

Individual Decision



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

The attached report will be taken as
Individual Portfolio Member Decision on:

Wednesday, 15th April, 2020

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID3873	Case Programmes for Public Rights of Way Work for 2020/21	Councillor Richard Somner	3 - 44



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Report title : Public Rights of Way Case Programmes

Committee considering report: Individual Executive Member Decision.

Date ID to be signed: 15th April 2020.

Portfolio Member: Richard Somner

Forward Plan Ref: ID3873

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To report progress on the Public Rights of Way (PROW) Case Programmes for 2019/20 and to recommend Case Programmes for 2020/21.

2. Recommendation

2.1 To note progress in dealing with the cases assigned for 2019/20. To agree recommended cases for 2020/21.

3. Implications

3.1 **Financial:** none.

3.2 **Policy:** the PROW case programmes contribute to a number of objectives within the Council Strategy, particularly the economy, wellbeing, transport infrastructure, and environmental sustainability.

3.3 **Personnel:** none.

3.4 **Legal:** none.

3.5 **Risk Management:** none.

3.6 **Property:** none.

3.7 **Other:** none.

4. Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council: Lynne Doherty

Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman: Alan Law

Ward Members: all members are affected.

Opposition Spokesperson: Lee Dillon

Local Stakeholders: Mid and West Berkshire Local Access Forum.

Officers Consulted: Paul Hendry, Sallie Jennings, Stuart Higgins, Matthew Walters, Garry Kimber, Ken Bowman, Sharon Armour.

Trade Union: N/A.

5. Other options considered

5.1 Many public rights of way functions are statutory and so might potentially be subject to judicial review if not carried out. Some of the proposed Rights of Way Improvement and Path Orders work is discretionary.

6. Introduction/Background

6.1 The Council possesses statutory duties to maintain the public rights of way network; to keep it open for public use; and to record it and then to keep the records under continuous review (the 'Definitive Map' process). These duties have been translated into four public rights of way Case Programmes, concerned with 'Maintenance and Improvement', 'Enforcement', 'Path Orders', and the 'Rights of Way Improvement Plan'.

6.2 **The Maintenance and Improvement Case Programme** is concerned with ensuring that the Council complies with its statutory duty to keep the standard of public rights of way suitable for the public use which is made of them.

6.3 **The Enforcement Case Programme** is concerned with ensuring that the Council complies with its statutory duty to ensure that the network remains free from obstruction and interference.

6.4 **The Path Order Case Programme** comprises two processes: 1. the investigation of evidence to support the existence of a public right of way which has not yet been recorded on the Definitive Map (a 'claim'); 2. the legal diversion, extinguishment or creation of a right of way. Both processes are usually carried out on receipt of an application from the public. The Council is under a statutory duty to investigate claims, but only a discretionary power to divert, extinguish or create rights of way.

6.5 The Council has a statutory duty to prepare a **Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP)**, which is the means by which the Council identifies the changes to be made to its rights of way networks in respect of management and improvement, so that it can improve provision for walkers, cyclists, equestrians and people with restricted mobility. Implementation of the ROWIP is not a duty, and it is therefore good practice to formulate an appropriate Case Programme so that progress can be made within available resources.

6.6 A ROWIP should be reviewed every ten years. The 2010 WBC ROWIP is therefore due for review in 2020.

7. **Supporting Information** - details of the four existing Case Programmes

7.1 **Maintenance Case Programme.** This is drawn up each year from requests from the public, plus surveys, and includes strategic improvements which enhance the network in accordance with the objectives of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan, and other relevant council strategies. It also contains lists of routine tasks required each year.

7.2 There are many outstanding requests and needs for maintenance and improvements to the network, but limited resources necessitate a method of prioritisation. As a general approach, relative priorities for attention are determined through a matrix, attached as Appendix A, through which benefits to the public and value for money are assessed. The recommended priorities for the coming year are listed in the Maintenance and Improvement Priority Case Programme attached at Appendix B, which also records progress from the previous Case Programme. It also lists records of routine annual work such as signposting, vegetation clearance, volunteer tasks, stiles/gates and minor drainage. A working version is updated continually as new requests and needs come to light.

7.3 The nature of the unsealed PROW surfaces, and the UK weather, is such that new priorities can emerge during the year. This will mean that other lower priority projects may not be completed, and usually these will be carried forward to the following Case Programme.

7.4 Funding comes via the annual revenue rights of way works budget, and the capital programme (including S.106/CIL). There are plans to seek increased external funds where appropriate. Most surface works projects are carried out by contractors, and a large amount of other maintenance work is carried out by the team of Rights of Way Rangers, e.g. vegetation clearances, routine drainage maintenance, and winter signposting. Volunteer groups also carry out surveys and simple tasks to keep the network open and easily useable.

7.5 Enforcement Case Programme. The Council possesses extensive legal powers to assist it to carry out enforcement work if necessary. This Case Programme is compiled from complaints from the public, surveys, and problems noted by officers. We receive frequent reports of enforcement issues, and these are assigned a priority, then logged on the Countryside Access Management System (CAMS). CAMS is then used to produce reports of priority work, based on the matrix and Appendix A.

7.6 The priorities in CAMS are frequently reviewed. A major review is taking place at the time of writing of this report, with the aim that CAMS can be used more often to produce some figures of cases received versus cases resolved. Some categories of enforcement work can be grouped together in projects so as to utilise economies of scale. An example of an annually-active project is ploughing and cropping.

7.7 The proposed Case Programme is shown at Appendix C2, with comments on progress made in the last year.

7.8 Path Order Case Programme. The Path Order Case Programme is determined each year with close reference to the prioritisation procedure which has been agreed between Countryside and Environment and Legal Services (see background papers). 'Claims' are generally dealt with in chronological order of receipt. For the diversion, extinguishment or creation of public rights of way, the application will only be accepted if the relevant legal criteria are met, and will generally need to demonstrate public benefit, or benefit to the overall management of PROW.

7.9 Appendix D1 lists the path order cases which have been worked on in 2019/20. Some have been completed, and some must be carried forward due to delays by third parties. Appendix D3 sets out the new proposed Case Programme. Completion is regarded as reaching the WBC decision stage (a public inquiry or written representations might follow, which are outside our control). Appendix D2 lists the remaining path order cases yet to be dealt with. If a new case is presented in a current year which meets the Statement of Prioritisation for Claims and Path Orders, then officers have agreed to make a request to the Portfolio, and relevant ward members, for permission for it to replace an agreed lower-priority case in the current Case Programme. In this process, consideration ought to be given to any potential legal challenges.

7.10 For 'claims', the Council has 12 months, from the date that the landowner was notified of the possibility that a right of way exists, to decide whether the evidence is sufficient for a Definitive Map Modification Order to be made. This timescale allows for the due legal processes to be followed. There is a right of appeal to the Planning Inspectorate if the Council either declines to make an Order or if there is a delay of more than one year in reaching a decision. A public inquiry procedure will be required if an Order is made and objections received.

7.11 For diversions, extinguishments and creations, there is no right of appeal to the Planning Inspectorate, but a public inquiry procedure will be required if an Order is made and objections received.

7.12 In addition to the cases, following the completed project to re-digitise the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way at a scale of 1:1250, the Definitive Map is presently being republished at this new, much clearer, and more accurate, scale.

7.13 In 2026, any right of way or highway which was in existence in 1949 and which has never been formally recognised will be automatically extinguished. Parish Councils and

interested groups have been contacted to explain this legislation, and were asked to make known to us any suspected public rights of way which are useful to the public but under threat of extinguishment under this legislation. WBC will then have a duty to examine the evidence for any such suspected routes and to make or reject an Order.

7.14 Rights of Way Improvement Plan Case Programme (ROWIP). The 2010 ROWIP contains 63 strategic objectives, concerned with improving access provision for users and also improving the efficiency of service delivery. Many of these objectives are ongoing, and are incorporated into the normal day-to-day work of the team. Some require special effort in order to progress, and to this end the objectives are reviewed each year and the proposed manageable number are identified by a ** in the table of all 63 objectives (Appendix E).

7.15 The table at Appendix E sets out the current progress on all the objectives.

7.16 The ROWIP is due for review in 2020, and consultation with the Mid and West Berkshire Local Access Forum on the best way to approach this has begun. The use of a consultant is being explored.

7.17 General note. The year 2019/20 has been difficult in terms of PROW staff resources. One member of staff in the small team has been absent on long term sick leave, and there has also been a vacancy. The situation is much improved but it has had an impact on some achievements in 2019/20.

8. Options for Consideration

8.1 Comments on any aspects of the proposed case programmes are sought.

9. Proposals

9.1 That the proposed 2020/21 PROW Case Programmes are approved, subject to any approved modifications.

10. Conclusion

10.1 Progress on the 2019/20 Rights of Way Case Programmes has been set out in this report, together with the recommended Case Programmes for 2020/21.

Background Papers:

Public Rights of Way Case Programmes.
Report to Management Board - 11th September 2008.
Statement of Prioritisation for Claims and Path Orders.
Rights of Way improvement Plan 2010 - 2020.

NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Operations Board.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: ☐ No: ☐

If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box by double-clicking on the box and selecting 'Checked':

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval

☐

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only	<input type="checkbox"/>

Wards affected:

*(add text)

Please put a cross in the appropriate box(es) by double-clicking on the box and selecting 'Checked':

Strategic Priorities Supported:

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority(ies):

- ☐ **PC1: Ensure our vulnerable children and adults achieve better outcomes**
- ☐ **PC2: Support everyone to reach their full potential**
- ☒ **OFB1: Support businesses to start, develop and thrive in West Berkshire**
- ☒ **GP1: Develop local infrastructure to support and grow the local economy**
- ☒ **GP2: Maintain a green district**
- ☒ **SIT1: Ensure sustainable services through innovation and partnerships**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Strategy priorities by *(add text)

Officer details:

Name: *

Job Title: *

Tel No: *

E-mail Address: *

11. Executive Summary

The Council possesses statutory duties to maintain the public rights of way network; keep it open for public use; to record it and then to keep the records under continuous review (the 'Definitive Map' process). These duties have been translated into four public rights of way Case Programmes, concerned with 'Maintenance and Improvement', 'Enforcement', 'Path Orders', and the 'Rights of Way Improvement Plan'. The report sets out details of progress on the previously-approved 2019/20 Case Programmes, and asks for comments on and approval of the proposed 2020/21 Case Programmes.

12. Conclusion

12.1 Progress on the 2019/20 Rights of Way Case Programmes has been set out in this report together with the recommended Case Programmes for 2020/21.

13. Appendices

- 13.1 Appendix A – Priority Matrix.
- 13.2 Appendix B – Maintenance and Improvement Case Programme.
- 13.3 Appendix C – Enforcement Case Programme.
- 13.4 Appendix D1 – Path Order Case Programme progress 2019/20.
- 13.5 Appendix D2 – Remaining Path Order case list 2020 +.
- 13.6 Appendix D3 – Proposed Path Order Case Programme 2020/21.
- 13.7 Appendix E – Rights of Way Improvement Plan Case Programme.
- 13.8 Appendix F - Data Protection Impact Assessment.
- 13.9 Appendix G - Equalities Impact Assessment.

Corporate Board's recommendation (if applicable):

*(add text)

To be completed after the Corporate Board meeting.

Appendix A - PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY MAINTENANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

**Add your
ratings for
each
parameter in
this column**

PROW Priority Matrix Calculator Spreadsheets

	Factor	Circumstances which would produce a score of 0	Circumstances which would produce a score of 5	Score for your path	Multiplier
1	Danger level along used route	No danger	Severe danger on a well-used path		4
2	Usage level	Not used	Very well used		3
3	Degree of obstruction of Definitive line	No obstruction	Completely obstructed		3
4	Benefit to general public once resolved	No benefit	Great benefit		2
5	Cost/time effectiveness in resolving	Major works on little-used path / poor evidence for enforcement action	Minor works on little-used path/ good evidence for enforcement action		1
6	Level of complaint	Minor problem noted by staff member or a survey / very low number of complaints	Many complaints received and/or representation from Parish Council		1
7	Potential for deterioration	Unlikely to deteriorate	Rapid deterioration could be stopped by prompt action		1
Score of 45 or over: high priority / 44 or less: low priority				Total with Multiplier	

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B

MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT CASE PROGRAMME

Proposed Case Programme 2020/21

*Items added since 2019 ID report.

ITEMS COMPLETED 2019/20

Beenham Byway 1 – Clay Lane - possibly finish tarmac.

Beenham Byway 1 – S end at A4 – tarmac apron repair.

***Beenham Bridleway 17** - repair of worst potholes.

***Brimpton Byway 11 – Brimpton Common** – supply of aggregate for residents.

***Bucklebury Byway 4 – Bucklebury Alley extension** – road surface severe slope. Done by Highways.

***Bucklebury Byway 42** – potholes – regulate and add aggregate.

***Chaddleworth Footpath 24/3** – scattered potholes near road.

Chieveley Byway 7 – Green Lane – access to cottages, review surface where potholed tarmac. Also at track junction, water collects in huge pool.

Chieveley Byway 29 – Curridge Green – potholes - requires site visit to determine priority.

Chieveley Byway 42 – Sandy Lane – potholes.

Chieveley Byway 49 – Marsh Lane – potholes.

***Cold Ash Byway 5 – Drove Lane west** – amended signage to deter Sat. Nav. vehicles.

***Cold Ash Byway 5** – delivery of aggregate bags to eastern end, for residents to lay.

***Hermitage Byway 23 – Doctors Lane** – surface repairs including tarmac patching.

***Inkpen Byway 50** – access to Crown and Garter PH – potholes.

Newbury Footpath 22 – SSSI and EA (check) consent needed. Inform Hitachi of date of commencement.

Lambourn Byway 38/1 – Long Hedge – potholes.

Padworth Footpath 1/3 – access to Padworth Mill - request for a ramp where there is a concrete step.

***Pangbourne Footpath 16/1 – The Moors** – northern end access to Co-Op car park –potholes in tarmac - this is a Private Street but we agreed to fill holes in view of heavy use.

***Stratfield Mortimer Byway 7 – Church Lane** – potholes in aggregate.

***Streatley Byway 9** – blocked drainage causing puddling.

***Streatley Byway 12A/1** –pothole repair to take place as a minimum. Heavy use. Consider better surface post April 2020.

ITEMS TO BE CARRIED FORWARD TO 2020/21

Aldermaston Footpath 12 – Padworth Mill – private bridges have small holes.

Beedon Byway 22 – N end – reports of 4 wheel drive ruts – assess priority.

***Beenham Footpath 4/1** – collapsing bagwork retainers.

Boxford Byway 2 – Penclose Wood area - reports of 4 wheel drive ruts again – assess priority.

Chieveley Bridleway 5A/1 – adjacent to M4 - reports of large puddle 30m long.

Chieveley Byway 30 – potholes – requires site visit to determine priority.

Chieveley Byway 49 – work needed on alternative route around ex-Grundon quarry (Grundon to fund) if byway is diverted onto this route. With Grundon.

East Ilsley Byway 12 – off Old Street - ‘vehicle rutting with non-parallel ruts which make it unsafe for the ridden and driven horse’. Check – and Byway 1?).

***Inkpen Restricted Byway 49 – Bitham Lane** – sump escapes, rubbish removal, increase width at southern end.

Inkpen Byway 51 – Haycroft Lane – additional works.

Lambourn Restricted Byway 45a – contribute towards improvements for specialist equestrian use.

Lambourn Byway 47/3 – deep ruts & drainage problem on natural surface. Grips required. Review priority on site.

Lambourn Byway 48/2 – chewed up natural surface in woods – deep muddy saturated sections. Level the ruts. Enforce a heavy cut-back of vegetation by the landowner. Would benefit from grips through the wood.

Purley Footpath 4/2 – path down to lock, dip in field – request for all-access surface. Dip is prone to flooding.

Purley Footpath 8/2,8/3 - uneven surface needs ramp for disabled use. EA approval needed?

Shaw Bridleway 3/1 – north of junction with Red Lane – aggregate through slurry area (also replace gate). Add a review of whole path to improve gates etc. to create an attractive accessible route out of Newbury.

Speen Byway 22 – across Rack Marsh SSSI – request for motorcycle and bicycle access.

Speen Byway 29/1 – Bagnor - residents laid pea shingle, letter needed to residents informing them of appropriate surfaces in future.

Snelsmore Common bridleway link – works to finish (waymarking, road crossing). Fencing consent needed.

Stratfield Mortimer Fairground footpaths – muddy areas by gates. Parish Council doing.

Streatley Footpath 21 – off Thames Path. Chase Volker or Highways engineers about how to do a feasibility study.

Sulhamstead Bridleway 4 – potholed tarmac – get quotation for tarmac and let residents know. Roughened tarmac needed for horses. Positive drainage needed in the dip, gully or soakaway onto adjacent land (property no.4 Oakley Drive ?) - on hold pending developer offer to do works.

Thatcham Footpath 10 - off Tull Way – raise path to avoid flooding. Possible developer assistance? See emails and seek advice from Stuart Clark.

The Ridgeway National Trail – the annual survey and works to keep the Trail up to the Surface Standard as agreed with Natural England. Consider chalk grassland study going on, contact them about ecological considerations generally (esp. small blue butterfly protection west of Bury Down). Also Bury Down - good for bird life. Check archaeology.

Tilehurst Footpath 13/2 – uneven and extremely boggy in winter – ‘I would not be able to walk along the path with a pushchair or wheelchair and there are many trip hazards’.

Theale Footpath 7 - near kissing gate – deteriorating. Revisit to see if work required yet.

Tilehurst Footpath 7 – off Little Heath Road – extremely muddy and waterlogged.

Winterbourne Restricted Byway 10/1 across Snelsmore Common. Muddy and in a gully, a request from BBOWT to improve for all users.

NEW FOR 2020/21 ONWARDS

Basildon Footpath 11 – badger holes.

Chieveley Footpath 1/2 - school route – improve degrading asphalt, general renovation.

Chieveley Footpath 37 - Old Lamb PH ‘layby’ area at Curridge – no parking – consultation / paint

Chieveley Byway 29 – Curridge Green – potholes - requires a longer-term affordable solution.

Chieveley Byway 49 – large puddle – requires raising and grips into old quarry.

Cold Ash Footpath 15 - ‘Siskin House’ – flooding of adjacent properties – work to prevent, working in liaison with Highways, and Planning.

Cold Ash Footpath 16 – report of poplar tree roots causing a trip hazard at western end.

East Garston Restricted Byway 1/7 – see ELM 174022 – improvements required to allow for local carriage drivers, plus review of the Kent Carriage Gap.

Hermitage Byway 23 – Doctors Lane – requests for tarmac, and this may be cost effective in the long term. Take care over flooding of properties at lower level.

Holybrook Footpath 4/1 – access to Linear Park – muddy. An old request from Caroline Booth. Definitive line issue.

Inkpen Byway 50 – beyond the Crown and Garter entrance – is this needed for access to properties or farms ?

Inkpen Byway 48 – Sands Drove – request for improvement – used by farmer in poor weather, surface has suffered.

Streatley Byway 12A/1 – Church Lane - consider better surface post April 2020. Approach Thames Water for a contribution.

Tilehurst Footpath 7 – eastern end very muddy, confined by fences. Raise surface with aggregate, camber.

Tilehurst Footpath 13/1 – badly gullied, improve whole surface western end.

Tilehurst Footpath 19/1 – school and commuter route – requested surface improvement.

ANNUALLY RECURRING ITEMS

Aldworth Byway 9 / Ridgeway link to Warren Farm access – monitor pro-actively once every 3 months, keep photos and dates of inspection. Inform Warren Farm residents of dates of inspection and results. Also we have agreed to provide aggregate for Warren Farm residents to use to maintain the access ROWs and for 'reasonable use' for driveway maintenance. More work needed Spring 2020- extra aggregate to shape flat sections to drain laterally.

Badgers - damage or hazards due to setts – as they arise. Liaison with Natural England required.

Beenham Bridleway 17 – Grange Lane – regular letter to all occupiers informing them of maintenance obligations. Private Street ?

Bucklebury / other - summer levelling etc works in conjunction with seasonal TRO. Ongoing assessments as part of seasonal TRO project.

LOWER PRIORITY – TO REVIEW

Aldworth Byway 11/2 – deep surface gullying.

Enborne Byway 12A – major drainage and surface works needed.

Farnborough Restricted Byway 15/3 – repair of soft spots as part of vehicle management work.

Hungerford Footpath 41/3 – very muddy in low area.

Pangbourne Footpath 17/1

- muddy, a popular path by river.

Wokefield Byway 13 – left overgrown due to ruts.

OTHER

Install concrete aprons around Kent Carriage Gaps. *Decided to clear vegetation and monitor.*

Review use of Kent Carriage Gaps – consult Local Access Forum and Carriage Drivers, maybe via LAF.

Concerns that they do not allow for easy access by carriages.

Sustainable practices - find out about appropriate materials to use in woodland environments, use appropriate materials for all environments. Consider ecological surveys where appropriate.

Signs needed ? - 'uneven surface' for residential accesses – see quote information 14/1/14.

To consider for future – follow up repairs with routine vegetation clearance.

Notes

Signs – Volker can have signs made, they require a pdf or a description of size, colour, type colour and type face. Check with signs manual and Traffic Management first. Volker can get emergency signs made up in half an hour, they are always on big boards.

ANNUALLY RECURRING ELEMENTS OF CASE PROGRAMME

FUNDING

Check with Gabrielle Esplin for CIL money for PROW.

LIGHTING COLUMNS ON PROW – MAINTENANCE REQUIRED

Bridleway 11 Tilehurst – Spring Lane.

PROW RANGERS - ONGOING ANNUAL WORKS

Winter signposting project.
Summer vegetation clearances and routine clearance schedule.
Winter clearances.
Volunteer group site preparations.
Step construction and maintenance and annual survey.
Tree clearances.
Gate deliveries.
Stile and gate maintenance.

PROW RANGERS – SEASONAL BOLLARD REMOVAL / REPLACEMENT FOR TROs

Beedon Byway 22 – south of Hailey Lane – seasonal TRO required central post to be removed end May and replaced end September.

Hermitage Restricted Byway 1 - Fence Lane – lock and unlock gate for seasonal TRO.

PROW RANGERS - ROUTINE CARRIAGE GAP MAINTENANCE

Vegetation clearance around bollards following installation of anti-vehicle Carriage Gaps on various Restricted Byways and other paths: Also inspections to check condition of structures and warning signs. Photos need to be taken of the cleared vegetation and signs.

Aldermaston	Bridleway 4/1 west end near Raghill road.
Aldworth	Byways 9, 10/5, 10/6 and Streatley Byway 20/1 .
Ashampstead	Restricted Byway 33/1 – western end at B4009 – CARE FAST ROAD .
Basildon	Byway 13A/1 Adders Lane west of junction with Yattendon Rd.
Beedon	Byway 22 South of Hailey Lane – north and south ends.
Brightwalton	Restricted Byway 9RB/1 – north of junction with Coombe Hill Rd to Farnborough House .
Catmore	Restricted Byway 9/2 north of Catmore Road junction.
Chaddleworth	Bridleway 6/1 near junction with A338 – CARE FAST ROAD .
Chaddleworth	Restricted Byway 7/1 & 7/2 at Woolley Down Cottages and Parish Boundary .
Chieveley	Restricted Byway 13/1 just west of junction with Footpath 40 near Ash Row .
Chieveley	Restricted Byway 18/1 at Oxford Rd and Restricted Byway 18/3 at arable field entrances 448585 175850 and Restricted Byway 18/6 at Bradley Court Cottages .
East Garston	Restricted Byway 1/7 two sets on Chalk Lane near Jimmies Farm .
East Garston	Restricted Byway 5/1 & 5/3 one east of Grange Farm , one on Washmore Hill .
East Ilsley	Restricted Byway 34/1 just east of junction with Ashridge Farm track.
Farnborough	Byway 10/1 north end where Byway 10/1 finishes at a dead end with Restricted Byway 15 at Whiteshute Row wood.
Farnborough	Restricted Byway 15/2 west end near junction with Footpath 2/1 by water tower and 15/3 just east of junction with Bridleway 18 .
Hampstead Norreys	Restricted Byway 29/1 at south end junction with C road from Four Elms to Worlds End.
Hermitage	Footpath 16/1 south end with Marlston Road .
Lambourn	Bridleway 49/1 two locations south of Cleeve Wood – junction with Byway 47 and Footpath 11 .
Lambourn	Bridleway 58/1 at junction with private drive to Park Farm – CLIENT OF CONCERN land.

Lambourn	Bridleway 69/3 southern end of Long Ground Border, south of Inholmes .
West Ilsley	Restricted Byway 2/1 south of junction with Copperage Road .
Winterbourne	Bridleway 14/4 Pebble Lane; one south of junction with Footpath 13/3 and Bridleway 14/4 one north of junction with Footpath 16/2 .
Winterbourne	Bridleway 6/1 near junction with B4494 Wantage Road .

DRAINAGE GRIPS

PROW RANGERS - GRIPS TO KEEP CLEAR & VISIBLE.

Chieveley Byway 42 - Sandy Lane Curridge.
Chieveley Byway 26 - Doctors Lane Hermitage.
Aldworth Byway 9 - in low areas to the east.
Inkpen Byway 49/4 - Bitham Lane. One only at lower end.
 The Ridgeway throughout (included in the annual maintenance programme).
Lambourn Byway 55/4 - Farncombe Farm.

PROW RANGERS – GRIPS TO BE CUT & KEPT CLEAR & VISIBLE.

Lambourn Byway 42/2 - Eastbury Grange.
Lambourn Byway 57/2.
Lambourn Byway 63/1 - Seven Barrows.
Lambourn Byway 47/3.
Thatcham Bridleway 25/1 - Highfield Farm.
Bucklebury Byway 11/2.

PROW RANGERS - other grips

Lambourn Byway 38/2.
Welford Footpath 17/1, by the waymarker on the bend.
Lambourn Byway 48/2.
Lambourn Byway 47/3.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix C

PROW Enforcement Case Programme 2020/21

Project	Summary of Issue	Actions required 2020/21	Progress 2019/20
General Obstructions Various locations throughout District.	Illegal impediments to public use.	Site visit if deemed a sufficient priority. Prioritise.	Ongoing area of work, new cases coming in all the time.
Illegal vehicles – non motor routes Various Bridleways and & Restricted Byways especially in downland areas.	Safety hazard, surface damage.	Ongoing area of work in Bucklebury Common, Farnborough and East Garston areas. Kent Carriage Gaps installed during winter months on routes identified. Action days with Police to be organised periodically during autumn and winter months.	Carriage gaps installed, signage installed, camera traps installed at various sites. Liaison with Police. Ongoing as more sites are identified.
Illegal vehicles - Byways	Safety concerns and surface damage resulting from irresponsible driving.	Some WBC actions might arise from Police requests for new structures or closures. Police liaison desirable.	Trial closure of selected Byways in Bucklebury and Lambourn over Winter 2017 to protect surface. Liaison with Police. This evolved in late 2019 into the Bucklebury Common Vehicular Use Action Plan - a strategy to protect PROWs on Bucklebury Common from excessive damage by vehicles. The general approach could be used elsewhere and involves seasonal vehicle restrictions; signage; barriers; publicity; surface works; policing, and monitoring by the community.
Stiles and gates project	Increase accessibility of the network for less agile or disabled users.	Continue to replace stiles or other restrictive structures with either gaps or more easily accessible gates. Aim for at least one every four weeks. Work mainly carried out by the Ramblers' Work Party volunteer group.	Ongoing area of work replacing stiles with more user-friendly structures, especially on well-used routes. One gate installed per month by the Ramblers' Work Party / gate kits supplied to landowners. Very successful. Work continues as in previous years.
Cropping	A seasonal network problem affecting c.300 paths.	Spring letter/email to selected landowners. Enforcement of complaint if required.	Ongoing area of work. Seasonal.

Appendix C PROW Enforcement Case Programme 2020/21

Project	Summary of Issue	Actions required 2020/21	Progress 2019/20
Ploughing	A seasonal network problem affecting c.300 paths.	Autumn letter/email to selected landowners. Enforcement of complaint if required.	Ongoing area of work. Seasonal.
Visual tree inspection project	Safety of users, particularly on popular routes and routes to school.	The high-priority tree-lined routes to be identified and surveyed. Works needed and/ or contact landowners.	The high-priority tree-lined routes have been identified and surveyed. 10 Top Tier Urban routes & 9 Rural Service Centre school routes surveyed. School Route inspections complete. WBC works largely completed. Some landowner enforcement required..
Overhanging vegetation	Boundary vegetation can obstruct PROWs, but it is the responsibility of the landowner.	Landowners/ farmers contacted in Autumn round- robin letter, and householders contacted following inspection of problem.	Ongoing area of work, best resolved over Autumn & Winter.
Forestry Works	Traffic management often lacking/ poor. Failure to liaise with WBC. Surface damage.	Landowners/ Forester to be contacted as necessary.	Advice from Streetworks given. Industry guidance collated.
Streetworks Failures	Surface damage, WBC liability and maintenance risk	Contact utilities, issue failure Notices in conjunction with Streetworks Team. PROWs being added to Streetworks Gazetteer.	Subcontractors contacted on site. PROWs being added to Streetworks Gazetteer.
Equestrian gates	Implement measures to ensure that all gates on equestrian routes are easily-openable from horseback, using best practice gate and latch designs and gate configurations. Mounting blocks to be installed where dismounting cannot be avoided.	To improve 10 to 12 equestrian gates per year would be achievable given resources. Many are wide vehicle access gates with poor accessibility/ latches.	The British Horse Society has been consulted and has reported on the results of a survey of visiting 62 gates known to be a problem. PROW Rangers have advised on alterations to latches and carried out minor improvements where possible. The British Horse Society has offered a grant of £1000.

West Berkshire Council Public Rights of Way Legal Order Cases
Priority work list, April 2019- April 2020

Case Type*	Title	Parish	Ward	Description
DMMO & PPO	Initial assessments of new queries and proposals as they come in	All	All	Provisions from the Deregulation Act 2015 are due to come into effect, that will put a statutory requirement for initial assessment decisions on Public Path Orders (PPOs) and Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs) applications within 4, and 3, months, respectively. At present, many proposals and queries come in each year. These are assessed straight away, and preliminary investigations are carried out. At present the Council has a discretion to process Path Orders, although it has an obligation to determine all duly mdae DMMO applications. Accepted cases that are then prioritized make it onto the annual caselist. Refused cases do not appear on any caselist, but the investigation and informal assessment still take time and resource.
PPO	Investigate a diversion of the long-obstructed public bridleway running through Broadview Farm	Bucklebury & Cold Ash parishes	Bucklebury Ward, and Chieveley & Cold Ash Ward	See if the obstructed public bridleway through Broad View Farm can be diverted onto a suitable new route (partly in Bucklebury and partly in Cold Ash parishes/wards). Parish meeting held in autumn 2019. No application has been submitted to date and so no formal decision can be made and the matter cannot be determined as yet. A meeting between WBC and the owners is due to take place March 2020.
PPO	Public footpath Burghfield 3 extinguishment	Burghfield	Hungerford & Kintbury ward	Proposed extinguishment of public footpath Burghfield 3 by Moatlands Cottages. The route is a 140 metre long cul-de-sac that was cut off by the b uilding of the M4 in the late 1960s. It does not lead anywhere of public interest and is not needed for public use. Liaison is going on with the WBC highways drainage team and the landowners. Further investigation relating to ownership of the track is underway. At present the matter is on hold until WBC receives a response from a
PPO	Investigate the permanent diversion of Byway Open to All Traffic Chieveley 49 onto the near temporary diversion route that has been in use for 23 years	Chieveley	Chieveley & Cold Ash ward	Diversion of Byway Open to All Traffic Chieveley 49 onto the existing used route that was set out in a temporary diversion carried out to allow mineral extraction that has now ceased. WBC published an order under section 116 Highways Act 1980 on 31st October 2019. Reading Magistrates' Court confirmed the order on 6th December 2019. Diversion complete.
PPO	Public bridleway East Ilsley 18 extinguishment	East Ilsley	Hungerford & Kintbury ward	Proposed extinguishment of public bridleway East Ilsley 18, which has been blocked and impassable due to the presence of the A34, which paths users would have to cross at a dangerous location. There is an alternative route via Filders Lane subway beneath the A34 to the north. Unsfae and not needed for public use. Extinguishment order advertised 9th January 2020
PPO	Public footpaths East Ilsley 31 & 35 extinguishment	East Ilsley	Hungerford & Kintbury ward	Proposed extinguishment of public footpaths East Ilsley 31 & 35. The route has been blocked by the A34 and various other impediments that have been left in abeyance due to the danger should anyone try to cross the A34 at this point. There is an alternative route around 40 metres to the north via a wide purpose-built subway beneath the A34. Unsafe and not needed for public use. Extinguishment order advertised 9th January 2020
DMMO	Legal Event Modification Order to update Definitive Map with effects of the extinguishment of public bridleway East Ilsley 18, public footpaths East Ilsley 31 & 35 and public fotpath Holybrook 6	East Ilsley & Holybrook	Hungerford & Kintbury ward & Tilehurst South & Holybrook Ward	The three extinguishment orders have come into effect, but the Definitive Map and Statement now require updating by means of a separate administrative order. An order was authorized on 21st February 2020. An Order will now be prepared and sealed.
PPO	Investigate Holybrook parish Council's request for a new public footpath to link Sharnwood Drive to London Road (A4), by Lidl	Holybrook	Tilehurst South & Holybrook Ward	Sharnwood Drive to London Road (A4) by Lidl. Delays have come about following a couple of potential compensation claims. Matter is on hold until this can be clarified, and then Holybrook Parish Council will have to decide whether they want to pursue the matter as they will be liable to pay any successful compensation claims.
PPO	Public footpath Holybrook 6 extinguishment	Holybrook	Hungerford & Kintbury ward	Proposed extinguishment of public footpath Holybrook 6, which has been blocked by residential housing since the early 1970s and which would only serve as a 40 metre long cul-de-sac route terminating in a private garden if reopened. Not need for public use. Extinguishment order advertised 9th January 2020
DMMO	Newbury Business Park	Newbury	Newbury Clay Hill	A claimed public right of way along a route along the west bank of the River Lambourn, running north from London Road (A4) immediately east of Newbury Business Park. The matter has been investigated despite the fact that no formal application was submitted for the case, and that the right of the public to use the route has not been brought into question under the usual statutory processes (by signs or obstruction). During investigation, a 1988 agreement was found that prevents dedication of a public right of way from being inferred under common law. No order will be made based on the evidence currently available.
DMMO	Donnington Square, claimed public footpath around back of properties	Newbury	Newbury Speen	Claimed public footpath around the outside of the houses on Donnington Square. Matter has been investigated. A decision report is being drafted.
PPO	Public footpath Sulhamstead 2 railway level crossing diversion	Sulhamstead	Bradfield ward & Theale ward	Network Rail are seeking to divert their railway level crossing for safety reasons, so that instead of the current situation where path users cross three sections of railway, they will only have to cross two, making it less distance and reducing the risk significantly. Network Rail have submitted a formal application but this did not include landowner agreement from an adjacent affected owner. The matter has been fully investigated but WBC cannot proceed until Network Rail has
DMMO	Lower Way footpath, north of Thatcham Nature Discovery Centre	Thatcham	Thatcham West Ward	A public footpath was created by agreement between West Berkshire Council and the landowners on 10th July 2019. A Legal Event Modification Order was subsequently authorised and sealed on 25th July 2019.
Creation	Create public footpath by agreement between Tull Way and Bowling Green Lane	Thatcham	Thatcham West Ward	Request from developer and Highways team to record a public footpath along this route to accompany housing development to the south. A track has existed here for many years. It was the private access lane to Henwick Manor before the building of Tull Way left it as a spur between roads. It has been left open since then, and is a useful local pedestrian link. It is in the ownership of the developer to the south, who is happy to accept it as a public footpath, as is the owner of the westernmost part of the track by Tull Way. This matter was investigated but cannot proceed due to a legal issue between the main landowner and a private right holder.
	Old cases needing further attention			
DMMO	Opposed Definitive Map Modification Orders at Cold Ash 18, Saltney Mead (Pangbourne) and Springs Farm (Purley-on-Thames)	Cold Ash, Pangbourne & Purley-on-Thames	Chieveley & Cold Ash ward, and Tilehurst & Purley ward	In June 2019, WBC submitted these three cases to the Planning Inspectorate for determination. WBC has carried out significant administrative and report-writing tasks, and arranged Planning Inspectorate inquiries for each case in summer 2020.
Agreement/ DMMO	Tilehust - Calcot Centre to Farm Drive claimed public footpath	Tilehurst	Tilehurst Birch Copse	WBC has made a decision to make an order to record this route as a public footpath. The landowner may not object, but certain tree maintenance works may be required. WBC is to encourage owner to carry out tree maintenance as there are various informal access routes used by the public. Aim is to avoid landowner objection that would lead to a costly Planning Inspectorate determination.
DMMO	The Bevers to Windmill Road, claimed public footpath	Stratfield Mortimer	Burghfield & Mortimer	Claimed public footpath. The matter has been postponed until April 2020 as the required applicaiton certificate was not received from the applicant until October 2019, six months after the initial part of the application.
DMMO	Stephen's Road to Stephen's Firs, claimed public footpath	Stratfield Mortimer	Burghfield & Mortimer	Claimed public footpath. The matter has been postponed until April 2020 as the required applicaiton certificate was not received from the applicant until October 2019, six months after the initial part of the application.
DMMO	Stephen's Close to Stephen's Firs claimed public footpath	Stratfield Mortimer	Burghfield & Mortimer	Claimed public footpath. The matter has been postponed until April 2020 as the required applicaiton certificate was not received from the applicant until October 2019, six months after the initial part of the application.
DMMO	Great Plantation, claimed public footpaths	Inkpen	Hungerford & Kintbury	Several claimed public footpaths running through Great Plantation, Inkpen. FIVE separate applications were submitted to cover various paths in Great Plantation. Substantial investigation has taken place. However, the application certificates were not duly made as the correct landowners were not correctly notified. Whilst this is a technical issue, it may have a material impact on the ability to appeal against the matter, and means that the obligation for WBC to determine the matters has not been activated.

*DMMO = Definitive Map Modification Order case (i.e to prove/disprove existence of a public right of way), *PPO = Public Path Order case (e.g. diversion, creation or extinguishment)
Grey Rows = complete. Amber Rows = on hold (awaiting third part input)

Definitive Map Officer, Countryside Team, West Berkshire Council, Market Street, Newbury RG14 5LD
Tel: 01635 503251 Email: stuart.higgins@westberks.gov.uk
From webpage: <http://info.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=28887>

This page is intentionally left blank

**Public Rights of Way (claimed public rights of way, proposed diversions, extinguishments, creations), informal and formal
2020+ Remaining cases**

Ward	DMMO or PPO*	Case Title	Proposal	Applicant	Receipt date	Notes
Aldermaston	PPO	Public Footpath Brimpton 21	Diversion	Mr C Hayes	09/01/2006	This diversion is from one landowner's property onto an objecting landowner's property. Compensation claims and a legal wrangle/neighbour dispute seems likely. Low priority. No material benefit for walkers.
Aldermaston	PPO	Public Footpath Aldermaston 15	Diversion/extinguishment	WBC (or developer possibly if planning permission granted)	n.a.	Path has been blocked since the early 1960s due to development of the extension, which was blocked by a housing estate (now in Hampshire) - extension was extinguished by Hampshire in 2017 but the WBC remnant it there. Development proposed that may actually link legal line to a continuation route.
Aldermaston	PPO	Public Footpath Brimpton 4 and Woolhampton 16	Diversion/Enforcement	WBC	n.a.	The public footpath has been flooded following mineral extraction work, and needs major work to reopen the legal line, or needs the owner/mineral extraction company to fund a diversion order.
Aldermaston	PPO	Beenham 15	Diversion	Mr Nelson	01/05/2013	Divert onto an existing permitted bridleway away from farms and paddocks
Bucklebury	PPO	Public Footpath Stanford Dingley 9	Diversion	WBC	n.a.	There has been a longstanding field-edge alternative route signed as a public footpath with three gates/stiles already in place. Ramblers and Open Spaces Society happy.
Burghfield & Mortimer	PPO	Public Footpath Burghfield 5	Diversion/Enforcement	Mineral Extraction Company	n.a.	The path has been quarried and has been flooded by a lake for several years. Was there ever a temporary diversion? Make the landowner resolve this matter by providing a new route and funding a diversion, or by reopening the legal path alignment.
Chieveley & Cold Ash Ward	PPO	Public Footpaths Herm/12/3 and Fril/14/1	Diversion	WBC	n.a.	The path across the wood is impassable, but everyone walks the route east/west to the south of the wood. Impractical to open up physically. Consider a diversion onto used route?
Hungerford & Kintbury	PPO	Public Footpath Inkpen 26	Diversion (unless clear legal document can be found to record actual used route)	WBC	n.a.	The legal line does not reflect the longstanding path built when Robins Road (and extension) was built. Check to see if there is a legal document that was wrongly recorded on the Def Map, or else make a diversion order onto longstanding route.
Hungerford & Kintbury	PPO	Public Footpath Welford 16	Divert public footpath for benefit of landowner	JHL Puxley	11/02/2015	Proposal to divert path out of farmyard and onto a route to the east around the farm. Local Open Spaces Society has indicated an objection on the basis that the existing route through the farmyard is more varied and interesting.
Hungerford & Kintbury	PPO	Public Footpath Boxford 17	Diversion	WBC	n.a.	landowner has created a pond on the line of the footpath and refuses to fill it in. The landowner has not approached WBC about making any diverison order.
Lambourn	PPO	Blind Lane, Lambourn	Regularize PROWs by diversion/creations	WBC	n.a.	Lambourn 36/2 is a fenced off drainage ditch. Walkers in the area use a well trodden route with no formal status between Bockhampton Road and Newbury Road, NW of Beales Farm Road.
Newbury (ALL Wards)	DMMO	Newbury Urban Paths	Claimed public footpaths	Newbury Town Council	2018/2019	Do any urban paths exist that were created before 1949 and which are not on the Definitive Map?
Newbury Central	DMMO	St David's Road to Craven Road, Claimed public footpath	Record public footpath between Craven Road and St David's Road	Cllr Dr Tony Vickers	13/05/2013	Record a public footpath over the area behind houses on Craven Road linking to the end of St David's Road, Newbury. The matter has been on hold at the request of the applicant to avoid unnecessary conflict between neighbours as things stand.
Newbury Speen	DMMO	Moor Lane, Hill Lane, Croft Lane - Speen/Newbury Private Streets	Claimed public rights of way (at least public footpath status).	WBC	n.a.	Moor Lane, Hill Lane and Croft Lane are all 'Private Streets'. There is a threat to them having Public Rights extinguished in 2026 if not recorded on the DMS by then. Would be very bad as they are vital links to the PROW network in a populous area.
Newbury Speen	PPO	Public Footpath Speen 28	Diversion	n.a. (pending)	n.a. (pending)	It has been noted that buildings granted planning permission were actually built a few metres off alignment, and have been built across the historic (legal) line of the public footpath. A wide fenced path has been left for the public, but it is actually a few metres west of the legal line, which is now inaccessible to the public. A formal diversion will rectify this situation.

n.b. this list is not exhaustive, but includes all remaining formal applications, and a number of viable informal proposed cases

Public Rights of Way (claimed public rights of way, proposed diversions, extinguishments, creations), informal and formal
2020+ Remaining cases

Newbury Wash Common	DMMO	Newbury, Sidestrand Road to Andover Road via Fairview	Claimed public footpath	Tony Vickers	2018/2019	Claimed public footpath to investigate as part of 2026 consultation
Newbury Wash Common	DMMO	Newbury, Roebuts Close	Claimed public footpath	Tony Vickers	2018/2019	Claimed public footpath to investigate as part of 2026 consultation
Pangbourne	PPO	Pangbourne 10	Diversion	WBC	n.a.	longstanding unofficial/unintended diversion at Lower Bowden Manor
Tilehurst Birch Copse	PPO	Tilehurst 14 diversion	Diversion	WBC	n.a.	divert from blocked gully route onto tarmac path already constructed along edge of Recreation Ground

n.b. this list is not exhaustive, but includes all remaining formal applications, and a number of viable informal proposed cases

West Berkshire Council Public Rights of Way Legal Order Cases
Priority work list, April 2020- April 2021

Case Type*	Title	Parish	Ward	Description
DMMO & PPO	Initial assessments of new queries and proposals as they come in	All	All	Provisions from the Deregulation Act 2015 are due to come into effect, that will put a statutory requirement for initial assessment decisions on Public Path Orders (PPOs) and Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs) applications within 4, and 3, months, respectively. At present, many proposals and queries come in each year. These are assessed straight away, and preliminary investigations are carried out. At present the Council has a discretion to process Path Orders, although it has an obligation to determine all duly made DMMO applications. Accepted cases that are then prioritized make it onto the annual caselist. Refused cases do not appear on any
PPO	Investigate a diversion of the long-obstructed public bridleway running through Broadview Farm	Bucklebury & Cold Ash parishes	Bucklebury Ward, and Chieveley & Cold Ash Ward	See if the obstructed public bridleway through Broad View Farm can be diverted onto a suitable new route (partly in Bucklebury and partly in Cold Ash parishes/wards). Parish meeting held in autumn 2019. No application submitted to date.
DMMO	The Bevers to Windmill Road, claimed public footpath	Stratfield Mortimer	Burghfield & Mortimer	Claimed public footpath. To be investigate and a determination of whether or not to make an order..
DMMO	Stephen's Road to Stephen's Firs, claimed public footpath	Stratfield Mortimer	Burghfield & Mortimer	Claimed public footpath. To be investigate and a determination of whether or not to make an order..
DMMO	Stephen's Close to Stephen's Firs claimed public footpath	Stratfield Mortimer	Burghfield & Mortimer	Claimed public footpath. To be investigate and a determination of whether or not to make an order..
PPO	Public footpath Burghfield 3 extinguishment	Burghfield	Hungerford & Kintbury ward	Proposed extinguishment of public footpath Burghfield 3 by Moatlands Cottages. The route is a 140 metre long cul-de-sac that was cut off by the building of the M4 in the late 1960s. It does not lead anywhere of public interest and is not needed for public use. Liaison is going on with the WBC highways drainage team and the landowners. Further investigation relating to ownership of the track is underway. At present the matter is on hold
PPO	Investigate Holybrook parish Council's request for a new public footpath to link Sharnwood Drive to London Road (A4), by Lidl	Holybrook	Tilehurst South & Holybrook Ward	Sharnwood Drive to London Road (A4) by Lidl. Delays have come about following a couple of potential compensation claims. Matter is on hold until this can be clarified, and then Holybrook Parish Council will have to decide whether they want to pursue the matter as they will be liable to pay any successful compensation claims.
PPO	Public footpath Sulhamstead 2 railway level crossing diversion	Sulhamstead	Bradfield ward & Theale ward	Network Rail are seeking to divert their railway level crossing for safety reasons, so that instead of the current situation where path users cross three sections of railway, they will only have to cross two, making it less distance and reducing the risk significantly. Network Rail have submitted a formal application but this did not include landowner agreement from an adjacent affected owner. The matter has been fully investigated but WBC
DMMO	Hill Gardens to Green Hill claimed public footpath	Streatley	Basildon	Claimed public footpath in Streatley parish running from Hill Gardens to public footpath Streatley 1. Evidence submitted, but no formal application yet submitted. Pending.
	Old cases needing further attention			
DMMO	Opposed Definitive Map Modification Orders at Cold Ash 18, Saltney Mead (Pangbourne) and Springs Farm (Purley-on-Thames)	Cold Ash, Pangbourne & Purley-on-Thames	Chieveley & Cold Ash ward, and Tilehurst & Purley ward	In June 2019, WBC submitted these three cases to the Planning Inspectorate for determination. WBC has carried out significant administrative and report-writing tasks, and arranged Planning Inspectorate inquiries for each case in summer 2020.
Agreement/ DMMO	Tilehurst - Calcot Centre to Farm Drive claimed public footpath	Tilehurst	Tilehurst Birch Copse	WBC has made a decision to make an order to record this route as a public footpath. The landowner may not object, but certain tree maintenance works may be required. WBC is to encourage owner to carry out tree maintenance as there are various informal access routes used by the public. Aim is to avoid landowner objection that would lead to a costly Planning Inspectorate determination.
DMMO	Great Plantation, claimed public footpaths	Inkpen	Hungerford & Kintbury	Several claimed public footpaths running through Great Plantation, Inkpen. FIVE separate applications were submitted to cover various paths in Great Plantation. Substantial investigation has taken place. However, the application certificates were not duly made as the correct landowners were not correctly notified. Whilst this is a technical issue, it may have a material impact on the ability to appeal against the matter, and means that the obligation for WBC to determine the matters has not been activated.

* of a public right of way), *PPO = Public Path Order case (e.g. diversion, creation or extinguishment)

iber Rows = on hold (awaiting third part input)

1, West Berkshire Council, Market Street, Newbury RG14 5LD

Email: stuart.higgins@westberks.gov.uk

3.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=28887

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix E

RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES - PROGRESS

Key: PROW = 'public right(s) of way'; WBC = 'West Berkshire District Council'; AONB = 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'

****Suggested priorities for 2020/21**

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
A well-maintained and safe access network		
Produce a strategy to reduce the instances of laying of unauthorized tarmacadam surfaces on PROW and a policy to set out the District Council's approach to tarmacadam on PROW.	ROWIP 1	Ensure the message is continually disseminated via Land Charges searches, web site etc.
Carry out a complete condition survey of all Definitive PROW every five years.	ROWIP 2	Survey completed 2010. A new survey is planned for 2020/21. The volunteer Ramblers' Work Party group carries out a complete survey of the entire network once every 5 years, on a rolling programme.
Investigate the feasibility of a limited scheme to remunerate landowners for carrying out repair, maintenance and improvement works on PROW.	ROWIP 3	No progress.
Implement measures to ensure that landowners maintain all hedges adjacent to PROW so as to prevent obstruction of PROW by overgrowth.	ROWIP 4	Complete - WBC does not clear hedge overhang, and enforces against landowners when such growth impedes public access. A reminder to landowners about their responsibilities is sent in the annual autumn ploughing/cropping reminder letter.
Formally adopt the draft policy governing the maintenance of PROW used for access to residential properties, farms and other private land or establishments.	ROWIP 5	Completed.
Produce a design and consultation protocol for the repair, replacement and installation of bridges on PROW.	ROWIP 6	The WBC Bridges section inspects and maintains PROW bridges, and a system is in place
Review PROW sign and waymark designs to reduce future instances of fading and unauthorized relocation or redirection.	ROWIP 7	Some work has been done with manufacturers regarding reduction of fading, and monitoring takes place. Particular attention is to be given to monitoring the new generation of resin-coated signpost fingers which contain the WBC logo within the arrow.

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
		We are monitoring the performance of newer signs. Taller signs are now used to prevent tampering.
Remedy all unresolved PROW signage defects by the end of April each year.	ROWIP 8	The PROW Ranger team aims to complete this every winter.
Produce a prioritization scheme for physical works, vegetation clearance and enforcement on PROW.	ROWIP 9	Complete, and partially ongoing - a scheme of routine vegetation clearance has been in place for some years. A priority review was undertaken in 2018 to take into account increased growth due to climate change, and an increase in on-line reports from the public.
A legally-recorded PROW network		
'Consolidate' and publish the Definitive Map and Statement in a clear and useable format.	ROWIP 10	Re-digitisation at 1:1250 scale is complete and the new Definitive Map and Statement was published in 2019. The data is being added to the National Street Gazetteer, so that utility companies, etc. can see locations of PROW.
Each year to complete the processing of the annually-agreed list of applications for modification orders and path orders.	ROWIP 11	Completed each year. Any amendments to the programme are agreed by the Portfolio member.
Produce a published prioritization scheme for dealing with applications for modification orders and applications for path orders.	ROWIP 12	Completed.
Carry out risk assessments for trees within PROW and formulate a prioritized plan of action to ensure the safety of PROW users.	ROWIP 13	Priority locations have been identified and regular inspections and works take place. Landowners are contacted where relevant.
Consider appropriate legal mechanisms to recognise acquisition of cycling rights along urban footpaths.	ROWIP 14	Little progress. Recent thinking is that cycling may lead to restricted byway status. 'No cycling' signs should not be installed where it is not known if the landowner objects. Sustrans may be of assistance.
An environmentally-sustainable access network		
Implement methods to prevent fly-tipping and littering of PROW and also improved methods for clearance of litter and fly-tipping when instances occur.	ROWIP 15	The Furniture Project group clears litter from selected routes. Fly tipping strategy is the responsibility of the WBC Waste Team. Tipping on PROW is cleared when accessible, otherwise contractors are needed. Approximately 150 fly-tips are cleared from PROW by the Waste Team each year. The Waste and PROW sections have used enforcement cameras at some hot spots. This work sits more

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
		appropriately with the Waste Team.
**Implement improved sustainable procurement practices	ROWIP 16	Sustainably-sourced wood is stipulated and recycled surfacing material used where possible. Vigilance will continue in the field of procurement. In 2018, some input was made into the WBC procurement process as part of a consultation following a procurement workshop.
**Introduce improved environmentally-sustainable working practices, which also protect and enhance biodiversity and historic landscape and features.	ROWIP 17	To be done via a review of procedures and ongoing monitoring of environmental effects. A checklist has been compiled of environmental aspects to consider when carrying out practical works. PROW staff and volunteers have been trained in basic habitat identification. More advanced training is required. Consideration is being given to the use of recycled plastics for certain purposes. More work is needed on the impacts on trees of different types of surfacing - liaison with WBC's Tree and Ecology sections is taking place.
Providing information / promoting the use of the access network		
Increase the availability of PROW / access information and promotional material and explore greater use of a wider range of formats, to compliment relevant work carried out by others.	ROWIP 18	More work on improved use of electronic media and a more interactive web site are needed, with improvements to the WBC on-line map already having been made. Many Parish Plan teams are producing promotional leaflets. Work is needed to re-design and print the set of 8 WBC walks and rides leaflets, and the two WBC riding routes. However, there is a WBC hold on such work (councillor instruction). An on-line app is being created by IT for the series of WBC rural cycle maps.
Support parish councils and parish plan groups to increase the range and availability of promotional material for PROW / access.	ROWIP 19	Many Parish Plan teams are producing promotional leaflets. WBC officers have been told by councillors not to fund promotional work.
Education / encouragement of responsible behaviour		

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
**Produce published material to provide information about PROW / access and about the responsibilities of PROW users, landowners and other bodies.	ROWIP 20	There is now a series of information sheets, and these need to be placed on the web site. Greater efforts are needed at dissemination of the information more widely. Greater use of social media needed.
Produce a formal policy for the management of vehicular use and vehicular surfaces, with the aim of improving the condition of PROW used by recreational vehicles.	ROWIP 21	Completed.
**Implement procedures to remove unsuitable PROW from published satellite navigation routes.	ROWIP 22	A couple of routes have been removed from the material produced by some sat. nav. companies. More work is needed. Prospects for progress may be limited as there are so many companies. The best way appears to be to take measures on the ground at each problem site, e.g. signage. New 'Sat. Nav. Unreliable' signs have been installed at Drove Lane, Cold Ash (Byway 5).
Continue to contribute access information to the "Greenways" newsletter.	ROWIP 23	This particular newsletter has lapsed. More use of newsletters and publications is desirable to spread PROW news and good practice.
Explore opportunities to work with schools within the National Curriculum to increase understanding of the role of access within the countryside and the responsibilities of citizens.	ROWIP 24	No work done directly by PROW team. Some discussions on this subject have taken place at the Local Access Forum.
Development of new access		
**Seek to promote, improve and create (where necessary) safe and commodious links between, within and around population centres, rural and urban facilities, attractions and transport interchanges.	ROWIP 25	Piecemeal work done annually via the annual programme of improvements and maintenance. A more planned approach is needed. BBOWT approval for the Snelsmore bridleway link has been given, and obstructions have been removed. Completion is planned for 2020. The Hermitage to Hamsptead Norreys railway line path was completed in 2020. New and improved routes are often created as part of the Path Orders Case Programme work.
**Seek to promote, improve and create (where necessary) suitable routes to school and consider an increased maintenance programme for these routes.	ROWIP 26	Important school routes are prioritised for the regular clearance of vegetation. A priority is also given to surface improvements which may be required. The PROW team works with the School Transport team.

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
**Seek greater partnership with businesses and landowners to secure the provision of additional permissive or Definitive access for all users.	ROWIP 27	Some work to protect CAP permitted routes has been done by the LAF, which is active in campaigning independently for access post-Brexit. Work of this kind is not carried out by the PROW team unless opportunities arise indirectly from other work, e.g. path diversions.
**Increase the provision of suitable equestrian routes where existing provision is low or fragmented, and where demand is high, especially routes which facilitate riding to and from livery yards without horseboxes.	ROWIP 28	Piecemeal work is done annually via the annual programme of improvements and maintenance. A more planned approach is needed.
Develop circular interlinking equestrian routes around settlements ("community circuits") which also link to longer rides.	ROWIP 29	Piecemeal work is done annually via the annual programme of improvements and maintenance. A more planned approach is needed.
Increase access for equestrians and carriages on West Berkshire-managed commons.	ROWIP 30	Liaison needed with BBOWT. Note that BBOWT have recognized the lawful rights for horse riding on those commons with a Scheme of Management made under the 1889 Act following submissions by the BHS & LAF to the access audits.
Physical improvements to the access network		
Research and implement mechanisms to realign the road user hierarchy in favour of non-motorized transport modes, especially walking (LTP 2, policy WI9).	ROWIP 31	Need to review in the light of new LTP policies.
Work with partners in rural areas to identify opportunities for improving the safety of the physical environment, in particular for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders (LTP2, policy RSI 7).	ROWIP 32	Need to review in the light of new LTP policies.
**Implement measures to ensure that all gates on equestrian routes are easily-openable from horseback, using best practice gate and latch designs and gate configurations. Mounting blocks to be installed where dismounting cannot be avoided.	ROWIP 33	To improve 10 to 12 equestrian gates per year would be achievable given resources. The British Horse Society has been consulted and has reported on the results of a survey of visiting 62 gates known to be a problem. The British Horse Society has offered a grant of £1000.
Increase the numbers of PROW signposts indicating destinations, distances and local attractions.	ROWIP 34	Some signposts already show these from an old project with parish councils. There may be scope to produce such signs where replacement is needed and the information would be useful. Some authorities, e.g. Herts, have much information on every

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
		<p>signpost (e.g. path number, destination and mileage). An investigation revealed that the signs cost about twice as much to produce as those with basic status information.</p> <p>There are no plans for any major progress at present due to staff resource constraints and the higher priorities of statutory duties. There is also a question over the practical usefulness because the signage would often have to continue each time at several points beyond the roadside.</p>
**Improve the signage of PROW in and around West Berkshire's countryside sites.	ROWIP 35	Much recent work has been done by the BBOWT access audits. Need to check that they are promoting access beyond the boundaries of their sites.
Implement measures to improve signage and promotion of all permissive access.	ROWIP 36	The routes are digitised for internal staff use. We cannot publicise these widely because there are so many variations in permission and we do not have the resources to review the paths and to keep the records up to date. Some are signed by WBC or by landowners.
Implement measures to improve management and promotion of open access land and links to and from access land.	ROWIP 37	Initial work only was done to waymark access routes when the legislation was introduced.
Improving accessibility for all users		
**Identify routes and circuits which are suitable for promotion for use by those with restricted mobility, including within countryside sites. Promote and sign the routes in terms of grading and carry out works, where needed.	ROWIP 38	<p>Work is ongoing on a circular route at Purley. Another priority location needs to be identified, preferably in the urban fringe so as to provide maximum benefit.</p> <p>BBOWT have established routes on Snelsmore & Wokefield Commons, with a web page being developed.</p> <p>The WBC on-line map now shows locations of structures on PROW.</p>
Continue to provide buggies, for those with restricted mobility, at West Berkshire countryside sites.	ROWIP 39	There was once a stock of buggies at Snelsmore Common, but there were some problems with use of the scooters, and booking. Find out from BBOWT if they plan any more such work.
**Continue to improve the accessibility of structures on rights of way and introduce and implement new incentives for landowners to do likewise.	ROWIP 40	There is an ongoing project to replace stiles with gaps or gates, mostly via volunteer help. For a number of years, one new easily-accessible gate was installed on average every three weeks via the

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
		volunteer Ramblers' Work Party team, and their 300 th gate was installed in 2019. The scheme is to continue, but a review in 2017 has concluded that one gate every four weeks will be less of a strain on staff and volunteer time, and will also allow the internal PROW Rangers to install additional gates occasionally.
**Implement improved promotion of access to the PROW / access network for Walking the Way to Health (WHI) participants.	ROWIP 41	Waymarking of some 'Walk4Life' mile routes has taken place. More local short routes are planned around population centres. Work being led by the Public Health team. Closer working with the Public Health Team would be desirable going forward.
Establish greater dialogue with ethnic minority groups, children and young people and groups which traditionally do not visit the countryside, to produce an action plan of high-quality measures to encourage and maintain participation.	ROWIP 42	No progress by PROW team but work could be done to encourage this via other sections of WBC.
Support and encourage measures to provide shower, clothes-drying and cycle-parking facilities at schools, work places and other destinations, to encourage non-car transport.	ROWIP 43	For Transport Strategy Team, also via Cycle Forum.
Audit car park barriers on the access network, and ensure that access is possible for horseboxes, where appropriate.	ROWIP 44	Examples are Bury Down, Paices Wood, Hosehill Lake, Sheffield Bottom, Snelsmore Common, Bowdown House. Progress has been made by removal of the height restrictor at Snelsmore Common.
Seek new car parking, cycle parking and horsebox/trailer parking on the access network, where there is a proven need.	ROWIP 45	Little progress made.
Working with partners		
Provide support, where needed, to other bodies whose aspirations compliment those of this ROWIP.	ROWIP 46	Any offers of help are welcomed and considered. We try to use all offers if we can, providing it is cost-effective.
**Encourage parish councils to use their full range of powers where appropriate and support the appointment of parish council public rights of way officers.	ROWIP 47	WBC is encouraging parishes to assist more with PROW work via the 'Devolution' scheme. There have been a number of enquiries from parishes about how to take this forward.
Arrange formal rights of way training for parish public rights of way officers, parish	ROWIP 48	The Parish Council Devolution Scheme involves exploring how

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
plan teams and voluntary groups.		<p>parishes can assist more with PROW work, therefore training requirements may arise.</p> <p>Advice sheets have been sent to parish councils on several occasions, and the Devolution literature also includes guidance. Advice has also been added to the WBC PROW web site.</p> <p>There are few requests for training from parishes but the PROW team would be willing to meet any such requests.</p>
**Continue to provide support and direction to voluntary groups and to encourage the participation of volunteers of all ages in access work.	ROWIP 49	The Furniture Project and Ramblers' Work Parties continue to help to maintain and improve the ROW network. A new volunteer strimming group was set up by WBC in 2017. A new group of volunteers to assist with surveys and site visits was set up in 2018. The idea of a volunteer co-ordinator has been discussed.
Support the access work identified within parish plans and 'Area Visions'.	ROWIP 50	Reactive support given when ROW team approached.
Improving working practices and customer care		
**Create a comprehensive PROW / access library incorporating controlled copies.	ROWIP 51	An on-line and hard-copy library exists but it is not controlled, therefore there is no system to identify superseded items. It is also not a comprehensive library, but is added to only when items come to light.
**Use all appropriate internal District Council communication channels to inform relevant parties of developments in PROW / access work.	ROWIP 52	More work could be done, e.g. Reporter.
Improve the efficiency and speed of use of available legal powers in relation to PROW.	ROWIP 53	Legal Notices can now be issued by the PROW team and in some cases the team have devolved powers to sign letters. Much work has been done to identify where direct action can be taken, thus reducing the length of some procedures.
Improve awareness of land management priorities and procedures amongst District Council PROW staff.	ROWIP 54	Efforts ongoing to increase knowledge of relevant aspects of land management. Recognised as an ongoing training need.
**Liaise more closely with West Berkshire's Planning and Transport Strategy group, and other planning consultees, so as to benefit the PROW / access network.	ROWIP 55	At present the main mechanism is via the Cycle Forum (meets quarterly).
Funding		
Investigate the feasibility of a grant scheme for access work by parish councils,	ROWIP 56	Successful schemes already run in Hampshire and Wiltshire.

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives	ROWIP reference	Progress to date
parish plan groups and others, taking into account funding already available.		A cost/benefit analysis is required. Budgetary constraints following the 50% cut in the capital PROW budget means this is probably not a practical option at present.
Seek to involve community and special interest groups in funding and delivering small access schemes.	ROWIP 57	Little progress made, beyond the Parish Council Devolution Scheme.
Investigate opportunities for external and grant funding for PROW / access projects.	ROWIP 58	Little progress made, partly due to lack of staff time. Also, many grants are not available for statutory Council work. However, new promising sources can be accessed via Government money for sustainable transport, particularly cycling, and where the network has been severed by major roads. Some AONB funding has been acquired in the past but effort needs to be made to source more. Other possible promising sources might be the Greenham Common Trust, Landfill Communities Fund, etc.
Monitoring / continued consultation		
Continue to receive and consider requests for improved access, and to incorporate them into an annually-updated list of requests for specific access improvements.	ROWIP 59	Ongoing. All requests to date are shown on the staff mapping system. The 2005 ROWIP public requests are also shown on the public on-line map.
The Mid and West Berkshire Local Access Forum to advise on implementation of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.	ROWIP 60	Via annual report to the LAF.
Learn and listen to views of others, at the same time seeking and implementing best practice in relation to PROW / access work.	ROWIP 61	Ongoing
**Implement an effective internal method of recording good practice and lessons learnt in PROW / access work, for the benefit of present and future staff.	ROWIP 62	All staff are required to read the IPROW publication 'Waymark' each month. Efforts are made to record legal advice and learning points on the WBC shared system. There is an annual WBC training budget. The Senior Rights of Way Officer attends the quarterly ADEPT SE Region working group meetings of PROW managers (and chaired the group 2018/19).
Produce an annual progress report on the Rights of Way Improvement Plan Action	ROWIP 63	Sent to LAF and Portfolio member annually.

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) themes and objectives		ROWIP reference	Progress to date
Plan.			

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix F

Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via dp@westberks.gov.uk

Directorate:	Place
Service:	Environment
Team:	Public Rights of Way
Lead Officer:	Elaine Cox
Title of Project/System:	Public Rights of Way Case Programmes ID Report
Date of Assessment:	1 March 2020

Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?

	Yes	No
<p>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</p> <p><small>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation”</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</p> <p><small>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</p> <p><small>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will any decisions be automated?</p> <p><small>Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual's input is “scored” or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any “profiling” of data subjects?</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</p> <p><small>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you answer “Yes” to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:***
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;***
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:***
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;***
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;***
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.***
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.***
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”***

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:	To note progress in dealing with the cases assigned for 2018/19. To agree recommended cases for 2019/20.
Summary of relevant legislation:	Mainly Highways Act 1980 and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?	No.
Name of assessor:	Elaine Cox.
Date of assessment:	1 March 2020.

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	Yes
Strategy	No	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes
Function	Yes	Is changing	Yes
Service	Yes		

1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	Improvement of the public rights of way network and ensuring ease of use.
Objectives:	Specific targets for physical works, path orders, enforcement, and general improvements.
Outcomes:	Improvements to access in terms of physical provision for the public. Also delivery of applications to create, move or extinguish access.
Benefits:	Improvement of the public rights of way network, and ensuring ease of use, in certain targeted areas of work.

2 Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.)		
Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this
Age	Inaccessible structures, e.g.	Work planning involves EIA

	stiles, and uneven PROW surfaces, exist on the PROW network. Some PROW may therefore be difficult to negotiate.	and often consultation with local people, parish councils and the Local Access Forum.
Disability	Inaccessible structures, e.g. stiles, and uneven PROW surfaces, exist on the PROW network. For the blind or partially-sighted, there may be trouble reading promotional information.	Work planning involves EIA and often consultation with local people, parish councils and the Local Access Forum.
Gender Reassignment	N/A.	N/A.
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A.	N/A.
Pregnancy and Maternity	Inaccessible structures, e.g. stiles, and uneven PROW surfaces, exist on the PROW network.	Work planning involves EIA and often consultation with local people, parish councils and the Local Access Forum.
Race	For those who are unable to read English, some PROW signs and literature may be unclear.	Work planning involves EIA and often consultation with local people, parish councils and the Local Access Forum.
Religion or Belief	For those who are unable to read English, some PROW signs and literature may be unclear.	Work planning involves EIA and often consultation with local people, parish councils and the Local Access Forum.
Sex	N/A.	N/A.
Sexual Orientation	N/A.	N/A.
Further Comments relating to the item:		
Those managing the public rights of way (PROW) network are legally obliged to ensure that all PROW are maintained in a suitable condition for those who wish to use them. There is a network of 700 miles of rural, urban and suburban PROW. When managing and maintaining this network, each PROW is considered on a case-by-case basis and reasonable adjustments are made to for access for the disabled.		

3 Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	Yes
Please provide an explanation for your answer: see mitigating measures explained in the table above for each category.	

What actions will be taken to address any negative effects?			
Action	Owner	By When	Outcome
Inaccessible structures, e.g. stiles, and uneven PROW surfaces, are to be removed/improved as part of the case programmes.	PROW team	Ongoing	A gradual improvement in accessibility across the network, with priorities in the case programme for replacement of stiles with gates and for identification of new routes for easy access by those with reduced mobility.
The case programme contains steps to introduce greater use of interactive web pages, to benefit the partially-sighted and those unable to read English.	PROW team	Ongoing	There is a priority in the case programme for promotional work, so there will be an improvement in accessibility to such material.

Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	No
Please provide an explanation for your answer:	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

4 Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	No.
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	N/A.
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	N/A.

Name: Elaine Cox

Date: 1 March 2019.

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) (rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website.

This page is intentionally left blank