to the largest number rather than 'network'. Our intention is to secure a greater number of networks	Noted	Noted
0	67	I know carriage drivers who drive on their own initiative so I suggest we add 'generally' to line 2 to read 'drivers generally rely on organised events'	Agree	The word 'generally' can be added
0	88 & 89, 90.	I think we should state here that the H of TR was discussed with and agreed by user organisations	Agree	Background supporting information about the HOTR will be published in appendix
0	95	Last bullet point. The correct reference is the Equestrian Tourism Strategy	Agree	The reference will be corrected

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	157	Totally unnecessary and dispiriting	Agree	AM will have discussions with senior management (who requested the inclusion of this sentence in the first place) as to how it can be rephrased or removed
8	0	Should explain what is meant by "Permitted Access"	Agree	An explanation of permitted access will be given
8	0	Glossary: add a further sentence "Production of the ROWIP is a requirement of the CROW Act. Implementation is not a requirement"	Agree	The ROWIP sentence in the glossary will include a point about implementation
18	0	Fig 2. I have seen this map before but I wonder of its worth. It is difficult to differentiate the different categories - review colouring	Agree	The maps will be improved for the full ROWIP
19	39	Table 3 - First box refers to Capita - thinks it is misleading - Capita is acting on behalf of CCC.	Agree	This nuance will be made clear
22	44	3rd bullet point. This list does not include 'not signed' - I think it should	Noted	The Cumbria Lost Ways survey captured 'incorrectly signed' information and the results are merely being presented here
24	51	I think we should mention that some of the routes referred to in these publications do not always show PROW	Noted	This point will be made.

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
27	54	& Para 54. We should be saying more about the needs and economic value of recreational use of horses. See 'Building an Equestrian Tourism Strategy' by Cumbria Tourist Board, estimates at £18 million. Should also refer to the need for horse box parking.	Agree	The opportunities for horse-riders section will be changed. Info about the value of recreational horse riding in the rural economy can be added.
32	70	Line 3 - Suggest it would be clearer if we refer to ladder stiles.	Disagree	People with limited mobility can find all stiles difficult to negotiate, not only ladder stiles.
33	71	Bullet Point 1. Should expand on what we refer to as conditions. I have in mind surface, cul-de-sac, gradients and grading	Agree	The word 'conditions' will be explained
33	73	Should be careful when we refer to powered wheel chairs etc as they can go almost anywhere and we do not want to raise hopes	Agree	However, it is the intention that this plan makes special provision for improvements for people with limited mobility
34	76	I think we should add to the sentence eg. 'miles without stiles'	Agree	MwS will be added to para 76.
36	84	I think this para ought at least state that the rest of CCC will endeavour to follow LD SPBs excellent example	Agree	Information about the holistic management approach to MPV use can be added
41	102	1st line Page 41. Does not like the use of 'getting' people I think all organisations should talk about 'enabling or encouraging'	Agree	The word 'getting' will be changed

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
41	104	Last sentence is misleading. What we say about little or no equipment might be fine in most urban areas but is not the case in the outer countryside	Agree	This will be changed
53				
0	0	Number of the figures would benefit from bolder colours and being more schematic (every little wiggle in the path is unimportant for some purposes)	Disagree	The colours will be improved. However the lines are taken from Geographical Information Systems. To remove every wiggle in the path would court criticism.
0	0	Fig 2 - make trials much brighter/bolder, add main roads and towns in fainter type to help orientation, Fig 5 - Improve colour contrast, Fig 8 - add towns/main roads	Agree	The maps will be improved for the full ROWIP
0	0	Thinks document should consider some key services which are essential in increasing peoples use of the countryside ie affordable/cheap cycle hire and mobility scooter hire in an increased number of locations	Noted	Noted

55

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	Noticed an increase in number of stiles vanishing in places that are not usable by people in wheelchairs. Is this because it is now policy to remove stiles to prevent a compensation claim should someone fall?	Noted	No it is about removing barriers to enable access to a wider number of people
0	0	Must be remembered that livestock grazing is necessary to Cumbria's landscape and things like gates and stiles are needed in some places.	Noted	Noted
24	0	Given that pages 22 and 27 tell us that only about half of Cumbria's ROWs are classed as "well used", the rest being "little used" or "never used", is this statistic true for the rest of the country if so it makes the Right to Roam Act a complete waste.	Noted	Noted
27	0	Would not like to see whole new tracks created to cycling across otherwise untouched land, this would in time scar the landscape and disturb wildlife	Agree	If unacceptable environmental (or other) damage would occur then an action suggestion was not scored any further
32	0	Lack of public transport a good point and does not just apply to the above group.	Noted	Noted
32	0	Carriage drivers - very small group surely given the cost of equipment needed for this activity. No special provision surely needed.	Disagree	Comments received back on the 'Countryside Access Strategy' included the lack of regard given to carriage driving

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	I would like to see cars prevented from entering more areas.	Noted	Noted
0	0	Fishermen, Huntsmen, Naturalists, Bird Watchers and Lone Walkers seem to be excluded. Can you explain why their needs and preferences have not been specifically considered?	Noted	All these user groups will either be walking, horse-riding, cycling, carriage driving or using a vehicle. Therefore their access needs have been considered.
0	0	It has to be acknowledged that many people visiting the countryside simply drive around. They may stop for a picnic or a cup of tea.	Noted	Noted
0	0	The identification of key audiences is not explained well	Agree	The process of identifying key audiences will be made clearer in the full ROWIP
0	0	People on low incomes are also under-represented in other activities which involves spending money. Why does it matter about women visiting the countryside.	Noted	Noted
0	0	Inner city residents. How many would needed to cure under-representation?	Noted	Noted
0	0	Don't worry about young people they will get older and then come to the countryside	Noted	Noted
0	0	What should anyone be concerned that "BME's" are under-presented?	Noted	Noted

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	What does it mean when you say disabled people are under-represented? - Harding surprising for active pursuits	Noted	Noted
0	28	Aim 2. Only mention found which mentions primary aim of your function ie. Conserving landscape and ecology.	Noted	This is not the primary aim of CCC
57				
0	0	Chapter 5 - Table - Draft RoW improvement plan statement of Action - LDNP - Action 10 - When you say "identify & fill in gaps" do you mean fix bridleways that are obstructed or make new bridleways to link current ones together? How do you plan to identify gaps?	Agree	The process of implementing the actions will be clearer in the full ROWIP
58				
6	0	F&M - The effect of the tourist industry in 2001 was direct not indirect, as stated. The financial and organisational effects on tourism were of a far greater scale in the long run than on agriculture, so how can they be described as 'indirect'?	Noted	The words 'direct' and 'indirect' effects of FMD were taken from a separate report. Much of this text will be revisited anyway.
50	0	et al - Improved public transport integration is clearly needed in many parts of the county, esp. on the West Coast and in Eden	Noted	Noted

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
60				
	0	0 Some stiles are too high for the elderly and small children	Noted	Noted
	51	0 There is no good case for allowing off-road vehicles or motor cycles except on metalled roads. No shortage of these. - If necessary the by-roads should be reclassified as bridleways or footpaths	Noted	Noted
64				
		0 The colours used on many of the maps are often too similar to differentiate between them	Agree	The maps will be improved for the full ROWIP
	0	0 Driving of vehicles on byways and (probably most) UCRs is a legitimate activity and statutory guidance includes this user group as one whose needs and provision to meet is needs have to be assessed.	Disagree	The guidance is quite clear on the scope of ROWIPs in terms of walking, cycling and horse-riding.
	0	0 The section on Opportunities for Carriage Drivers should perhaps mention the absence of RBs.	Agree	The absence of restricted byways (formerly RUPPS) means that all RUPPs were reclassified one by one, as highway authorities were under an obligation to do.
	0	0 Parts (if not all) of "development of the prioritisation method" would be better in an Appendix	Agree	Much text will be placed in appendices

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	The Statement of Actions for LDNPA needs to have more clearly defined targets and resource implications (including info about where resources may be sourced including partners). Ditto for the rest of Cumbria SoA.	Agree	The SOAs will be more developed for the full ROWIP
0	0	The Statement of Actions do not really give any indication of the mechanism that will be used to deliver the proposed actions?	Agree	More information about implementation will be included in the full ROWIP
0	0	Given the growing concern about illegal off-road motoring, and the disturbance this causes to other PRow users as well as damage to the environment and surfaces I was surprised not to find some proposals for actions controlling this illegal activity on PRowS.	Noted	See para 85
0	0	The sections do not flow easily from one to the next, plus it ends rather abruptly.	Agree	Chapter 3 will be moved to the front of the document to improve flow. The analysis section will be strengthened.
0	0	It would be helpful and interesting to have some commentary to explain the big fluctuations in the BVPI data over the last couple of years for some of the managing partners.	Noted	Noted

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	The glossary is unusual in the way it presents information. Also there are various terms which could usefully be added such as: Local RoW (in order to distinguish from public RoW), Project, Latent users, dedicated land	Agree	The suggestions will be added to the glossary
0	0	Footnote 25 is wrong. The NERC Act received Royal Assent on 29 March and the 1st sections came into force on 2-05-06 (and some provisions came into force retrospectively)	Agree	The NERC Act information will be checked
0	0	Remove typos and errors - Remove repetition - Improve consistency - Tighten up wording to remove unnecessary verbiage	Agree	Agree
0	0	Put unnecessary detail into appendices rather than in the main body	Agree	Extra text will be placed in the appendix where possible
0	0	Page number is confusing (eg there are three Page 2s)	Agree	This only applied to the electronic version of the document. It had to be split up into sections to enable easier downloading. The full ROWIP's page numbers will be locked before it is split up, pdf-ed and pasted to the website.
0	0	The description of the DDA 1995 and 2005 is, I think, slightly misleading and may be worth running past a legal expert	Disagree	The DDA text was agreed with user group representatives and taken from a Countryside Agency publication.

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	It would be better to drop RUPPs and substitute Restricted Byways, perhaps with a brief footnote about the change	Agree	The glossary about RUPPS will be updated
0	0	Section on Opportunities for Cycles does not contain anything about utility journeys and contains a lot of material which I think is not directly relevant to the section's title.	Agree	Information about commuter cycling will be added
0	0	Regarding mechanically propelled vehicles, it is worth noting that S20 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 removes invalid carriages from the definition of MPV for the purpose of RTA legislation	Noted	Noted
0	0	As PROWs are also highways, the list of highways that are not UCRs should include PROWs	Noted	We are in touch with you to find out which list you mean
0	0	It would be better if Exec Summary started on more positive note	Agree	Agree
0	0	Given the long length of Cumbria's coastline, the govts commitment in its rural manifesto and the current DEFRA interest in improving access to the coast should coastal access be mentioned more	Agree	Reference will be made of the plans to introduce coastal access

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	Suspect the average LRoW user is not particularly worried about the exact extent of the responsibilities of the organisations responsible for managing the network but is more interested in result	Noted	Noted
0	0	Given the uplift in resources available in Cumbria over recent years) is it sufficiently ambitious to propose a 2% per annum imp in BVPI scores? Also BVPI is an indicator of outputs not outcomes. Would be good to have some targets in the form of higher level of usage, greater enjoyment etc.	Noted	It is important to include indicators which can be measured. Measuring enjoyment is difficult, especially without any baseline figures. Consideration will be given to the most practical indicators to include
0	0	Is it necessary to include so much information to support the contention that tourism is vital to the Cumbria economy and FMD was a major setback?	Agree	The 'integrating access' section will be re-written
0	53	Is more of a Cumbria/NPA view. If this is the line being taken in the ROWIP, I think it needs a fuller justification	Noted	Noted
0	95	Section 3 -It would be better to have dates and references for the plans and strategies listed	Agree	The plans listed will have dates and references together with where they can be found.
0	99	Bullets should become the title for the subsequent sections and be listed in same order	Agree	The 'integrating access' section will be re-written

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	Could reflective hands be made available at cost to cyclists for winter use?	Noted	Noted
7	0	Roads used as public paths - there are unadopted roads along which there is a public footpath registered eg. Old College Lane/St Marys Walk, Windermere and New Road, Portinscale. Old College Lane is an approach to several old peoples' homes and is in need of adoption or at least the path should be sited within the road.	Noted	Noted
7	0 & 8.	Suggests a cross-ref about footpaths to management paras on page 19.	Agree	Parts of the glossary can be cross-referenced to areas of text.
19	39	Management - Public should be told who to report to or complain about defects etc in using RoWs. DCs should be aware of Environmental Protect Act 1990 Sec 86 & 89 and ensure public footpaths are kept clear and clean. Should regular inspections and cleansing of urban footpaths in Windermere/Bowness.	Agree	The highways hotline (telephone and generic inbox) can be mentioned

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	Was it unavoidable that separate statements of action were arrived at by the LDNP and CCC? The LDNP statement omits reference to land owners/managers as a category or beneficiaries and some of the policy links in their table appear somewhat 'contrived'	Noted	We will merge the statements of action and rename the policy links column
0	0	Overall presentation, layout and format - good	Noted	Noted
5	0	Line 2. Spelling mistake "health" instead of "heath"	Agree	word will be changed
6	2	Why quality health conditions - 'long term' and elsewhere	Noted	The mention of 'long term health condition' under the DDA section in the glossary is taken from the DDA itself.
22	0	Last para. 'around 10% never used' - perhaps safer to say 'rarely used'	Agree	Greater clarity will be added to the Cumbria Lost Ways condition data section
23	49	Last para. 'Convolutd language ' has informed the channelling'	Agree	The jargon in para 49 will be re-written
27	0	No mention of the cycle facilities provided already at Whinlatter (Forestry Commission)	Agree	Agree - The Whinlatter facilities will be mentioned if possible.

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
129	0	Table 5 - KA6, 7. Feels that a need for both serious and casual walkers in "public transport improvements" as the decision or desire to do a linear walk may well depend on the availability and/or frequency of local transport. This is not reflected in the ROWIP for LDNP (para 151)	Agree	But public transport improvements are beyond the scope of a ROWIP
110				
	0	SOA's: filling gaps in the network should be a priority (examples given)	Noted	The scoring system includes the concept of 'filling gaps' in the prioritisation methodology
	0	SOA's cycling seem recreation-orientated. Utility routes also important. Those that serve both needs would be highest priority.	Noted	Utility routes are included within the Local Transport Plan. Further links will be made with this before publication of the full ROWIP
	0	Costs would have been helpful	Noted	The full ROWIP will include costings
	0	OS maps should also show access points	Agree	OS maps have been sent the open access measures information, in addition our website will shortly have some more local, site based information to download about open access areas / access points.

112

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	Disappointed in the lack of any consideration of the potential environmental impacts of any of the proposals and actions. Effects on wildlife and habitats ought to be a prime consideration of any plan.	Noted	The potential impacts are a key part in the scoring system. Unacceptable environmental damage means that a project idea is progressed no further. This will be made clearer
117				
0	0	No acknowledgement that cyclists have any needs of rights-of-way beyond recreation. The needs of recreational cyclists and those using cycles for transport, such as commuting, going to shops etc are different and the latter are ignored.	Agree	Further weight will be given to commuter cycling
0	0	Many new cycle paths/lanes are ignored by non-recreational cyclists due to poor appreciation of their needs during design and routing. In most cases design seems to be based on motor vehicle users desire to keep them well out of the way rather than increase safety for cyclists or promote alternatives to car use.	Noted	Noted
0	0	There is a need for cycle lanes to go where people want to go.	Noted	Noted

123

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0		The number of available routes for the disabled has dropped considerably, most through lack of maintenance.	Noted	Noted
0	0	Draft CROWIP was duly placed on CCC in 2000, over 6 years in planning and not completing the surveying of over 50% of the ROW	Noted	Noted
0	0	The "Miles without Stiles" the flagship for the disabled has yet to achieve any great improvement in the number of kms that are usable in the Lake District.	Noted	Noted
0	0	Throughout Cumbria 51% of the PROWs have yet to be surveyed, these PROWs may be in a much worse condition than you assume, as your 49% sample surveyed will have been the most accessible for the volunteers to carry out.	Agree	The 49% surveyed depended on the availability of volunteers per parish, rather than the accessibility of the routes. This will be added.
0	0	When you look at the total 2271.65km that are unusable it is a poor reflection on the CCC Management that leaves over 35% of this precious asset to fall into such disrepair, thereby ignoring your statutory duty?	Noted	Noted

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
0	0	Figures in the Improvement Plan making interesting reading as the LDNPA are always claiming there is nothing wrong with the PROW network.	Noted	Noted
0	0	The most disadvantaged group in the county is disabled people, yet the commitment to maintain or improve the PROW network throughout the county leaves a great deal to be desired	Noted	Noted
0	0	No doubt after the CROWIP has been accepted we will get the old excuse for doing nothing - This is "CCC & LDNPA do not have a statutory duty to improve the PROW".	Noted	Noted
0	0	A good doc, yet a lack of total commitment to improve the PROW has been addressed. There is no timescales to carry out any of these imps, the costings for these imps has not been carried, the sources of funding have not been quoted in the plan, no duties or responsibilities have been addressed.	Noted	Timescales / costings etc will be included for the full ROWIP.
0	0	Plan should deal with statutory duties to the maintenance and removal of obstructions - this is very much neglected in the PROW network throughout Cumbria.	Disagree	Disagree - it has been agreed that statutory duties are not to be included in the ROWIP

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
125				
0	0	OS license info on maps	Agree	OS license info on maps will be added
0	0	Add more about demo projects	Agree	If demo projects are at a reporting stage, this will be included
0	0	Diversity Review info could be included	Agree	The section about the diversity review and 'outdoors for all' will be updated
0	0	Packhorse trails / Eden valley loops to be added to statement of action	Agree	Packhorse trails and Eden Valley Loops will be added to statement of action
133				
0	0	Problem in understanding some of the maps.	Agree	The quality of the maps will be improved for the full ROWIP although they are not intended to be a guide of where to go.
0	73 & 75	Does removing all the barriers for those with very reduced mobility risk removing any challenge that develops the young and more able, and tempt some too far, beyond their countryside understanding or capabilities.	Noted	Noted
0	73 83 & 85.	How does one allow tramper access and legitimate farm/work access whilst deterring the 'off road recreation vehicle' from all or any of these routes?	Noted	Access conflict management is a big issue in the profession

Page no.	Para no.	Comments or summary	Response	Recommended action
70	0	<p>PROW 11% not used. Could these paths not be kept on historical papers only and not marked on the ground. Some of ours were in effect a private agreement between farms and postmen before the latter got bikes. Better use could then be made of paths which are used ie funding can go to them instead of maintaining unless signs/stiles etc.</p>	Noted	Noted