


Leicester's Local Transport Plan
2011-2026

Leicester City's Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2011-2021



LEICESTER'S LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 2011 TO 2026

LEICESTER CITY'S RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2011 TO 2021

**Regeneration, Highways and Transportation Division
Leicester City Council
New Walk Centre
Welford Place
Leicester
LE1 6ZG**

DOCUMENT CONTROL FORM

Document Title	Leicester City's Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2011 – 2021
Project No.	25017
Report No.	1
Location	Transport Strategy Section - www.leicester.gov.uk
File Name	

Primary Author	Paul Standley
Reviewer	Garry Scott
Approval Authority	Full Council
Date of Approval	24 th March 2011

Leicester City Council,
 Regeneration, Highways & Transportation,
 New Walk Centre,
 Welford Place,
 LEICESTER,
 LE1 6ZG

Contact Name: Paul Standley
 Telephone No. 0116 252 6605
 E-mail: paul.standley@leicester.gov.uk

Distribution List / Amendment Details

Issue No.	Date of issue	Prepared by	Approved by	Distribution	Amendment Details
1	24 Mar 2011	Paul Standley	Garry Scott	Internet	

LEICESTER CITY'S RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2011 to 2021

Contents

Introduction

Chapter 1 Setting The Scene

- 1.1 Legal Requirements
- 1.2 Leicester City's Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2007 – 2017
- 1.3 The City of Leicester a Brief Description
- 1.4 Useful Definitions
- 1.5 Sources of Information
- 1.6 The Leicester City Local Access Forum

Chapter 2 Contributing to The Wider Agenda

- 2.1 One Leicester
- 2.2 Leicester's Local Transport Plan 2011 to 2026 'Planning For People Not Cars'

Chapter 3 Making The Assessment

- 3.1 The Rights of Way Network
- 3.2 The Needs of Users and The Paths They Use
- 3.3 Maintenance of Paths
- 3.4 The Barriers Which Prevent Use of The Network
- 3.5 Summary of Our Assessment

Chapter 4 Realising The Potential of Our Rights of Way – Our Statement of Action

- 4.1 The Statement of Action
- 4.2 Involvement of Leicester Local Access Forum
- 4.3 Delivery Incentives
- 4.4 Funding of The Works
- 4.5 Monitoring of Our Progress
- 4.6 Summary

Introduction

Welcome to Leicester City's Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2011 – 2021 (RoWIP). This plan has been developed in parallel with the preparation of Leicester's Local Transport Plan 2011 to 2026 "Planning For People Not Cars" (LTP3). The Rights of Way Improvement Plan is a statutory requirement set out in sections 60 and 61 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

In addition to the requirements of the legislation, the RoWIP explains what rights of way are and highlights some of the council's statutory duties in relation to their recording and maintenance. It also sets out our intentions for how our network of rights of way will contribute to our wider corporate vision and transport strategies.

Leicester's first RoWIP was published in October 2007 and was intended to cover a ten year period up to 2017. The first RoWIP was integrated within the Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 2006 to 2011 (LTP2). The third edition of the local transport plan (LTP3) is being published in March 2011 and includes revised objectives to those contained within LTP2. To ensure that the objectives of the RoWIP and the local transport plan are reflected within each other it is now necessary to revise the RoWIP so that it is in line with LTP3.

Plate 1a



It is acknowledged that not all of the recommendations arising out of the first RoWIP have been completed. Those commitments which are still relevant and necessary to further improve the network have been carried over to this edition of the RoWIP. Our ability to make progress with those commitments, and the new recommendations within this RoWIP will depend upon funding availability. The Government's current priority of reducing the budget deficit will have a key influence on our aspirations.

At present our rights of way network is made up of many different types of path and the status of some of these paths has still to be recorded. The work of investigating and recording the true status of each of these paths is of the utmost importance and will be a long-running exercise.

In summary, rights of way are in an ideal position to provide routes for non motorised transport as:

- A venue for leisure and recreational activities.
- A means of access to local facilities or public transport routes for onwards travel.
- An alternative network to facilitate medium to and longer distance journeys.

Chapter 1 **Setting The Scene**

This chapter outlines background information about rights of way improvement plans and the city of Leicester and its highway network. It also seeks to highlight some of the council's main statutory duties in relation to the recording of rights of way. Finally it explains the relationship between the Leicester City Local Access Forum and Leicester City's Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

1.1 Legal Requirements

- 1.1.1 Leicester City Council (the council), as with every other highway authority specified within the legislation, has a requirement, under section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP). The council shall then, not more than ten years after first publishing it, review the plan and decide whether to amend it.
- 1.1.2 The Rights of Way Improvement Plan shall include an assessment of:
- i The extent to which the rights of way network meets the present and likely future needs of the public.
 - ii The opportunities provided by local rights of way for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area.
 - iii The accessibility of local rights of way to blind and partially sighted people and those with mobility difficulties.
- 1.1.3 It should also include a statement of the action the authority intends to take for the management of local rights of way and for securing an improved network, with particular regard to the matters dealt with in the assessment.
- 1.1.4 To assist with the production of Rights of Way Improvement Plans the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs published statutory guidance in November 2002.
- 1.1.5 This RoWIP covers the administrative area of the City of Leicester and in accordance with the legislation applies to its network of footpaths, bridleways and cycle tracks. In addition to the requirements of the legislation, the plan also applies to those cycle tracks which are in, or by the side of, a highway consisting of, or comprising, a made-up carriageway and those paths which are used on a permissive basis.

1.2 Leicester City's Public Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2007 – 2017

- 1.2.1 Leicester's first RoWIP was published in October 2007 and was intended to cover a ten year period up to 2017. The first RoWIP was integrated within the Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 2006 to 2011 (LTP2). The third edition of the local transport plan (LTP3) is being published in March 2011 and includes revised objectives to those contained within LTP2. The Leicester Partnership's Sustainable Community Strategy, 'One Leicester', adopted in 2008, sets out a 25 year vision for the city. To ensure that the objectives of the RoWIP, the Local Transport Plan and the

One Leicester priorities are reflected within each other, it is now necessary to revise the RoWIP so that it is in line with LTP3.

1.2.2 The first RoWIP resulted in major improvements being undertaken on a number of rights of way and progress with the council's statutory duties relating to rights of way. Specific improvements included:

- The resurfacing of King William's Bridge, which carries a bridleway running from Castle Hill Country Park across the Rothley Brook towards the village of Anstey.
- The surfacing of a well used missing link which provides a direct link between surfaced paths leading to a large residential area and the Beaumont Shopping Centre.
- Provision of street lighting on a path connecting the Great Central Way with Braunstone Lane East.
- Access improvements on an embankment leading to a crossing point of Hamilton Way.
- An increase of 100% of the total length of paths recorded on the definitive map and statement.
- Exceeding targets set for measurement of service under BVPI 178 and CL 19.

Plate 1b



Plate 1c



King William Bridge crosses Rothley Brook, which flows along a section of the city county boundary, is well used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and connects the city's Castle Hill Country Park with the village of Anstey. **Plate 1a** (taken in October 2006) shows the poor condition of the bridge deck which presented a trip hazard to users and detrimental to the structure of the bridge. **Plate 1c** (taken in October 2010) shows the new surfacing which was applied as a result of our first Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

1.2.3 In August 2008 Natural England published an evaluation of RoWIPs which assessed if they were 'fit for purpose'. Leicester's RoWIP was included within the assessment and report for the East Midlands Region. The assessment concluded that our RoWIP met the requirements and was fit for purpose but was lacking in detail and content. Our assessment of the needs of disabled people was considered excellent.

1.2.4 The first RoWIP was awarded first place in the improving accessibility for all category of Natural England's ROWIP awards, held in March 2009. The award, which was

presented by BBC Coast presenter Nicholas Crane, recognised the role played by our RoWIP in improving accessibility to the network.

Plate 1d



Plate 1e



Our first Rights of Way Improvement Plan identified a clearly defined desire line as shown in **Photo 1d** (taken October 2007). The path connected a network of other surfaced paths leading to a large residential area to retail, leisure and other local facilities at the Beaumont Centre. **Plate 1e** (taken in October 2010) shows the newly surfaced and illuminated link.

1.2.5 It is acknowledged that not all of the recommendations arising out of the first RoWIP have been completed. Those commitments that are still relevant and necessary to further improve the network have been carried over to this edition of the RoWIP.

1.3 The City of Leicester a Brief Description

1.3.1 With a population of over 300,000, Leicester, which covers an area of over 73 square kilometres, is the most populous settlement in the East Midlands and the ninth largest city in the country.

1.3.2 There is no “access land” (as defined in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) in the city but there are areas of natural environment, together with 800 hectares of parks and open spaces. Additionally the River Soar, which also doubles as the Grand Union Canal Leicester Line, flows from south to north through the city.

1.3.3 The city is located in the centre of the county of Leicestershire. The surrounding county offers access to greater areas of the natural environment. The National Forest, Charnwood Forest and Bradgate Park are all located within easy reach of the north western side of the city. The Soar Valley and Watermead Country Park borders the northern edge of the city. Arable farm land lies largely to the east of the city. Access to the natural environment to the west and south of the city is somewhat limited by the M1 and satellite settlements but the River Soar catchment and Grand Union Canal do offer some opportunity for recreation and access.


Leicester’s Highway Network

1.3.4 The highway network within the city comprises about 838km of carriageways and 1300km of footways. This is supplemented by a network of footpaths, bridleways,

cycle tracks and other vehicle free paths. A desktop survey was undertaken in November 2010 to estimate the length of this network. The survey included those paths shown on our Definitive Map and those which are currently only recorded in our List of Streets. In addition the survey sought to identify those routes which are not shown in either of these two principal records.

1.3.5 The total network identified was approximately 185km. The survey also identified about 33km of cycle tracks which were associated with a carriageway in lieu of a footway.

1.3.6 The findings of the survey are summarised in the table shown below.



1.4 Useful Definitions

1.4.1 Public rights of way are highways. Legally, they only differ from the roads which you drive along by the types of traffic entitled to use them. There are two types of public path within the city and they are shown below. Public path is a collective term for public rights of way.

- Footpaths are for use by people on foot.
- Bridleways are open to walkers, equestrians and cyclists.

1.4.2 A permissive path is a path which the landowner permits the public to use, with the intention that it should not become a public right of way.

- 1.4.3 Cycle tracks are routes over which the public have a right of way on pedal cycle, with or without a right of way on foot. They can be associated with an adjacent carriageway, usually in lieu of a footway, or be independent from any other route.

The Definitive Map and Statement

- 1.4.4 The council has a duty under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to keep a definitive map and statement (the definitive map) of public rights of way under constant review. The definitive map is the legal record of public rights of way and records footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways. Inclusion on the definitive map is conclusive evidence of the existence of the right of way. However, the reverse is not true, as paths not shown on the definitive map may also carry public rights. It is the duty of the council to make sure the definitive map reflects reality by modifying it to remove discrepancies between the rights that exist and those that are recorded. The council must make and confirm a definitive map modification order, which must be supported by suitable legal evidence, before a change can be made to the definitive map.
- 1.4.5 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 introduced a cut off date of 1st January 2026 for many unrecorded public rights of way. The rules relating to this are rather complex and have yet to be agreed but, essentially, any public path which was in existence before 1949 but is not recorded could be extinguished. Consequently there is a need to record any such routes on the definitive map before the 2026 cut off date.

1.5 Sources of Information

- 1.5.1 The assessment undertaken within this RoWIP draws heavily upon the results of a rights of way questionnaire which was undertaken in 2006 as part of the consultation on our first RoWIP. The questionnaire was distributed to all households in the city and it was also available on the council's website. A total of 537 responses were received. On comparing the questionnaire survey sample with the census, our questionnaire sample had a large over-representation of both white and more elderly respondents compared to the population as a whole. However, this was found to be similar to RoWIP survey samples experienced elsewhere within the region.
- 1.5.2 Quotations from the rights of way questionnaire and from the minutes of the Local Access Forum are included to add support to the RoWIP where necessary.

"A wonderful resource, to be maintained & expanded, please, to the limits of the budget"

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

1.6 The Leicester City Local Access Forum

- 1.6.1 Local Access Forums are statutorily prescribed bodies, introduced by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Their main function is to advise their appointing authority regarding the improvement of public access to land for the purposes of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area. Dealing with the Local Access Forum will also become more relevant as the council picks up on the Government's localism agenda.

- 1.6.2 As of January 2011 the Leicester City Local Access Forum (Local Access Forum) has held 28 meetings since its inaugural meeting in January 2005. Minutes from the latest meetings and details of forthcoming meeting are available on the council website.
- 1.6.3 The council is required, under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to consult with their forum on the preparation of its RoWIP. The production of this RoWIP has been discussed at formal meetings of the Local Access Forum and at an informal Workshop requested by its members. The Workshop was used to help members direct the council on the content and general direction of the RoWIP. It was also used as an opportunity for members to advise on actions to be included within the RoWIP.

"In an attempt to offer better advice as to the possible content of a revised RoWIP the Forum offered to meet with officers at a workshop on this subject. Items for consideration at the workshop could include; proposed physical improvements to the network, fulfilment of statutory obligations, closer Forum involvement, gaps in the network, previous Forum recommendations and quick wins."

Local Access Forum, Minute 8, Leicester's Rights of Way Improvement Plan, Tuesday 3rd August 2010

- 1.6.4 The RoWIP is recognised, by the council and the Local Access Forum, as being one of the most important areas in which they can make significant inputs. The Handbook for LAF Members, published by Natural England in March 2008, echoes this view and encourages forums to undertake a wider role in the implementation of the RoWIP. The production of a forward work programme is considered necessary to give forums a clear direction and purpose. The work programme of the Local Access Forum will be developed to match, as closely as possible, the programme of work to be undertaken within the RoWIP. This should ensure that advice issued by the Local Access Forum is relevant and meaningful. It should also help to monitor and encourage continual progress on the actions identified within the RoWIP.

Plate 1f



Chapter 2 **Contributing to The Wider Agenda**

This chapter demonstrates the role of the rights of way network and the improvements recommended within the Rights of Way Improvement Plan in the wider context of One Leicester and the Local Transport Plan.

2.1 One Leicester

- 2.1.1 The Leicester Partnership's Sustainable Community Strategy, 'One Leicester', adopted in 2008, sets out a 25 year vision for the city. One Leicester was developed after extensive consultation across the city and is supported by all of the members of Leicester Partnership – the group that represents the main public, private, voluntary and community organisations in Leicester.
- 2.1.2 The vision is to transform Leicester into Britain's most sustainable city and in doing so, to deliver a beautiful city, with confident people and a new prosperity. Leicester will be a great place to live but also somewhere that does not place a burden on the planet in future years. To realise the vision One Leicester has the following three goals:
- Confident people
 - Greater prosperity
 - Beautiful place
- 2.1.3 To meet these goals One Leicester has developed the following seven key priorities, those in bold being particularly relevant to the implementation of the RoWIP:
- Investing in our children.
 - **Planning for people not cars.**
 - **Reducing our carbon footprint.**
 - **Creating thriving, safe communities.**
 - **Improving wellbeing and health.**
 - **Talking up Leicester.**
 - Investing in skills and enterprise.
- 2.1.4 To support the One Leicester vision the RoWIP will actively contribute towards these goals as follows:
- Planning For People Not Cars**
- 2.1.5 The idea of 'people not cars', has been central to the historical creation and development of our network of rights of way. Likewise the legislative framework supporting the network has been developed to protect the rights of non-motorised users. The network is, therefore, ideally equipped to facilitate the development of a city where the use of non-motorized transport is the preferred choice for shorter and mid distance journeys.
- 2.1.6 Implementation of the recommendations within the RoWIP will ensure that the network is legally protected, maintained and developed to cope with the increased use which will be generated when the One Leicester vision is fulfilled.

Reducing Our Carbon Footprint

- 2.1.7 In addition to facilitating carbon neutral travel, the rights of way network is also formed by basic infrastructure. In many instances the infrastructure required to support some of our most well used paths is simply provided by the use of good ground maintenance practices.
- 2.1.8 Owing to the narrow width required for the purpose of pass and repass, rights of way offer an ideal location where the planting of landscaping and trees could be considered.

Creating Thriving, Safe Communities

- 2.1.9 The rights of way network includes many well used paths which are used to access local facilities and public transport for onward journeys. Many of these paths provide the shortest and quickest route and also allow for the use of free of charge transport.
- 2.1.10 The introduction of the recommendations within the RoWIP will improve the safety of path users and address many of the negative images which often accompany areas where criminal activity or anti social behaviour are present. They will also protect the well used paths which serve our local communities and seek to identify new routes providing for better connected communities.

Improving Wellbeing and Health

- 2.1.11 In addition to utilitarian use, the majority of users access the network for the purposes of recreation and physical exercise. The network is ideally placed to provide access to areas of the natural environment, parks and open spaces.
- 2.1.12 The RoWIP will provide further opportunities and promote routes which enable users to access open spaces and be close to nature.

Talking up Leicester

- 2.1.13 Fulfilment of the objectives of the RoWIP will result in a rights of network which is of immense benefit to the people of Leicester and its visitors. The network could then be promoted as an example of good practice amongst other local authorities.
- 2.1.14 The Local Access Forum offers the public an opportunity to become directly involved in matters relating to rights of way, and to help shape the future of our network. The RoWIP seeks to strengthen the role and membership of the Forum so this will further increase the opportunities for public involvement.

2.2 Leicester's Local Transport Plan 2011 to 2026 - 'Planning For People Not Cars'

- 2.2.1 The contribution made by our rights of way towards the high level objectives of Leicester's Local Transport Plan 2011 to 2026 (LTP3) and particularly those relating to accessibility is recognised within the LTP3. The RoWIP and LTP3 have been prepared parallel and consequently share many common objectives.

2.2.2 We have carefully considered our LTP3 objectives, in addition to feedback from our Local Access Forum, and have created our high level policy statement to reflect how the development of our rights of way network is embraced by, and integrated with, our LTP3 process.

Rights of Way Improvement Plan Policy Statement:

'Leicester City Council aims to manage, improve and promote its local rights of way network, within and around the city, to facilitate non-motorised access to services and to provide leisure and recreational opportunities to all residents of and visitors to the city'
Leicester's Local Transport Plan 2011 to 2026 – 'Planning For People Not Cars'

2.2.3 The following seven high level objectives have been developed within LTP3. The objectives will be used to help guide the development of the Statement of Action and the programme of schemes contained within the RoWIP.

- **Reduce Congestion and Improve Journey Times**
 We will develop and maintain our rights of way network to assist in achieving this objective by facilitating proportionally more walking and cycling trips on the rights of way network.
- **Improve Connectivity and Access**
 We will improve access to everyday services, places of work, schools, leisure and shopping by extending the rights of way network to improve links from residential areas to such services.
- **Improve Safety, Security and Health**
 We will help improve people's health and well being and continue to reduce the number of people killed or hurt on the road network by attracting proportionally more trips to be taken on the rights of way network by extending and promoting it.
- **Improve Air Quality and Reduce Noise**
 We will facilitate proportionally more walking and cycling trips on the network to reduce the effects of traffic omissions and noise.
- **Reduce Carbon Emissions**
 We will facilitate proportionally more walking and cycling trips on the network to reduce the effects of carbon omissions as a result of vehicular traffic.
- **Manage to Better Maintain Transport Assets**
 We will continue to improve the condition of our rights of way network and make it easier to use by improving our inspection and maintenance regimes.
- **Quality of Life**
 We will take every possible opportunity to improve, extend and promote our rights of way network through the land use and transport planning processes to provide the highest possible quality leisure facilities for walkers, cyclists, equestrians and disabled users.

Equality Impact Assessment

2.2.5 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is a process by which the impact of policies and

services on communities, users and non-users is assessed. The process involves consultation with service users and stakeholders to identify and measure unequal outcomes or unmet needs, thus challenging discrimination and meeting duties under legislation. The results of the consultation can be used to develop equality objectives and targets that can be integrated into the business planning process. The EIA is an important tool as it helps us to understand the needs and concerns of diverse communities to make informed decisions and to increase public involvement and openness in shaping services. Completion of EIAs is a key stage towards the council achieving level 4 of the Equality Standards.

- 2.2.6 The EIA on the first RoWIP was completed in 2007. The assessment made no further recommendation other than to support those included within the in RoWIP. The EIA for LTP3 also covers the RoWIP, hence its recommendations have been absorbed into this plan.

Chapter 3 **Making the Assessment**

In this chapter we have undertaken the assessment of the network as required within section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. To assure compliance with the legislation we have also included a summary of our assessment to address the three specific points included within the legislation. The recommendations arising from this chapter are carried forward to the Statement of Action in Chapter 4.

3.1 **The Rights of Way Network**

3.1.1 To commence our assessment we have undertaken a desk based study of our definitive map, list of streets and other highway records which we have available.

The Definitive Map & Statement and The List of Streets


- 3.1.2 The council became responsible for the definitive map & statement (the definitive map) when it acquired unitary status in 1997. The current length recorded on the definitive map is 65.5km. Using our experience and knowledge of the network, it is considered that there are over 33km of additional paths which still need to be recorded on the definitive map and over 60km of paths whose status still needs to be determined.
- 3.1.3 The fact that the definitive map is incomplete does cause problems with uncertainty over the status of routes. It can also lead to routes being the subject of gating or closure, without any legal order and associated public consultation. The first RoWIP identified the production of the definitive map as a key priority for the council. The Local Access Forum has also taken a keen interest in the production of the definitive map and a report outlining progress made with mapping is presented to each of their meetings.
- 3.1.4 As the 2026 cut off date approaches, the council will have to redouble its efforts towards the production of the definitive map, if it is to protect the network for future use and to avoid losing well known routes as a result of this cut off date.
- 3.1.5 The legal cases of Gulliksen v Pembrokeshire County Council and the more recent Ley v Devon County Council have caused the status of paths crossing council housing areas to be questioned. The council now has an obligation to consider the status of many previously unrecorded paths. The total length of the paths within council housing estates is not known, so it is difficult to estimate how much work would be involved in investigating and mapping those paths found to be public rights of way.
- 3.1.6 In addition to changes to the definitive map made by the council, members of the public can also make an application to modify the map. The introduction of the 2026 cut off date and the incomplete nature of our definitive map may lead to a flurry of such applications. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 placed a duty on the council to produce a register of definitive map modification order applications on its website and in a paper format

3.1.7 The Wildlife and Countryside (Definitive Maps and Statements) Regulations 1993 require the definitive map to be made available in a paper format at a scale of not less than 1 to 25,000. With the creation of new technologies the definitive map can now be provided to all those with the ability to display digital mapping. Access to a digital version of the definitive map would be beneficial to various other groups within the council, including those dealing with local land charge searches, planning applications and highways maintenance. Whilst the definitive map is incomplete, it has previously been difficult to offer access to the mapping without the professional advice offered by officers working with the mapping.

3.1.8 Public rights of way are shown on the CityStreAtZ web based application on the council website. This gives access to a map showing public rights of way. It does not, however, provide access to the statement. More work is required on this mapping application to develop broader functionality, including access to the statement, promoted routes, local walking and riding opportunities and limitations to use owing to surface, gradients and steps, and lawful barriers.

3.1.9 To provide users with a seamless record of rights of way it would be necessary to combine our records with these of the county council. Currently the publically available records for both are silent on those of the neighbouring authority.

Plate 3a



The rights of way information shown on CityStreAtZ requires reviewing to ensure that it contains relevant and current information on the rights of way network.

3.1.10 Even though the definitive map is incomplete, it does contain a number of anomalies, such as paths which are either obstructed or fail to connect highway with highway or any meaningful destination. A number of such anomalies have already been removed from the map via a series of stopping up and diversion orders. The Local Access Forum has considered a number of the mapping anomalies and they have advised the council how it could effect changes to remove them from the map.

3.1.11 Although the definitive map is incomplete, it is still possible to identify missing links within the network. Our focus will be on completing missing links needed to ensure the continuity of quality routes between the city and county cycling networks, particularly where they provide new journey opportunities between residential areas, public transport links and other public facilities. Where appropriate, we will provide individual new links likely to arise in association with workplace travel plans. Potentially the incomplete nature of the definitive map is advantageous as it could allow for paths to be added at a higher status which would take into account the needs of more users.

3.1.12 The council has a duty, under the Highways Act 1980, to keep an up to date List of Streets. The List of Streets contains an alphabetical list of highways - streets, footpaths, bridleways and cycle tracks - that are adopted as maintainable at public expense. It also lists those highways that are unadopted (maintained privately).

"Inspection of the Council's list of streets has revealed a number of paths which cannot be identified."

Local Access Forum, Minute 11 Maintenance of Rights of Way, Wednesday 11th June 2008

3.1.13 Although two distinctly separate records, there is duplication between the definitive map and the List of Streets, as they both record information about the same paths. The definitive map records the existence and status of the path and the List of Streets identifies whether the council is responsible for its maintenance. So that both records can be cross referenced, the definitive map reference number is also shown within the List of Streets.

Links to Leicestershire County

3.1.14 There is a total of 31 rights of way and 59 roads crossing the boundary between the city and the county. The Local Access Forum has previously highlighted the importance of these routes, as they provide cross boundary access for city residents to the wider network of rights of way within the county, and access to facilities within the city for county residents.

"Ensure continuity of paths at the city county boundary"

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

3.1.15 A major strength of our transport planning work is our partnership with Leicestershire County Council. We are already delivering many areas of work jointly, including management and operation of bus services, park and ride services and traffic management and monitoring. As the network of paths crosses the boundary between the city and the county, it is clear that joint working will have to be undertaken to ensure that cross boundary paths have:

- Uniform legal status.
- Coordinated maintenance regimes.
- Harmonised standards (particularly regarding access controls on rights of way).
- Where appropriate, jointly delivered improvement schemes.

3.2 The Needs of Users and The Paths They Use

3.2.1 The focus of the assessment will now consider the more specific requirements of certain classes of users. As the needs of pedestrians are adequately covered by the requirements of other users, it is not considered necessary to include a section dedicated to their needs.

Disabled People and The Partially Sighted

3.2.2 Leicester has slightly higher proportions of people in the 'fairly good' and 'not good' health categories, compared with the census figures for England & Wales, but there

was less difference for people with limiting long-term illness. Using figures from the 2001 census, there were around 52,500 people (around 18.8% of the population) who stated that they had a limiting long term illness compared to 18.2% nationally. 17.2% of respondents to our rights of way questionnaire stated that they either had a physical or visual disability.

3.2.3 Disabled people require, and should expect, access to all modes of transport. Our work to benefit disabled people must, therefore, be wide-ranging in order to reflect the breadth of access issues. On the basis of recent inspections of our rights of way, many of the paths appeared to be usable by disabled people, if only they could get on to and off them. The most common obstructions were unsuitable gates, gaps and stiles, areas of local overgrowth and unmanageable gradients. It is essential for us to ensure that the removal or replacement of barriers which restrict access for those with limited mobility:

- Does not permit illegal use of the network, e.g. by horse-riders on footpaths, or by motorcycles.
- Does not substantially change the character of the route e.g. providing an artificial surface on open fields in sensitive areas.
- Is appropriate and sympathetic to local land uses e.g. where livestock is being kept.
- Is not unreasonably expensive to implement.

3.2.4 The Equality Act 2010 (formerly the Disability Discrimination Act 1995) makes it unlawful to discriminate against anyone on the grounds of their disability in connection with the provision of goods and services. There is no specific reference within the act or case law referring to its application to the management of rights of way. It does, however, require reasonable provision to be made where a route may not be fully accessible to those with limited mobility, whenever an appropriate opportunity arises.

3.2.5 Often small-scale changes can deliver real benefits in improving access to the rights of way network for disabled groups. It is also worth noting that, as well as wheelchair users, there are a considerable number of other users, including, young children and those using prams or pushchairs, elderly people who are just not particularly active and even people with dogs, who may be hindered by barriers which prevent wheelchair access.

"I would be taken out more often by my wife in my wheelchair if there was easier access for wheelchairs and more information regarding suitable routes".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

3.2.6 For people with visual impairments, previous experience has told us that well defined step edges and continuous handrails are important. People want clear signage and way marking in large print and good tonal contrast.

3.2.7 Legislation introduced under the Disability Discrimination Act prompted a study by the council's Parks Services Section to assess the accessibility of their parks and open spaces. The council will work with the Local Access Forum and disability access

groups to ensure that shared and appropriate standards, for access points, gates, surfaces and gradients, will be achieved across the council. The detailed rights of way asset register will include the locations of impediments.

- 3.2.8 There are many physical barriers in the form of stiles, gates or other such restrictions on the network. A survey undertaken on the known network in 2006 found over 650 barriers of some form or another. In comparison just over 500 entrances to paths were found to be barrier free.

Plate 3b



Muddy and wet sections of path such as this on an otherwise dry and level network of paths present an obvious obstruction to disabled and ill prepared users.

Plate 3c



This gate was originally installed to prevent vehicular use. Users were initially expected to negotiate the anti motorcycle trap to the right. Users now have to follow the unmade and frequently wet path to the left of the gate.

- 3.2.9 Even where barriers were installed with good intentions, it is clear that, in many instances, they represent an unlawful obstruction to some users. In particular, stiles represent an obstruction, to some degree, to all users. It is probable that stiles were initially intended to control livestock but this need has now greatly reduced as the grazing of animals is restricted to only a couple of locations within the city. In all instances stiles within the city could be replaced with more user friendly features.

"I agree with the fencing and gating of paths and green spaces to stop the increasing use of mini motos and motorcycles, but these in turn also stop disabled users from accessing them".
Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

- 3.2.10 It is likely that gates and other such restrictions were introduced in an attempt to prevent unlawful motorised use but this has resulted in the installation of many different types of barrier on the network. Some of these have proved to be sympathetic to the access needs of users however others only serve as an unlawful obstruction to those who have a legal right to use the path. Many can be too narrow for double buggies or mobility scooters to pass. After measuring a range of pushchairs, wheelchairs and scooters, gaps of 1.10(±0.05)m between posts should be passable by all legitimate users. Unfortunately, they would also be passable by cyclists, motorcyclists and riders of smaller "quads". While cyclists may be legitimate users of certain routes, motorcyclists and quad riders are generally deemed anti-

social. The Government has acknowledged the contradiction that, in providing access to legitimate users, we permit abuse and has reinforced Local Authorities' and the Police Forces' powers of enforcement and prosecution.

"A key issue for cyclists is the removal of presumably lawful obstructions, gates which require cyclists to dismount are near impossible to get through with a bike or a push chair".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

- 3.2.11 Steps form barriers to wheeled users of rights of way but the needs of visually impaired users are often overlooked. If steps are necessary at a particular location, they should include clearly-contrasting edges and nosings to the treads and, ideally, at least one highly-visible, self-coloured handrail extending the full length of each flight with a definite end. Neither feature needs to be unduly expensive, if specified at the design stage.
- 3.2.12 Gradients, especially descents, and unbound surfaces are another common deterrent for wheeled users. Many wheelchair-bound people have a real and legitimate fear of falling forward and out of the chair when descending a slope. Similarly, users of mobility scooters have reported the fear of falling over when they have to negotiate a descending corner because, at some point, the scooter will be leaning sideways. The location of all such obstructions should, wherever possible, be included on published leaflets and information made available to users.
- 3.2.13 Overhanging branches restrict headroom: on bridleways, the British Horse Society recommends that branches should be cut back to provide 3 meters. This permits some growth before pruning is carried out when the headroom has reduced to about 2.5 meters. The Rights of Way Act 1990 amended the Highways Act 1980 to empower highway authorities to require neighbouring landowners to prune their trees appropriately over bridleways.

Cyclists and Cycle Tracks

- 3.2.14 Our East Midlands household travel survey told us that 29% of the 1,045 sample Leicester households had access to a bike. Cycling provides the flexibility of travel from any origin to any destination, at any time, and is a practical solution for journeys of up to about five miles. It is a way of improving accessibility to sites that are not well served by public transport and has obvious health benefits.
- 3.2.15 National census and school travel plan data for Leicester suggests a growing popularity in cycling and a significant suppressed demand, particularly amongst young people. There are already more than 60km of signed cycle routes across the city which the Cyclists' Touring Club's cycle benchmarking exercise confirmed as being of high quality.
- 3.2.16 There is no legal requirement to record cycle tracks on the definitive map. Cycle tracks which form part of the highway and are not associated with a carriageway are recorded in the List of Streets, although this record is incomplete. The List of Streets does not currently record those cycle tracks which are associated with an adjacent

carriageway, neither does it identify which other users are permitted to use them. If the record in the List of Streets is to be more complete, it will require expanding to include all cycle tracks, regardless of whether they are associated with an adjacent carriageway. It will also need to record these users who are permitted to use them.

"I'm about to start cycling to work and would like to know what routes are available".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

3.2.17 Cycle tracks which do not form part of the highway would be recorded as permissive paths. The use of some of these routes, on a permissive basis, may not be the most satisfactory way to secure their continued use by the public. Permissive paths lack the legal protection afforded to highways, consequently they can be closed to the public without the need for any legal order or public consultation. Additionally, permissive paths may not be maintained to a suitable level. The council has a legal duty to maintain highways which are maintainable at public expense, whereas a landowner merely has an obligation to maintain a permissive path.

3.2.18 The National Cycle Network (NCN) is co-ordinated by Sustrans and forms a comprehensive network of safe and attractive cycle routes running throughout the country. The network follows a combination of traffic-free paths and quiet streets. The city is bisected by NCN 6, which runs north to south across the city, and NCN 63, which runs east to west. In addition to the NCN, the city is also served by other named cycle routes, such as Belgrave Way and Knighton Way, which provide additional linear routes suitable for cyclists accessing the city. The Green Ringway is an orbital cycle and pedestrian route around Leicester using routes through parks and open spaces, to link schools, hospitals, the National Cycle Network and other named cycle routes within the city. Much of the Green Ringway has already been implemented but its final route is still under review.

Plate 3d



The Great Central Way forms part of NCN6, this section of the route in Aylestone is well used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, and is unrecorded and unadopted.

"The cycle network needs to be properly joined up with new links so that everyone can start to cycle virtually direct from their home rather than feeling they have to risk life and limb before enjoying a more relaxing route or even feeling they need to transport their bike by car to a suitable point. The idea of a circular route(s) is excellent".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

Equestrians and Bridleways

3.2.19 Our rights of way questionnaire found that only 2% of users access the network for the purpose of horse riding, although 41% of path users were aware that they have used a bridleway. Equestrian use within the city is primarily limited to areas within Aylestone Meadows and Beaumont Leys. Any enhancement of the equestrian network would, therefore, be most beneficial in these areas of the city or on the routes extending from these areas out into the county.

Plate 3e



Equestrians using a bridleway within the Beaumont Leys where use is increased by the presence of a local riding school.

Plate 3f



Verges like this one on Bennion Road, could be considered for part of wider advertised routes for equestrians.

3.2.20 Enhancements in the network of routes available to equestrians could be easily achieved by the mapping of paths as bridleways where the surface is, or can be readily made, suitable. This would offer instant benefit to equestrians, at minimal cost to the council, and would also have the added benefit of allowing cyclist to use these paths, as bridleways are open to pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. The identification of wide verges for use by equestrians could also be considered, especially when promoting circular routes within the city or as part of wider routes crossing into the county.

"I would like to see verges kept clear and useable by both horses and pedestrians".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

3.2.21 Any improvements for equestrians will have to be balanced against the needs of different users. As has been stated in the 'user hierarchy' in LTP3, pedestrians will have the highest priority, followed by cyclists. Equestrian users will have the lowest priority. This hierarchy is appropriate in an urban environment due to much lower equestrian usage on the network. Even so, minor improvements, such as mounting blocks and removal of overhanging vegetation, could be considered where identified as being necessary to provide route continuity.

3.2.22 Equestrian users within the city have expressed a wish for a number of cycle tracks and routes across parks to be made available for their use. This would in turn create a cross city route for equestrians. Any such route would have to be considered with

regard to needs of other path and parks users. Given the probable amount of usage, there may be some benefit from pursuing this suggestion, if only on a permissive basis.

"Equestrians have also used the other main parks in the city. It would be easy to link the parks together to allow a long distance trail through the city. "

Local Access Forum, Minute 9 Members Question – Equestrian Use in Parks, Thursday 28th May 2009

3.3 Maintenance of Paths

3.3.1 The impact which path maintenance has upon the needs of users is now explored as part of the wider assessment.

Maintenance of Paths Maintainable at Public Expense

3.3.2 Maintenance needs are identified from reports by the public and inspections undertaken by officers in Highway Management. The most common request for maintenance involves the cutting back of vegetation and, as such, can be predicted in line with new seasonal growth in areas where this is known to be a perennial problem. The introduction of an annual programme of vegetation clearance would easily address this problem.

3.3.3 The 22% of paths on the network which do not have a sealed surface, and those which have steps or steep gradients, also give rise to increased requests for maintenance. To address this problem it may be necessary to undertake additional inspections on these paths.

3.3.4 To assist those officers undertaking inspections, it would be helpful if an asset register could be produced to identify the location of signs and waymarkers, paths which are not formed of a sealed surface and the location of steps and steep gradients. The asset register would also help to identify areas where additional signage or improved surfaces would be beneficial.

3.3.5 In addition to inspections undertaken by the council, it may be beneficial to encourage volunteers to report problems encountered on the paths which they regularly use. The use of walking audits, especially those which are undertaken with a view to the needs of people with limited mobility or who are partially sighted, would also be beneficial when considering maintenance or improvements to the network.

3.3.6 A number of large maintenance items were identified within the first edition of the RoWIP. Completion of some of

Plate 3g



Melton Brook runs along a section of the city county boundary. The brook is crossed by a bridleway, which runs from the city towards the village of Barkby Thorpe. The bridleway crosses the brook via a ford. Users also used to be able to cross on a footbridge, seen to the right of ford, which has now fallen into a state of disrepair.

these, most notably work to King William's Bridge, was undertaken during the period covered by the first RoWIP. A number of these items, however, remain outstanding, the most notable being the requirement for a footbridge over Melton Brook. The bridge is required to replace a previous structure which is beyond repair. The bridge is located at a piped ford across the brook which is only passable during periods of dry weather. Our ability to undertake expensive work items will be restricted by the current financial situation. Alternative solutions or remedial measures may therefore, have to be considered for our major work items.

"I find dog mess, broken glass and metal bottle tops a particular problem, especially when I have kids with me".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

- 3.3.7 In addition to maintenance, it is important to users that paths are subject to regular cleansing to remove dog mess, litter and graffiti. Closer involvement with Cleansing Services will need to be undertaken to ensure that paths are subject to regular inspections and cleansing. The installation of dog poop scoop bins may be beneficial in some areas, in addition to a programme of information and education for dog owners.

Permissive Paths and Paths Not Maintained at Public Expense

- 3.3.8 There is no statutory duty for the council to record the location of permissive paths. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 however, placed a duty on the council to produce a register of declarations made under section 31A of the Highways Act 1980. Section 31 outlines the defences a landowner can take to ensure that a permissive path crossing their land never becomes a public right of way.

- 3.3.9 It is not known at present how many permissive paths there are within the city. As the definitive mapping work progresses, a more accurate picture should develop of the extent of the permissive network.

- 3.3.10 There are many well known and well used paths, including sections of the National Cycle Network, which have previously been considered as being permissive paths. Given the time they have been in use, the council may have to now reconsider the status of many of these routes.

- 3.3.11 Maintenance of permissive paths is the responsibility of the owner of the land over which they pass who may not be best suited or equipped to undertake or fund regular

Plate 3h



This path runs through Beaumont Park and connects the Beaumont Centre with the residential area to the south. The status of the path is currently unknown as it is not included anywhere within our highway records.


inspections and work. This can mean that they are not subject to any recognised programme of inspections or planned maintenance work, unlike highway maintainable at public expense which is maintained by the council under a statutory duty. The lack of planned inspections and maintenance work, over a prolonged period of time, can result in deterioration to the path surface and its associated features. It can also result in delays in responding to requests from users for maintenance improvements.

"The council fully investigates the status of the Great Central Way to reflect its use by walkers, cyclists and equestrians".
Local Access Forum, Minute 15 Equestrian Use on The Great Central Way, Thursday 10th April 2008

3.3.12 Ideally all permissive paths which are found to be public paths should be adopted as maintainable at public expense. Unfortunately, without the completion of remedial works, the condition of some of these paths may not be to a standard which would be suitable for them to be immediately considered for adoption. The cost of any remedial works prior to adoption would be the responsibility of the landowner. Adoption of substandard paths would place an unnecessary burden on the council’s highway maintenance budget.

3.4 The Barriers Which Prevent Use of The Network

3.4.1 Within our rights of way questionnaire we asked users what would encourage them to use the network more. We also asked non users, although a much smaller sample of 55 respondents, what would encourage them to use the network. The main elements that respondents prioritised first, to encourage people to use the network are shown on the graph below.



3.4.2 The reasons given fall within two broad groups; physical barriers, dog mess, litter, vandalism, signing, surfacing, etc. The physical barriers should be addressed by the measures already covered within this assessment. The non physical barriers; personal safety, maps and leaflets, etc, will be considered further in the remainder of this assessment.

Crime, Disorder and Misuse by Motorised Vehicles

3.4.3 Not feeling safe is the main reason given by users and non users for not using the network more. This is particularly true for women, elderly people and for children getting home from school in winter. We have already been working with our local community safety partnerships to identify where appropriate street lighting improvements could help reduce such fears and encourage use of the network.

"As an over 55 years old woman, feeling safe is one of the main points for me".
Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

3.4.4 Leicestershire Constabulary has developed the concept of Joint Action Groups after successfully trialling ‘patch walks’ in Beaumont Leys. Patch walks are a practical way of bringing together the Crime and Disorder Partnership, Police, Highway Authority, local councillors, officers and residents to assess ways to improve lighting, visibility on footpaths and to reduce areas of vandalism. The aim is to encourage everyone to work together to reduce crime and the fear of crime, thus removing an additional barrier to walking and cycling trips.

3.4.5 In addition to patch walks, the safer routes programme has revitalised the use of walking audits. Their primary purpose is to identify physical barriers (lack of dropped kerbs, guard rails, overgrown shrubbery etc.) in the pedestrian environment, but they also overlap with patch walks in assessing psychological barriers (unkempt areas, overgrown shrubbery, loiterers, lack of lighting etc). The aim of a walking audit is to remove barriers to encourage more walking and cycling trips.

3.4.6 There are occasions when the council is asked to install a barrier to address misuse by motorised vehicles. Recent work undertaken in Beaumont Leys has caused the council to concede to the opinion that no barrier is capable of preventing use by motorcycles whilst still maintaining access to all lawful users. At best, all barriers can do is deter motorised users and act as a speed reduction barrier.

3.4.7 The use of a methodology promoted by British Waterways, in their document Motorcycles on Towpaths – Guidance on Managing The

Plate 3i



Recent work to address misuse by motorcycles has seen a coordinated effort involving the police. One of the measures introduced was the installation of signs warning offenders.

Problem and Improving Access For All, was applied whilst addressing the problem. The process caused rights of way officers to work closely with Leicestershire Constabulary, representatives on the Joint Action Group within the Safer Leicester Partnership, ward councillors, members of the local community, the Local Access Forum and path users.

- 3.4.8 The result of this joint working was the installation of signs warning offenders that the use of the motor vehicles was unlawful and could result in legal action against them. To maintain impact and freshness the signs were periodically moved to different locations within the area. Barriers, which are acceptable to user needs and beneficial in the policing of the area, were installed where the activity was most intensive and excessive speed was an issue. The effectiveness of the barriers is still being monitored; however early indications are that combined efforts have been successful as reports of unlawful use of motorcycles have decreased.
- 3.4.9 In extreme cases the use of lighting, CCTV and environmental works such as hedge clearance could be considered, however, these measures would usually only be used as a last resort.

Gating Orders

- 3.4.10 To date the council has only made one gating order since the introduction of the powers in 2006. A policy outlining how the council would consider applications for a gating order was produced in 2008. For an order to be made approval has to be obtained from both the Head of Community Safety and the Head of Transport Strategy. Unresolved objections to the order are discussed with the appropriate cabinet leads and the respective ward councillors, who then decide whether to enact the order.
- 3.4.11 In an attempt to mitigate the effect of gating orders on users and the connectivity of the network. The use of time specific orders, are considered preferable to those which permanently restrict the use of the path. The issuing of keys to local residents who may have a legitimate need to use the path has also been considered in an attempt to reduce to loss of access.

Information on Rights of Way and Circular Walks

- 3.4.12 Our questionnaire found that 90% of respondents had used the network in the past twelve months. A total of 88% of users travelled to the network on foot. It also revealed that 60% of users use the network for relaxation, with a further 52% citing health and fitness, as the main reason for using the network. The most popular frequency of use was two or three times a week. These figures would suggest that many users access the network as part of a circular leisure walk centred on their home. The council has, in the past, published a number of leaflets giving details of walks covering various areas of the city. Many of these guides are now no longer in print and none are available on the council website.
- 3.4.13 The Local Access Forum has also suggested that a number of circular walks be published covering different areas of the city. The possibility of cross working with the

county council was also suggested for walks. These walks could develop the suggestion of 'gateways to the countryside' which are offered by the use of rights of way on the urban fringe. Extended walks into the county could follow a linear route incorporating the use of public transport to complete the journey.

"It was suggested that these routes should also include a number which could be undertaken by equestrians and cyclists. The use of the term Circular Leisure Routes should also be avoided as the routes could also follow linear paths with the return journey being made by public transport."

Local Access Forum, Minute 6 Circular Leisure Routes, Thursday 17th January 2008

3.4.14 Our survey found that path users expect to obtain information on the network from the following sources.

- 49% Tourist Information Centre & council buildings.
- 48% Ordnance Survey Maps.
- 42% Word of Mouth.
- 33% Internet
- 32% Newspapers

3.4.15 There is some basic information on public rights of on the council website. The pages are, however, devoid of links to the mapping, information on recommended walks or other sources of information which may be of use to these wishing to use the network. Enquiries will be made with the Ordnance Survey to see whether details of the paths within the city can be added to their publications. Wider use of improved, path specific signage may also help users to identify and use the network. Signs containing destinations and distances or times give users more information on what the path can offer. Such signage also serves as an advertisement to non users.

"My 1:25,000 Ordnance Survey Explorer map has no information for rights of way within the city. Addressing this omission should be a priority".

Respondent to Rights of Way Questionnaire 2006

Mass Participation Events

3.4.16 During 2010 the council were involved in mass participation events with an aim to boosting levels of walking and cycling. In August Leicester's second annual SkyRide was held, the event attracted 12,500 people who followed a traffic free route around the city.

The Sky Ride event will take in the city's most iconic landmarks and sites with traffic-free streets, enabling cyclists to enjoy a day of bike-based entertainment and to explore their city on two wheels with family and friends. The free event aims to encourage thousands of people, of all ages and abilities, to get on their bikes.

Leicester City Council Press Release August 2010

3.4.17 In September 2010 the council participated in Leicestershire Walking Week. A number of walks were held in the city including one within the new Highcross Shopping Centre. The Leicester Marathon was held in October 2010 and attracted 578

participants, with a further 2,059 people entering the half marathon. All of these events used parts of the rights of way network. The RoWIP can help assist with similar events by providing a network which is suitable for use by mass participation events and ensuring that a legacy of information is available long after the event.

Health and Wellbeing

3.4.18 The public health strategy for the East Midlands, 'Investment for Health' (EMRA 2002), aims to improve the health of East Midland residents by reducing health inequalities year-on-year. In addition, the Director of Public Health in Leicestershire is keen to tackle obesity, the Leicester Lifestyle Survey in 2002 found that only 26% of adults took a minimum of 30 minutes of moderately intense activity on 5 days a week or more. We are contributing to these aims through the RoWIP by supporting healthy lifestyles and increasing physical activity levels through the promotion of cycling and walking routes, thus having a positive impact on physical and mental health.

3.4.19 In addition to facilitating walking journeys between local destinations, our Rights of Way Questionnaire showed that the primary uses of the network was for:

- Relaxation 60.2%
- Health and Fitness 52.5%
- Getting to Local Facility 26%
- Getting to Work 21%
- Dog Walking 16%
- To Visit an Attraction 14%

It is clear from these results that our network has a key role in providing for recreational journeys within the city.

3.4.20 To increase walking participation the council is involved in a number of initiatives. Let's Walk Leicester is funded by Leicester City Health Action Zone, it aims to develop a coordinated programme of walking activity that promotes and improves access to led and independent health walks. Health walks are usually led by a volunteer leader recruited from the local community and last for between 30 and 45 minutes. They are aimed at anyone who currently does very little or no physical activity. The council has also introduced a Walking For Health Scheme which encourages walking within the city parks and includes a regular programme of walking events.

3.4.21 The delivery of the RoWIP objectives will bring considerable benefit to these types of initiatives, as it will provide the basic framework to support the schemes. It will also ensure that the wider network of paths is suitable and able to meet the demands of these who are eager to explore the wider area.

Case Study: Great Central Way

Great Central Way runs from just west of the city centre southwards for approximately 5 kilometres to the city boundary then onwards towards Glen Parva, Whetstone and Blaby. The Great Central Way forms part of the National Cycle Route 6, and is regularly used by over 500 cyclists a day. Its route follows the line of the former Great Central Railway and lies

mid way between the A5460 Narborough Road and the A426 Lutterworth Road – Aylestone Road and is a vehicle free alternative to both of these main arterial routes. There are direct traffic free connections to Aylestone Road and Braunstone Lane East. Narborough Road is easily accessed via quiet residential streets. Cyclists using the route can easily record travel times from the city boundary to the city centre that are little different from rush hour bus timings. Sections of the route are well used by equestrians who enjoy use of the wide verges which are adjacent to the surface of the path.

The status of Great Central Way has never been recorded as it was considered to be a permissive path. The northernmost section of the route, between Evesham Road and Westbridge is however, recorded as being a cycle track maintainable at public expense, the last section being adopted in 2009. The southern section between Evesham Road and the city boundary and the links to Aylestone Road and Braunstone Lane East are still unrecorded and unadopted.

Being unadopted this section of the route is not subject to a prescribed maintenance regime. Consequently the surface is beginning to deteriorate and is hazardous for high speed cycling in some sections.


The route used to cross the Bowstring Bridge which was deemed unsafe for use. The section of the route crossing the Bowstring Bridge was the subject of a temporary closure on safety grounds, until its eventual demolition in 2010. The, at the time, unrecorded nature of the route became an issue for the council, when it considered the permanent stopping up of this section of the route, prior to removal of the bridge. To enable the route to be stopped up the council considered the route to be an unadopted cycle track.

To avoid similar problems along the unadopted section of the route it is proposed to introduce the following six point action plan. The action plan will ensure that the public right to use the route is protected, a suitable maintenance regime is introduced on the path to best serve the different uses who enjoy this facility

- The council dedicates the unrecorded sections of the route including the links to Braunstone Lane East and Aylestone Road to a status which reflects their use.
- Minor improvements are made to improve access to the route.
- A comprehensive signing scheme is implemented for the route.
- Consideration is given to the maintenance regimes for the adjacent verges and hedgerows to permit improved access for equestrians.
- The route is inspected to ensure that it is safe for use, to identify any necessary emergency or safety works and to enable the council to make a long term decision as to any necessary repair, adoption and subsequent maintenance.
- That an estimate be produced to determine the cost of bringing the path surface up to a standard which is suitable for adoption.

3.5 Summary of Our Assessment.

3.5.1 To gauge support for a number of the points in our statement of action our questionnaire asked which of the following proposed actions people strongly agreed with, the results are shown in the following graph.



3.5.2 To more accurately address the three areas of assessment included within the legislation we have summarised our assessment as follows:

- **The extent to which the rights of way network meets the present and likely future needs of the public.**

The council has yet to define the full extent of its rights of way network currently only 65km of routes are shown on the definitive map the status of a further 106km still need to be determined. Until this work is substantially completed it is difficult to assess how the network meets present or future needs. It is essential the council proceeds with this work in accordance with its statutory duties. However, as a consequence the network is not stymied by a poorly drafted map and there is opportunity to record unrecorded paths to a higher status to allow for a greater range of users.

There are a number of gaps within the network which need addressing to provide a more comprehensive network. Again some of this could be achieved by mapping to a higher status.

- **The opportunities provided by local rights of way for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area.**

A total of 90% of the respondents to our questionnaire had used the network in the past 12 months, with 60% of the use being for the purposes of relaxation. The network of paths within the city does provide good coverage across the city and to the wider areas of natural countryside surrounding the city. Work needs to be undertaken to widen the network of recorded bridleways and cycle tracks but this could easily be achieved by recording unrecorded paths to a higher status.

Production and promotion of circular walks, and greater accessibility to the definitive map and maps of other paths, coupled with a robust maintenance regime would help to widen the opportunities for recreation.

- **The accessibility of local rights of way to blind and partially sighted people and those with mobility difficulties.**

The majority of the network - 78% - follows paved surfaces, so accessibility along the network is relatively easy. The various gaps, gates and other barriers which have been installed across the network will need assessing with regard to accessibility. Likewise the information which is provided on the network needs to include references to such features which may impede access. The introduction of a more robust and pre-emptive maintenance regime would also help to improve accessibility.

Chapter 4 Realising The Potential of Our Rights of Way

This chapter contains our Statement of Action as required under section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. It also outlines how we intend to realise the recommendations made within our Statement of Action

4.1 The Statement of Action

4.1.1 The Statement of Action is the most important part of the RoWIP as it sets out the list of actions that we intend to take to improve the network and provide greater opportunities for people to use paths.

4.1.2 We have drawn up the following four target areas for improvement within the Statement of Action. Within each area, we have identified a number of individual actions that need to be undertaken to achieve the target. The target areas are listed below, along with a summary of what they are designed to achieve.

Statutory Duties Relating to Recording of Paths and Local Access Forum

- To provide an up to date and extensive Definitive Map & Statement to ensure that known paths are immune from the threat of the 2026 cut off.
- To complement the Definitive Map with a comprehensive record of other paths which are not required to be shown on the Definitive Map and Statement.
- To ensure that the council fulfils its legal requirements regarding the Local Access Forum.

Provide a Better Connected Network Suitable For All Users.

- To provide a network which is free from obvious anomalies, is well connected to the wider highway network and serves as many classes of user as is practically possible.

Provide a Network Which is Easy to Access and Use

- To introduce inspection and defect reporting regimes which will enable our network to be maintained to as high a standard as possible.
- To improve the accessibility of paths for people who are visually impaired or have limited mobility. We will also try to reduce the real and perceived public worries about personal safety on paths.

To Improve the Provision and Availability of Information on The Network

- To ensure that the Definitive Map & Statement is widely available in both paper and digital formats. To bolster this legal record with information on the network of other paths which are not required to be shown on the Definitive Map & Statement.
- To improve the provision of information about the network and access to the countryside.

4.1.3 To help us to achieve our improvements to the network we have prepared our Statement of Action shown in Table 4.1.

4.2 Involvement of Leicester Local Access Forum.

- 4.2.1 It is proposed that the views of the Local Access Forum will be sought for many of the individual actions within the Statement of Action. The council values the views of the Forum and they will be useful to help us determine whether our recommendations are appropriate to the needs of users. Given the depth of collective knowledge within the Forum, they may also be able to identify matters which we have overlooked or suggest alternative methods and approaches which will help towards our targets.
- 4.2.2 The Statement of Action indicates those items upon which it is intended to consult with the Local Access Forum. The forward programme of improvement, which arises out of the Statement of Action, will also be used to develop a forward works programme for the Forum.
- 4.2.3 It is also hoped that the Local Access Forum can be used as a means of measuring, or progress towards, the objectives set within the RoWIP. As the Forum is an independent body, made up of elected members and individuals who have an interest in rights of way matters, they are ideally placed to offer an unbiased appraisal of the progress being made by the council. Under section 94 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, the council is required to have regard to any relevant advice given to them by a Forum in carrying out its functions. This should ensure that the Forum can actively help the council to implement its RoWIP.
- 4.2.4 As part of the RoWIP we will consider how we can raise the profile of the Forum. This will involve an appraisal of the exposure currently given to the Forum. We will also seek to add increase the size of the membership of the Forum via a series of recruitment initiatives. This will ensure that the Forum membership remains within the limits set within the legislation and is bolstered by the input and enthusiasm of new members.

4.3 Delivery Incentives

- 4.3.1 There are the following high-level drivers for delivering improvements to the rights of way network:
- Some of the improvements which have been highlighted are a statutory responsibility. The council has no option but to undertake these duties.
 - Many of the improvements can be implemented relatively cheaply and with minimal disruption to users and local residents.
 - The improvements will contribute towards the wider objectives of the LTP3.
 - The improvements will help the council realise its 'One Leicester' vision.
 - A number of the proposals arise from suggestions made by the Local Access Forum and other path users.

4.4 Funding of The Works

- 4.4.1 The RoWIP works programme has been, and will continue to be, developed in parallel with the programmes arising from our LTP, with rights of way improvements being funded predominantly from the Integrated Transport capital programme and as part of new developments. A Draft Works Programme 2011 to 2021 is shown in Table 4.4. This will be refined on an annual basis depending on budget allocations, and also taking into account on-going joint working, advice from the Local Access Forum and identifying opportunities for match funding and contributions.
- 4.4.2 We will also work to identify alternative funding streams for work on the network. This could include seeking funding from other areas of the council, or securing external contributions from developers. The possibility of joint funding with the county council will also be explored with regard to schemes which cross the boundary. Contributions in the form of funding or voluntary working, from other external organisations will also be pursued.
- 4.4.3 The effects on funding, being brought about as a result of the Government's reduction of the budget deficit; will have an affect on how and to what extent the council funds its works. The exact details of how this reduction will affect the rights of way service provided by the council is not yet fully know. It is however, apparent that the use of alternative funding streams and or working practices will be necessary. The work of the Local Access Forum in identifying and lobbying for such funds will be of immense benefit with this aspect of funding.

Procurement

- 4.4.3 The council has in-house contractors delivering civil engineering and grounds maintenance services and a long-term partnership with a commercial public lighting contractor. Work of values up to £150,000 can be let to City Highways, the council's own civil engineering contractor, using our term highway maintenance contract. Most rights of way maintenance and improvements are likely to fall within its scope. Larger construction projects (£150k-£2m) are to be framework-contracted to a limited set of contractors.

Maintenance Works

- 4.4.4 Maintenance needs are identified from reports by the public and inspections by council officers. We have allocated £15,000 per annum in our highway maintenance revenue budget for routine maintenance.
- 4.4.5 The use of voluntary organisations could be considered and developed for some rights of way inspection, maintenance and improvement works.

4.5 Monitoring of Our Progress

- 4.5.1 The initiatives and projects will be managed and monitored through our established programme and project management arrangements, using our quality management system.

Local Access Forum

- 4.5.2 A number of the issues included in our Statement of Action will need further scrutiny and consideration by the Local Access Forum. The minutes of their meetings will, therefore provide a means of checking our progress. It is proposed that a summary of progress with the matters listed in the Statement of Action be considered by the Local Access Forum at their Annual Meeting. This will have to be discussed with, and agreed by, the Local Access Forum. The benefit of this would be that our progress could then be recorded in the Local Access Forum's Annual Report. The annual report has a wide circulation and would be a useful means of exposure for our efforts.

Department for Transport

- 4.5.3 As the RoWIP is integrated with the LTP, progress will be reported to the Department for Transport in accordance with their reporting requirements of local authorities.

Performance Indicators

- 4.5.4 To assist in monitoring the effectiveness of our Statement of Action we have adopted three high level performance indicators and have set targets for these indicators. The indicators are those relevant to the rights of way network and RoWIP taken from the LTP3.

Performance Indicator L LTP X: Percentage of Paths Easy to Use

- 4.5.5 'Easy to use' has been defined as a path that is "signposted or waymarked, free from unlawful obstruction, overhanging vegetation and will have surfaces and lawful barriers in good repair". Our rights of way network is an integral part of the highway network and, as such, has an important role in improving accessibility to everyday facilities as well as the wider county network for leisure use. The indicator is measured annually. We will allocate sufficient staff resources to make rapid progress to 95% as this represents good value for money.

Performance Indicator L LTP X: LTP3 Annualised Index of Cycling Trips

- 4.5.6 During the past five years we have recorded a large increase in the number of people cycling. We have improved our monitoring by installing ten radar-based continuous automatic cycle monitoring sites both on and off road. We have set our target to continue to increase cycling

Performance Indicator L LTP X 21: Percentage of People Doing Over 30 Minutes/Day Physical Exercise by Walking and/or Cycling.

- 4.5.7 We are keen to continue to promote healthy lifestyles both through improving access to healthy food and other initiatives to facilitate an increase in walking and cycling, arising from engineering, education or encouragement measures. Data for this indicator is to be obtained from the Sport England/MORI national (England) survey of participation in sport and recreational physical activity. This will assist in comparisons between Leicester and other areas.

4.6 Summary

- 4.6.1 The RoWIP fits very comfortably with our transport vision and objectives and strengthens our ability to deliver our LTP programme. The plan will be used by council officers, partners, consultants and developers to ensure consistent delivery of the desired improvements to the network. This is a living document that will develop and change over time, in line with our business planning and financial processes. We will be continually reviewing progress even though a new edition of the RoWIP is not formally required for another ten years.

The Statement of Action

Target Area For Improvement	Para.	Recommendation	Dates	Leicester City Council Partners	Statutory Duty?	Monitoring	
Statutory Duties Relating to Recording of Paths and Local Access Forum.	3.1.2 to 3.1.5	Produce a programme of mapping showing the order in which paths will be added to the definitive map, including these crossing council housing	2011 - 2026	Local Access Forum	Requirement of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	Progress measured against programme of mapping and anomaly removal. Minutes of Forum meetings and inspection of definitive map. High performance indicator reported.	
	3.1.3	Report progress made with the programme of mapping to each meeting of the Local Access Forum.	2011 - 2026				
	3.1.10	Identify anomalies on the definitive map and propose a programme of changes to effect their removal from the map.	2011 Then per programme.				
	3.1.6	Compile and maintain a register of definitive map modification order applications.	2010		Requirement of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.	Register present on council website.	
	3.1.14 3.1.15	Ensure that paths crossing the boundary between the city and the county are of uniform status	2011 - 2026	Leicestershire County Council, Local Access Forum, Leicestershire Local Access Forum	No	Minutes of Forum meetings.	
	3.1.12 3.1.13	Ensure that the List of Street and the Definitive Map form a set of compatible records.	2011 - 2026		Requirement of the Highways Act 1980, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 respectively.	Comparison of two documents.	
	3.2.16	Record cycle tracks forming part of the highway in the List of Streets. Identify within the List of Streets these routes which are part of the National Cycle Network and other named routes.	2011 - 2026	Sustrans	Requirement of the Highways Act 1980.	Inspection of List of Streets.	
	3.3.8 3.3.9	Compile a catalogue of known permissive paths including these cycle tracks which do not form part of the highway.	2011 - 2026		No	Catalogue available upon request.	
	3.3.8	Compile a register of declarations made under section 31A of the Highways Act 1980.	2011		Requirement of the Highways Act 1980.	Register present on council website.	
	4.2.4	Recruit new members to the Local Access Forum	2011	Local Access Forum	Requirement of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.	Minutes of Four meetings.	
	4.2.4	Consider how the profile of the Local Access Forum can be raised.	2012				
	4.2.4	Review information available regarding the work of the Local Access	2011				
	Provide a Better Connected Network Suitable For All Users	3.1.11	Identify any missing links within the network particularly linking communities with facilities and compliment with a series of site visits to prove usage by the public.	2011 - 2026	Local Access Forum, Users, Landowners	No	Minutes of Forum meetings. Works completed.
3.2.19		Identify routes, especially these within the Beaumont Leys and Aylestone Meadows areas, which would enhance the historical network of bridleways within the city.	Following mapping of these areas.				
3.2.22		Work with Parks Services and equestrian groups to explore the possibility of allowing equestrian use within a number of the city's parks.	2012	Park User Groups, Equestrian Users, Local Access Forum			
3.2.20		Identify wide verges which could be used by equestrians as part of a wider publicised route.	2012	Equestrian Users, Local Access Forum			
3.1.11		Consider the advantages of recording routes to a higher status to provide additional links for a wider range of users.	2011 - 2026	Sustrans, Local Access Forum, User Groups, Land Owners.			
3.11.2 3.12.1		Consider improved access to the waterside, the natural environment, parks and open spaces, either with additional routes or improvements to existing.	2013	Local Access Forum, Land Owners, British Waterways, Leicestershire County Council			
Provide a Network Which is Easy to Access and Use	3.3.2	Keeping routes free from obstructions.	Ongoing.		Requirement of the Highways Act 1980.	Routes free of obstruction. High performance indicator reported.	
	3.3.2	Produce an annual programme of maintenance to deal with the seasonal growth of vegetation at known problem areas.	2012 Then Ongoing.		No.		
	3.4.4 3.4.5	Respond to maintenance requests made on patch walks, walking audits and from users.	Ongoing.		Requirement of the Highways Act 1980.		
	3.3.5	Engage with known path users to encourage them to report defects on the network.	Ongoing.				
	3.2.11 3.2.12 3.3.3 3.3.4	Compile a list of locations of steps, steep gradients and unbound surfaces on the network and consider increased maintenance inspection frequencies where they are present.	2012 Then Ongoing.		No	List of locations available.	
	3.3.4	Produce an schedule of signs and waymarkers to develop an annual programme of maintenance and to identify where new signs and waymarkers are required.	2012 Then Ongoing.			Schedule complete. Programme complete and implemented. High performance indicator recorded.	
	3.3.12	Arrange a series of inspections of paths not forming part of the highway maintainable at public expense and consider whether they should be adopted as such.	2011			Inspection complete and results available. Works undertaken.	
	3.2.9	Identify the location of all stiles within the city and remove or replace, if necessary, with a more user friendly feature.	2011 - 2021			List of locations produced. Stiles removed or replaced.	
	3.2.10	Identify all gates, barriers, or other such restriction, on the network and determine whether or not it impedes lawful use. Produce a programme of removal or replacement of these barriers which impede lawful use.	2011 - 2021		Requirement of the Highways Act 1980.	Routes free of obstruction. High performance indicator reported.	
	3.2.12	Provision of suitable surfacing relevant to users needs.	2011 - 2021	Land owners.	No	Work undertaken.	
	3.9.1	Provision of crossings where routes meet road network.	2011 - 2021	Local Access Forum, User Groups,			
	3.4.7 3.4.8	Consider requests for barriers to address misuse by motorcycles in line with the methodology promoted by British Waterways.	2011 - 2021	Police, User Groups,			
	3.4.9 to 3.4.11	Measures to reduce fear of crime, lighting, CCTV, hedge clearance, gating orders.	2011 - 2021	Local Access Forum, Land Owners		Minutes of Forum meetings. Register of Gating Orders.	
	To Improve The Provision and Availability of Information on The Network	3.1.7	Ensure that a copy of the definitive map and statement is available for public inspection at New Walk Centre.	2011		Requirement of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	Map available upon request at New Walk Centre.
		3.1.7	Make information on the network available to other colleagues who would find it of benefit.	2012		No	Information available.
3.1.8		Consider how the definitive map and statement can be adequately displayed on the council's website.	2012			Inspection of council website.	
3.1.9		Explore with Leicestershire County Council ways of sharing information on our respective networks.	2013	Leicestershire County Council, Local Access Forum, Leicestershire Local Access Forum		Inspection of respective websites.	
3.4.14		Undertake a review of the information available for users of the network and consider how improvements can be made.	2012	Local Access Forum		Minutes of Forum meetings.	
3.4.11 to 3.4.13		Publish a number of city walking guides catering for various levels of mobility.	2011 - 2021	Local Access Forum, Healthcare Trust, Leicestershire County Council.		Minutes of Four meetings. Guides available.	

Draft Works Programme 2011 to 2021

Target Area For Improvement	Recommendation For Work Arising From Statement of Action	Statutory Function	Resource	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021
				Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs	Costs
Statutory Duties Relating to Recording of Paths and Local Access Forum	The following items need no further funding other than officer funding. Each of the items is ongoing.												
	Compile and maintain a register of definitive map modification order applications.	YES	Technician Transport Strategy										
	Ensure that the List of Street and the Definitive Map form a set of compatible records.	YES	Technician Transport Strategy										
	Record cycle tracks forming part of the highway in the List of Streets.	YES	Technician Transport Strategy										
	Compile and maintain a register of declarations made under section 31A of the Highways Act 1980.	YES	Technician Transport Strategy										
	Report progress made with the programme of mapping to each meeting of the Local Access Forum.	YES	Technician Transport Strategy										
	Compile a catalogue of known permissive paths including these cycle tracks which do not form part of the highway.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	Ensure that paths crossing the boundary between the city and the county are of uniform width.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	The following items need funding in addition to officer funding.												
	Definitive mapping including production of programme, including paths in council housing	YES	Legal Services	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000
Identify anomalies on the definitive map and propose a programme of changes to effect their removal from the map.	YES	Legal Services	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	
		Physical Works	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	
Facilitation of Local Access Forum	YES	Annual Report Expenses	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	
		Recruitment of New Members	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	
			£2,000			£2,000			£2,000			£2,000	
Provide a Better Connected Network Suitable For All Users	The following items need no further funding other than officer funding. Each of the items is ongoing.												
	Work with Parks Services and equestrian groups to explore the possibility of allowing access to the network.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	Consider the advantages of recording routes of higher status to provide additional links for a wider range of users.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	The following items need funding in addition to officer funding.												
	Identify any missing links within the network.		Legal Services			£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000				
		Physical Works			£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000					
Provision of Bridge over Melton Brook		Bridges Team (a)	£50,000										
Improved access to the waterside, natural environment, parks and open spaces, either		Physical Works					£10,000	£10,000	£10,000				
Provide a Network Which is Easy to Access and Use	The following items need funding in addition to officer funding.												
	Keeping routes free from obstructions. Respond to requests made on path walks.	YES	Highway Maintenance (b)	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000
	Produce an programme of maintenance to deal with the seasonal growth of vegetation at known problem areas. Compile a list of steps, gradients, unbound surfaces, signs and waymarks, stiles, barriers, etc to assist maintenance inspections and to identify access improvements.	YES	Vegetation clearance	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000
		YES	Surfaces, steps, gradients	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000
		YES	New waymarks and signs	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500
		YES	Improvements to stiles	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000
		YES	Improvements to barriers	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000
	Arrange a series of inspections of paths not forming part of the highway maintainable at public expense and consider whether they should be adopted as such.		Inspection of unadopted paths	£150,000									
	Thurmaston Footpath surfacing and environmental improvements.		Works to adopt paths (c)		TBE	TBE	TBE						
	Consider requests for barriers to address misuse by motorcycles in line with the Measures to reduce fear of crime, lighting, CCTV, hedge clearance, gating orders.		City Highways (d)					£20,000					
		Physical Works	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	
		Physical Works (e)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
To Improve The Provision and Availability of Information on The Network	The following items need no further funding other than officer funding. Each of the items is ongoing.												
	Make information on the network available to other colleagues who would find it of benefit.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	Consider how the definitive map and statement can be adequately displayed on the website.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	Explore with Leicestershire County Council ways of sharing information on our respective websites.		Technician Transport Strategy										
	Undertake a review of the information available for users of the network and consider how to improve it.		Technician Transport Strategy										
The following items need funding in addition to officer funding.													
Ensure that a copy of the definitive map and statement is available for public inspection at the City Hall.	YES	Printing	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	£500	
Publish a number of city walking guides catering for various levels of mobility.		Production and Printing	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	
Yearly Total For Each Target Area				2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021
Statutory Duties Relating to Recording of Paths and Local Access Forum				£7,000	£5,000	£5,000	£7,000	£5,000	£5,000	£7,000	£5,000	£5,000	£7,000
Provide a Better Connected Network Suitable For All Users				£50,000	£0	£11,000	£11,000	£21,000	£21,000	£10,000	£0	£0	£0
Provide a Network Which is Easy to Access and Use				£184,500	£34,500	£34,500	£34,500	£34,500	£54,500	£34,500	£34,500	£34,500	£34,500
To Improve The Provision and Availability of Information on The Network				£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500	£5,500
Annual Total				£247,000	£45,000	£56,000	£58,000	£66,000	£86,000	£57,000	£45,000	£45,000	£47,000

Notes: All funds made available from integrated Transport Capital, Capital Maintenance and Revenue Budgets as appropriate subject to approval
(a) Scheme carried over from previous RoWIP
(b) Highway maintenance revenue budget, for routine maintenance.
(c) Cost to be estimated following inspection.
(d) Scheme carried over from previous RoWIP. Possibly developer funded.
(e) Works would normally be funded by applicant requesting the works.