

**Wokingham Borough  
Council**

Rights of Way  
Improvement  
Plan 2020

Consultation Draft



**APPENDIX 2**

Assessment of Need Consultation Report

## Introduction

This consultation statement relates to the assessment of need prepared for the revision of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2020 - 2030 (hereafter referred to as the ROWIP). The responses to the consultation are detailed and analysed below, and responses to each comment have been included.

## Consultation and publicity undertaken

The consultation on the assessment of need was undertaken from 19<sup>th</sup> March 2019 until 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2019. This consultation asked recipients to review the existing assessment and conclusions made in the 2010 Rights of Way Improvement Plan and respond with their views as to the current and future needs and how the public rights of way network can be improved.

A summary of how the consultation and publicity were undertaken is provided below

- An online survey was developed to receive responses to the consultation. The survey asked the following questions:
  1. What are the present and likely future needs of the public in terms of the rights of way network?
  2. How can it be improved in the future for all users?
  3. Are there any current or future strategic access projects we should consider in the new ROWIP?
  4. Are there any deficiencies in the network for particular classes of user (walkers, mobility restricted users, blind and partially sighted users, cyclists, horse riders, motor users etc.)?
  5. Are there any particular gaps in the network or any other shortcomings in the public rights of way network?
  6. Are there any particular ways that the network can be changed to address these problems?
- Direct emails were sent to all Councillors, Parish Councils, Neighbouring Local Authorities, Local and National User Groups and the Mid and West Berkshire Local Access Forum
- The consultation was advertised on the Council's website

## Summary of Consultation Responses

During the consultation 21 responses were received.

The table below summarises all comments made during the consultation period. The Council's response to these comments are within this table, and where stated, the draft ROWIP has been changed in accordance with these comments.

Personally identifiable information has been withheld for Data Protection and GDPR reasons.

No.	Consultee	Comment summary	ROWIP Themes
1	Resident from Charvil	<p><u>Future Needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased network of paths for vulnerable users for day to day travel and for leisure.</li> </ul> <p><i>A specific action has been added to develop a network of paths to cater for vulnerable users [SOA 4.1]</i></p> <p><u>Network shortcomings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very difficult to use most footpaths as a mobility restricted user</li> <li>Gaps in the network - some are filled by Permissive paths, but there need to be more of these to allow for circular routes, and more cycle paths to link towns and villages eg Twyford to Henley</li> </ul> <p><i>The revised plan includes actions to identify and fill gaps in the network [SOA 2.2], to create more cycle paths to link towns and villages [SOA 2.1] and to develop additional circular routes [SOA 2.3]</i></p> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved surfacing <i>Included within the revised plan [SOA 4.2]</i></li> <li>Better way marking <i>Included within the revised plan [SOA 3.2(a)]</i></li> <li>Working with landowners to remove hazards. <i>Actions are included in the plan for the removal of inaccessible stiles and gates and replacement with more accessible options [SOA 4.4]. Further actions are included to manage enforcement issues effectively [SOA 5.3]</i></li> <li>Safer road crossings where paths cross busy roads <i>A specific action has been added to improve road crossings where paths cross busy roads has been included in the revised plan [SOA 3.2(d)]</i></li> <li>Greater investment to make paths more user friendly for a variety of users - others need extending <i>Actions to improve surfacing [SOA 4.2], encourage use of the network [SOA 3.1], increase confidence using the network [SOA 3.2], improve the information available [SOA 1.3] and fill gaps in the network [SOA 2.2] all contribute to achieving this aim.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Improved accessibility</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Increased circular routes</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p> <p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved signage and information</p> <p>Improved integration with wider highway network</p>

2	Finchampstead Parish Councillor	<p><u>Future Needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The needs of the public for the public rights of way network is to grow substantially due to increased house building. <i>Specific actions have been included in the plan to create more routes to link major development areas in response to this increased demand [SOA 2.1]</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider impact on Finchampstead routes when Bracknell Forest upgrade Horse Shoe Lakes to a Country Park and substantially increase usage <i>A specific action to improve and upgrade surfaces where appropriate in response to changes in demand has been included in the plan [SOA 5.1(b)]</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New routes added and links established where suitable. <i>'Statement of Action 2: Creating new links' details a variety of actions to create new routes and fill gaps in the network</i></li> <li>More Greenways <i>Included within the revised plan [SOA 2.1(a)]</i></li> <li>Get the proposed routes through the refurbished Cemex site in Finchampstead open to the public and routed according to agreed plans. <i>This is a project currently underway and is being dealt with as part of day-to-day management. It is outside the scope of the strategic plan.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Increased network</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p>
3	Resident from Shinfield	<p><u>Future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linking communities</li> </ul> <p><u>Network shortcomings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The network is not joined up enough</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High quality surfacing</li> <li>Linking Shinfield towards Arborfield</li> </ul>	<p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved surfacing</p>

		<i>Specific actions have been included in the plan to create more routes to link major development areas and towns and villages [SOA 2.1], and to fill gaps in the network linking communities [SOA 2.2]. Actions are included to improve the surfacing of paths where appropriate [SOA 5.1].</i>	
4	Resident from Winnersh	<p><u>Future Needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better maintenance of the pathways in our urban areas. Rural areas are nice, but it is the urban areas that are most used.</li> </ul> <p><u>Network shortcomings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to ensure that paths are accessible to wheelchair and pram users.</li> <li>Improvements are needed for any user with wheels, for example cyclists and wheelchair users.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need for better, separated cycleways</li> <li>The urban routes need to be properly maintained - they need to be well lit and paved, like other footpaths around them.</li> <li>Build ramps and surface the paths</li> </ul> <p><i>The revised plan includes actions to improve paths for wheelchair and pram users [SOA 4.1 – 4.4], to create more cycle routes [SOA 2.2 &amp; 2.3], and to improve and upgrade surfaces of urban paths where appropriate [SOA 5.1(c)]. An action has been included to install street lighting where appropriate [SOA 5.5].</i></p>	<p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved surfacing</p> <p>Improved accessibility</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p>
5	Resident from Finchampstead	<p><u>Future needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The surfaces of most paths are likely to be eroded more quickly by use and increased rain.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Act quicker in assisting with the resurfacing of the paths and changing of rain water course routes</li> <li>Creating more Green ways would help wheel chair users.</li> </ul> <p><i>An action has been included to identify address recurring surface or drainage problems along paths [SOA 5.1(a)] and the implementation of Greenways has been included in the plan [SOA 2.1(a)].</i></p> <p><u>Future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of this is being handled by WBC in its Green Routes, move these up the priority list for creation of them.</li> </ul>	<p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved surfacing</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p> <p>Improved accessibility</p>

		<p><u>Specific path issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a FP in Finchampstead, 34, it was blocked by construction of a property and the path terminates abruptly.</li> <li>• FP 26 in Finchampstead needs a complete refurb as it is regularly eroded by rain, water courses need seeing to</li> </ul> <p>The specific path issues are outside the scope of the strategic plan but will be dealt with as part of day-to-day management of the network.</p>	
6	Swallowfield Parish Council	<p><u>Future needs</u> Swallowfield is a rural parish and its footpaths and byways are an important recreational amenity attracting walkers, horse riders, etc. both locally and from surrounding more developed areas.</p> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u> The following would be worthwhile improvements to the footpath and byway network in the parish.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The surface condition on sections of the following byways is poor with deep ruts and mud. The surface would benefit from improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) SWAL BW8 III – (Raggetts Lane) costs a huge amount to maintain and isn't passable by any mode of transport once the 4x4s have done their work each winter</li> <li>b) SWAL BW23 I</li> <li>c) SWAL BW32 I - impassable in any conditions due to water runoff from the field</li> <li>d) SWAL BW33 I.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>These byways are open to all traffic and the surface gets churned up by 4x4 off-roaders. These might benefit from a change in designation or some restriction on use by motors as they form valuable links in the network for the walking and horse riding fraternity.</p> <p><i>Actions have been included in the plan to improve surfaces of byways and to investigate potential restrictions where appropriate [SOA 5.1(a) &amp; 5.6]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The creation of a roadside link along Swallowfield Road in the vicinity of the entrance to Tanners Farm linking footpath SWAL FP13 II to byway SWAL BW30 I would be beneficial and improve safety for walkers on this busy but narrow road.</li> </ul> <p><i>This has been included as a proposed new route in Appendix 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various footpaths suffer from poor drainage, water-logging and flooding as follows:</li> </ul>	<p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved surfacing</p> <p>Manage vehicle use on byways</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Development of long distance routes</p>

		<p>a) SWAL FP16 II suffers from water-logging along the section near to its junction with Part Lane, alongside the allotments field.</p> <p>b) SWAL FP17 I off Trowes Lane suffers from bad drainage and flooding due to agricultural activity making it impassable on many occasions.</p> <p>c) SWAL FP14 I suffers from drainage/flooding problems near the junction with SWAL FP13. There is a possibility that Farley Farms will address this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although not within Wokingham Borough being on the border with and officially in Hampshire, the section of the Devil's Highway east of the Odiham Road forms an important part of the local paths network as it forms part of the "Wokingham Way". The surface is in need of improvement.</li> </ul> <p><i>The specific path issues are outside the scope of the strategic plan but will be dealt with as part of day-to-day management of the network.</i></p> <p><u>Future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WBC has had a long term vision to create a footpath along the length of the River Loddon through the Borough to the Thames. The creation of such a route is a very attractive proposition if it could be achieved. In Swallowfield, this would involve the diversion of SWAL FP18 I so that it would pass along the southern and eastern perimeter of the solar farm at Sheepbridge. A newly dedicated footpath would then ultimately continue following the path of the river across land where Cemex has proposed to extract gravel up to Bridge Farm on the A327 and onwards.</li> </ul> <p><i>An action is included in the plan to develop and implement the Loddon Long Distance Path [SOA 2.1(b)]. The precise detail of the route will be established as the project progresses.</i></p>	
7	Wokingham Without Parish Council	<p><u>Future needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leisure uses such as running and walking are well documented and largely catered for, but we would like to see improvements to signage identifying PROW, in order for them to play a greater part in reducing car dependency and thereby reducing traffic and improving air quality <i>Improvements to signage have been included in the revised plan [SOA 1.7, 3.2(a), 3.2(b) &amp; 3.3(a)]</i></li> <li>PRoW should have the same level of consideration / importance in large planning applications as the broader highway network, in order to ensure that a suitable level of investment is made in improving walking and cycle routes. <i>Actions are included in the plan to ensure that public rights of way are given proper consideration in the planning process [SOA 6.1, 6.2 &amp; 6.3]</i></li> </ul>	<p>Improved signage and information</p> <p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved surfacing</p> <p>Manage vehicle use on byways</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p>

		<p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased spending on maintaining paths – particularly those that deteriorate considerably in the winter / wet weather <i>An action has been included to identify address recurring surface or drainage problems along paths [SOA 5.1(a)]</i></li> <li>• Use of notices that restrict the use of motorised vehicles in the winter would help keep paths in a more usable state for pedestrians <i>Actions have been included in the plan to improve surfaces of byways and to investigate potential restrictions where appropriate [SOA 5.1(a) &amp; 5.6]</i></li> <li>• Increase the level of public awareness of the available routes - such as ensuring information online is available and kept up to date <i>A variety of actions have been included to improve and increase the availability of information about the public rights of way network in 'Statement of Action 1: Improving Information'</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Current and future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general investing in the network to encourage non-motorised traffic to key locations</li> </ul> <p>In WW (greater Crowthorne)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) access to Wokingham town centre via Gorrick Woods - Greenways [WOKW FP 15 I, WOKW FP 16 II &amp; WOKW FP 17 I]</li> <li>b) access to new Grays Farm sports facility from "greater Crowthorne" – Greenways [via WOKW FP 12I]</li> <li>c) access to new SDL from Greater Crowthorne - some existing footpaths off Redlake Lane [WOKW FP 7 I] / Honey Hill [WOKW FP 11 I] / Easthampstead Road [WOKW FP 5 I] might be re-purposed, but crossing of Easthampstead Road / Heathlands Rd will need to be carefully considered (they don't have "verges" let alone pavements so not safe for walking, nor really cycling)</li> <li>d) access to Crowthorne railway station improvements on Oaklands lane, West of NWR (and East of NWR but that is in hand)</li> <li>e) access to Pinewood Centre from the Bracknell side - especially Buckler's Park (TRL site)</li> <li>f) Resurfacing of local footpaths e.g. Hatch Ride Woods, Hatch Ride Extension (north of Nine Mile Ride), Hatch Ride to Nine Mile Ride footpath (broken concrete) also needs a surface upgrade (but might be a different type of surface). All of these would be part of the key routes we identify - either to Wokingham / Grays Farm, to Pinewood or to Crowthorne Station</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>The suggestions above detail various surfacing improvements, highway network improvements and cross boundary improvements. Actions have been included in the plan to improve surfacing in response to demand [SOA 5.1(b)] and where it provides links to schools, amenities and public transport [SOA 5.1(d)]. It also details actions to improve the interaction between the public rights of way network and the wider highway network [SOA 3.2(e)], and to liaise with neighbouring local authorities to increase cross border connectivity [SOA 2.2(d)]. The proposed new path suggested above has been included as a proposed new route in Appendix 4.</i></p> <p><u>Shortcomings in the network</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor condition of PRoW during wet conditions preclude a lot of users (e.g. cycling / walking to work through muddy puddles isn't going to happen) <i>An action has been included in the plan to improve and upgrade surfaces of paths that provide links to school, amenities and public transport [SOA 5.1(d)]</i></li> <li>• Overgrown footpaths, or with significant debris, means that the effective capacity is much reduced (e.g. the pavement on the junction of Heathlands Road and Nine Mile Ride is more than 50% covered in leaves / moss / debris). If a tree fell down &amp; part blocked a road, this would instantly be removed by WBC contractors, so why not pavements / PRoW? <i>Actions are included in the plan for more effective enforcement (for example where there is an overgrown hedge) [SOA 5.3] and improved vegetation management [SOA 5.2]</i></li> <li>• Crossings from ProW to pavement / road appear to be forgotten - Equestrian users for example, particularly in north WW area, where there are a lot of equestrian businesses and we are about to build a massive new road (SWDR)</li> <li>• A further problem is that most people want to cross at junctions, and very rarely is a safe crossing provided. This problem is exacerbated when a (road) junction is implemented - typically increasing the speed that road traffic can progress through the junction, by smoothing bends, adding extra lanes etc. The Pinewood roundabout on Nine Mile Ride would be a good local example - where pedestrians / cyclists now have a wider arm to cross, competing with faster traffic =&gt;higher risk of collision</li> </ul> <p><i>A specific action has been included in the plan to improve road crossings where paths cross busy roads [SOA 3.2(d)], and actions are included to fill gaps in the network for walkers, cyclists and horse riders [SOA 2.2(b)]</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>Gaps in the network</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent designation footpath / bridleway / RUPP. E.g. on Hatch Ride [WOKW BW 28 III]</li> <li>• Footpath [WOKW FP 33 I] from Hatch Ride to Nine Mile Ride (past Oakham Park) - should be enabled for cyclists (Bridleway)</li> <li>• Byway from end of Hatch Ride to Memorial Hall [WOKW BW 28 III]- should ban motorised vehicles as they churn up shade wooded path (Bridleway)</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restricting Use of 4x4 / larger motorised vehicles on forest (shaded) paths that are prone to flooding is a particular problem.</li> <li>• Reclassifying certain PRowS - examples above</li> </ul> <p><i>Specific actions have been included in the plan to fill gaps in the network for walkers, cyclists and horse riders [SOA 2.2(b)] and an action has been included to manage the network of byways more effectively, including considering restrictions where appropriate [SOA 5.6]</i></p>	
8	Winnersh Parish Council	<p><u>Future needs</u></p> <p>The right of way network can assist with a key part of improving sustainable travel if it is joined up with other suitable networks. Within Winnersh parish this is dependent on where the right of way is located. Within urban areas the rights of way are likely to see an increasing need for access to work/transport link/school/access to local amenities as well as recreation – walking/cycling dog walking/running. Rights of way at the edge of, but leading away from the urban/suburban environment the routes could be used for recreation walking/cycling dog walking/running with less usage for access to work/transport link/school/access to local amenities.</p> <p><i>Actions have been included in the plan to improve the surfaces of paths that provide links to schools, amenities and public transport [SOA 5.1(d)] and to seek to fill gaps in the network for walkers, cyclists and horse riders [SOA 2.2]</i></p> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guided walks, off road guided cycling in conjunction with Greenways project. <i>Included within the revised plan [SOA 3.2(c)]</i></li> <li>• Improved surfacing and signage <i>Included within the revised plan [SOA 5.1, 1.7, 3.2 &amp; 3.3]</i></li> </ul>	<p>Improved integration with wider highway network</p> <p>Improved signage and information</p> <p>Development of guided routes</p> <p>Improved integration with wider highway network</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved accessibility for wheelchairs/pushchairs. <i>'Statement of Action: Access for all' details a range of actions to cater for mobility restricted users.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Current or future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A north-south Greenways route linking Arborfield-Sindlesham-Winnersh (station)-Dinton Pastures-Twyford (Station Cross-Rail).</li> <li>Improved walking and cycle link from Winnersh Triangle to Arbor Lane.</li> <li>Improved walking and cycling link from Winnersh Triangle / Showcase cinema to Dinton Pastures.</li> </ul> <p><u>Deficiencies / Gaps in the network /</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cyclists accessing the off road Byway WINN 3 Sadlers End/Lane route from Sindlesham need to use Bearwood Road which has a current speed limit of 40mph. This needs to be reduced to 30mph to create a safer route to access this off-road route to avoid the busier and narrow Kings Street Lane.</li> <li>Upgrade FP 6 (Bearwood Path) from Hatch Farm Way off road shared cycle/footway that links to Jersey Drive to allow cycling with a surfaced route.</li> </ul> <p><i>A specific action has been included to seek to make adjustments to the highway network to improve the interaction between the rights of way network and the wider highway network [SOA 3.2(e)], and to fill gaps in the existing network for cyclists [SOA 2.2(b)].</i></p>	
9	Wokingham Town Council	<p><u>Deficiencies / Gaps in the network</u></p> <p><b>The two footbridges over the Wokingham Railway Junction; Barkham Park to the Bowling Alley (WOK FP 231 I think)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The temporary bridge over the Railway is not accessible to less-than-fully-fit folk owing to its steepness. Whilst we realise that this is Network Rail property its still your Right of Way and in effect the Right of Way is not fit for purpose. Please can you encourage NW to get on with scheduling the bridge replacement?</li> </ul> <p><b>The footpath through St Pauls Church into Mount Pleasant and St Pauls Gate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the path turns at the St Pauls Gate garages point the retaining walls are unsafe and the surface is not suitable for disabled or for prams/buggies. Please will you have that spot looked at with a view to improvement/repair?</li> </ul> <p><b>Footpath Millmead to Brook Close (Close to Woosehill roundabout) via Paper Mill bridge under railway.</b></p>	Improved accessibility

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I note this is not on your Public Rights of Way map. But you do have streetlights in it. Are you responsible for its maintenance?</li> </ul> <p><i>An action has been included in the plan to upgrade or improve bridges to cater for users with restricted mobility [SOA 4.3] and to improve the surfacing on paths to cater for users with restricted mobility [SOA 4.2]. The specific path issues are outside the scope of the strategic plan but will be dealt with as part of day-to-day management of the network.</i></p>	
10	Buckinghamshire County Council	<p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ROWIP should commit to supporting and contributing –financially pro rata to the National Trail Thames Path Partnership</li> <li>Access improvements are needed at Remenham Footpath 4 / 15 at Hambleden Lock to allow pushchairs and wheelchairs to access the Buckinghamshire side of the Thames.</li> <li>An additional river crossing between Henley and Medmenham would be desirable for circular walking from Henley, but the high cost of bridging the Thames for a recreational route might be difficult.</li> </ul> <p><i>WBC is currently a member of the Thames Path Partnership and an action has been included in the plan for this membership to continue [SOA 5.8(a)] and also to foster closer links and work with neighbouring local authorities [SOA 5.8(c)]. Actions have been included in the plan to increase cross border connectivity [SOA 2.2(f)] and improve accessibility of paths [SOA 4.1 – 4.4]</i></p>	<p>Improved partnership working</p> <p>Improved accessibility</p> <p>Increased circular routes</p> <p>Cross-boundary improvements</p>
11	Hampshire County Council	<p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that there are no routes terminating upon the administrative boundary between Hampshire and Wokingham.</li> </ul> <p><i>An action has been included in the plan to assess the fragmentation of the network between authorities and increase cross-border connectivity [SOA 2.2(d)]</i></p>	<p>Cross-boundary improvements</p>
12	Barkham Parish Council	<p><u>Priorities for access in Barkham:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenway suitable for cycling from Arborfield Cross to the SDL (safe route to school)</li> <li>Greenway suitable for cycling from Barkham to the SDL (safe route to school) and extension to Wokingham centre (commuting)</li> <li>Promotion of greenways (maps, websites, QR codes etc.)</li> <li>Ensure proposed greenways in SDL are fit for purpose, in particular adequate crossings provided for main roads, specifically Biggs Lane, Shearlands Road and the Nine Mile Ride Extension.</li> <li>Plans for longer routes, e.g. Bearwood Circle linking The Coombes, Woosheill, Sindlesham and Carters Hill.</li> <li>Loddon Long Distance Footpath</li> </ul>	<p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p> <p>Improved integration with highway network</p> <p>Improved signage and information</p> <p>Increased circular routes</p>

		<p><i>Actions to develop and implement the Greenways and the Loddon Long Distance Path projects have been included in the plan [SOA 2.1(a) and 2.1(b)].</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signs for existing footpaths, e.g. The Coombes Circular Walk, Barkham to Rooks Nest. <i>Included within the revised plan [SOA 1.7, 3.2(a) &amp; 3.2(b)]</i></li> <li>• Develop circular routes for horse riding especially in The Coombes and Carters Hill area. <i>Actions to develop circular routes for walking, cycling and horse riding are included within the plan [SOA 2.3]</i></li> <li>• Bridge over Arborfield bypass <i>Actions to fill identified gaps in the network are included within the plan [SOA 2.2(b)]</i></li> <li>• Reclaiming quiet lanes, specifically. Church Lane (Arborfield) and Edney's Hill.(Barkham) <i>Actions to manage byways more effectively are included within the plan [SOA 5.6]</i></li> <li>• Maintenance arrangements for stiles, kissing gates and ensuring adequate drainage to facilitate all weather usage. <i>Actions are included within the plan for the improvement of stiles with more accessible structures [SOA 4.4] and address issues with paths where there are recurring surface or drainage problems [SOA 5.1(a)]</i></li> <li>• Improved crossings at various locations including Barkham Road adjacent to Barkham Bull, Edney's Hill and Pegasus crossing in Mole Road. <i>An action has been included in the plan to improve road crossings where paths cross busy roads [SOA 3.2(d)]</i></li> </ul>	<p>Development of long distance routes</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Manage vehicle use on byways</p> <p>Increased accessibility</p>
13	Councillor Sarah Kerr	<p><u>Future needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The right of way network is crucial to improving sustainable travel providing it's connected up with other networks. It's therefore imperative that these rights of way in urban/suburban areas are in the right locations and actually get people to their destinations. In other words, they need to get people to schools, places of work, town centres, public transport facilities etc. <i>Actions are included in the plan to create new routes to join up gaps near to schools, amenities, green spaces and public transport [SOA 2.2(b)], improve the signage including destination signs [SOA 3.1(d)] and improve the surfacing [SOA 5.1(d)].</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Deficiencies in the network</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rights of way that are leading away from urban/suburban areas could be more recreational</li> </ul>	<p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Improved integration with highway network</p> <p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Improved surfacing</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The surfacing of these paths could be improved in places. For example, some of the paths in Evendons East (my ward) leading to Evendons Primary School get very muddy and wet in the winter, but they need to be used by parents taking their children to and from school. <i>Actions are included within the plan to improve the surfacing for paths to and from school [SOA 5.1(d)] and also to address issues with paths where there are recurring surface or drainage problems [SOA 5.1(a)]</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paths that go through natural areas could have a reflective surface. In these areas you would not want street lighting, but by providing a reflective surface, cyclists and walkers with torches would be able to use the routes even when dark. For example, this would work on the proposed Greenway through Foxhill <i>An action has been included to investigate options for street lighting or illumination within the plan [SOA 5.5]</i></li> <li>Signage can always be improved. Gorrick woods would really benefit from better signage. As a runner I got lost a couple of times! <i>Actions have been included within the plan to improve signage on the network [SOA 1.7, 3.2(a) &amp; 3.2(b)]</i></li> <li>Development of guided routes would encourage people to recreationally use routes more. In Simon's Wood there is a Millennium route which my children enjoy following. This could be implemented in other places, and between areas as well. This could also lead to guided running routes – I've seen this done in France where there are a number of routes from a central location that if you follow take you on a 5km run, then 10km, and progressively going up. <i>An action has been included in the plan to develop guided routes [SOA 3.2(c)]</i></li> </ul>	<p>Improved signage and information</p> <p>Development of guided routes</p>
14	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	<p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wokingham Borough Council's involvement with the Thames Path Partnership is not listed in the 2010 plan, and would be worth including in the 2019 plan as an example of improved partnership working. <i>A specific action has been included in the plan confirming WBC commitment to maintain membership of the TPP and ADEPT as part of partnership working. [SOA 5.8(a)]</i></li> <li>The Improvement Plans produced by neighbouring local authorities may be worth including in the revised ROWIP.</li> </ul>	<p>Improved partnership working</p> <p>Cross-boundary improvements</p>

		<i>An action has been included to foster close links with local authorities and work in partnership to improve the network for all users [SOA 5.8(c)].</i>	
15	Loddon Valley Ramblers	<p><u>Future needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that there is nothing that needs to be removed from this statement, but notes that it is based on old surveys dating from 2005.</li> <li>States some needs which need to be amplified in the 2020 plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The need to improve surfaces of byways across the Borough (e.g. in Swallowfield and Finchampstead) and to restrict vehicular access to them, in order to prevent surface damage recurring and to avoid the need for seasonal closures <i>An action has been included within the plan to improve the surface of byways and more effectively manage the use of byways [SOA 5.1(a), 5.6]</i></li> <li>b) A continuing drive to replace stiles throughout the Borough with gates, to improve access for all – this should include an audit of all remaining stiles and a campaign to encourage landowners to give in principle permission for conversions (whether or not funds for gates are currently available), so that installations can be arranged quickly once funding has been secured. <i>Actions have been included within the plan to replace stiles and other inaccessible structures with more accessible alternatives in line with BS5709:2018 [SOA 4.4] and also to undertake a survey of all path furniture on the network [SOA 1.4(a)]</i></li> <li>c) Plans to <b>educate/persuade farmers and landowners on the need to avoid the ploughing/cropping of paths, backed by vigorous enforcement</b> when instances occur <i>An action has been included to manage enforcement issues effectively, including a review of the policy and procedures for enforcement issues [SOA 5.3]</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>States some additional needs that need to be included in the plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Specific acknowledgement of the role and benefits of <b>Greenways</b> in providing safe, easily-accessible routes for walkers and others to access local amenities, schools etc. In this context, the references to improving signage on Greenways are particularly important in encouraging their use by the wider public (for instance, the Arborfield Green to Finchampstead Greenway does not currently have a single sign anywhere along its length); <i>Actions are included in the plan to develop and implement the Greenways [SOA 2.1(a)] and to improve signage along rights of way [SOA 1.7, 3.2(a) &amp; 3.2(b)]</i></li> <li>b) The need to undertake a programme of <b>riverbank repairs</b> to protect and secure the future use of the numerous riverside rights of way in the Borough;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Improved surfacing</p> <p>Improved maintenance</p> <p>Manage vehicle use on byways</p> <p>Improved accessibility</p> <p>Improved signage and information</p> <p>Improved enforcement procedures</p> <p>Improved integration with wider highway network</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Increased circular routes</p> <p>Development of long distance routes</p> <p>Improved partnership working</p>

		<p><i>An action to assess and take action to repair and protect against riverbank erosion has been included within the plan [SOA 5.8]</i></p> <p>c) A reference in the statement of needs to ensuring that future development in the Borough (especially roads and housing) leads to preservation of the existing public rights of way and to significant enhancements and improvements to the network – the latter is particularly important in the context of the stated need to link up paths and create more circular routes. (The opportunities provided by the South Wokingham SDA are an obvious example).  <i>Actions are included within the plan to protect rights of way [SOA 6.3(a)] seek improvements to the network as part of the planning process [SOA 6.1]</i></p> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SOA1 (Mapping the network)</b> still appears to us to be valid in all respects</li> <li>• <b>SOA2 (Creating new links)</b> remains sound and sensible, but needs to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) cross-references to the ongoing development of Greenway plans in looking to meet the needs of walkers, cyclists and horse riders;  <i>Included within the plan [SOA 2.1(a)]</i></li> <li>b) the need to explore the scope for creation of new longer distance routes across the Borough, for example the creation of a path alongside the whole course of the Loddon, with a bridge link to the Thames Path near the confluence of the two rivers, or the creation of a route based on the Devil’s Highway. (Some of the suggested routes set out the “Proposed New Routes Section” on pages 4 to 8, below, contain short stretches of suggested routes which would go towards the eventual realisation of such paths);  <i>Actions are included in the plan for the Loddon Long Distance Path [SOA 2.1(b)]. The specific suggestions above have been included in the proposed new routes (Appendix 4).</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>SOA3 (Encourage use of the PROW network)</b> needs to give greater acknowledgement of the scope for working with organisations such as LVR on vegetation clearance, to ensure that usage of the network is encouraged and increases, notwithstanding any limitations on the Local Authority’s own capacity to undertake clearance  <i>Specific references to partnership working have been included throughout the statement of action, with a specific action to foster closer links with user groups and work in partnership to improve the network for all users [SOA 5.8(b)]</i></li> <li>• <b>SOA4 (Access for all)</b> in the light of our recent experience, this should action should include a requirement for the Local Authority to play a more active role in identifying sites for stile conversions and in obtaining landowner permissions. Most of the work in finding locations and</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>getting permission is currently undertaken by LVR. Whilst our role is valuable and important, better support from the Local Authority would speed up the conversion process. A commitment from the Local Authority to (assisting with) funding would also be helpful. There should also be a reference to the Greenways programme, as a means of improving access to key routes for all.</p> <p><i>An action has been included in the plan to work in partnership with user groups and volunteer groups to replace stiles across the network [SOA 4.4(b)]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SOA5 (Looking after the network)</b> still appears to LVR to be valid as written, although there is no reference to LVR as a partner on vegetation clearance, which needs to be corrected to match the current reality. There is also no reference to responding to ad hoc problems, such as fallen trees, broken or missing signs etc. Whilst its performance in attending to such problems is reasonably good, the Council should, we feel, set itself some standards and targets in terms of response times for such problems.</li> </ul> <p><i>Actions have been included within the plan to work in partnership with user groups and volunteer groups to undertake vegetation clearance on rights of way [SOA 5.2(d)] and to review the service standards, policy and procedures for vegetation and debris clearance [SOA 5.2(c)]</i></p> <p><u>Specific path suggestions</u> The response details a list of 41 paths, noting that this list has been revised from the previous suggestions submitted in 2010 with those paths which appear to Loddon Valley Ramblers to be unfeasible during the life of the plan being omitted.</p> <p><i>The specific suggestions above have been included in the proposed new routes (Appendix 4).</i></p>	
16	Resident from Arborfield	<p>Our main interest is in horse riding. This needs extending in the Arborfield area</p> <p>Link up the fragmented bridleway and by way network in Arborfield, Farley Hill and towards Swallowfield</p> <p>As the new Arborfield relief road is constructed, the opportunity to create a linking bridleway to the existing network from Litchfield Equestrian should be considered using the land adjacent to the new road.</p> <p>Yes for horse riders the growth in traffic caused by the very significant new build is making it dangerous to ride on the road network so more bridleways are needed.</p> <p>Within three square miles there are four equestrian businesses that focus on providing livery for customers: Litchfield Equestrian and Clouds in Arborfield, Cow City Livery in Farley Hill and Farley Hall Equestrian between Farley Hill and Swallowfield. Between them they provide employment for local people as well as training facilities. All make use of the existing road and bridleway network and with</p>	<p>Increased equestrian network</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p>

		<p>the exception of Cow City all are seriously adversely affected by the new relief road so depend on a new bridleway solution.</p> <p><i>An action has been included within the plan to join up gaps in the network for walkers, horse riders and cyclists [SOA 2.2(b)], create more circular routes [SOA 2.3] and improve the interaction between the rights of way network and the wider highway network [SOA 3.2(e)]</i></p>	
17	Charvil Parish Council	<p>The general consensus is that the present rights of way in this area are all right as far as they go, in that paths in the country park are well-kept, and are well-used, but there needs to be an all-round improvement on the accessibility of rights of way to all users.</p> <p>So for example, there are no safe routes for horse riders and there is one cycle path running through the parish – this is very limiting to families etc, who may be nervous to take families on the road, but would like safe, circular routes, or routes to interesting destinations. This would probably mean upgrading some of the footpaths to allow access to both bicycles and wheelchairs etc, and some new paths.</p> <p><i>Actions have been included within the plan to create new Greenways [SOA 2.1(a)] and to develop more cycle paths to link towns and villages [SOA 2.1(c)]. From a horse riding perspective the plan contains and action to create new routes to join up the gaps in the network for walkers, cyclists and horse riders [SOA 2.2(b)]</i></p> <p>I understand that there are plans to add a track from Winnersh Triangle to Twyford Station, and if this were to come this side of the Loddon, then that would be very popular – one of the most requested rights of way improvements is for an off-road route to the station from Charvil (although I suspect there would also be some demand for artificial light as well).</p> <p>Another route would be to use the disused second track alongside the Henley-Twyford railway line as a right of way – that would prove VERY popular, and would probably reduce the number of car journeys as well. It could also be used by wheel-chair users etc.</p> <p><i>The specific suggestions above have been included in the proposed new routes (Appendix 4).</i></p> <p>As far as footpaths are concerned, there is a general feeling that there needs to be more circular routes and routes linking villages – so a path between Charvil and Wargrave would be popular – I believe there used to be a permissive path from what is now Riverways Farm to the Twyford Road near the sewage works, but what would be more popular would be a right of way all along Loddon Drive. The existing path from Thames Drive to Loddon Drive also needs attention as it is a classic point of clashes with the local landowner who makes no effort to keep the path passable and whose cows are very</p>	<p>Improved accessibility</p> <p>Increased equestrian network</p> <p>Filling gaps in the network</p> <p>Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways</p> <p>Increased circular routes</p> <p>Improved enforcement procedures</p>

		<p>aggressive. I think there are workable solutions but the Parish Council would need to work with the Borough to bring these to fruition.</p> <p><i>Actions have been added into the plan to create more circular routes [SOA 2.3(b)], and to manage enforcement issues more effectively [SOA 5.3]</i></p>	
18	Councillor Pauline Jorgensen	<p>The one comment I would like to make is we need a preference for off road cycleways which are physically separated from the highway and paths – I would like to see these form a network of ‘cycle motorways’ which conveniently and directly link places people want to go</p> <p><i>The plan includes an action to continue the Greenways project to create a network of off-road routes to link strategic development locations [SOA 2.12(a)]</i></p>	Increased off-road Cycle Routes / Greenways
19	Resident from Shinfield	<p><u>Future needs</u> New rights of way required for expansion of Spencers Wood into Croft Farm and Ryeish Farm area, especially in dangerous one-way road systems with no footpath.</p> <p><i>Actions have been included within the plan to create a better joined up PROW network [SOA 2.1]], to develop more cycle routes to link towns and villages [SOA 2.1(c)] and to improve the interaction between the rights of way network and the wider highway network [SOA 3.2(e)].</i></p>	Filling gaps in the network
20	Resident from Earley	<p><u>Future needs</u> The population is expanding, especially to the south of Reading. The health and environment benefits of cycling and walking are increasingly recognized. Main roads will be increasingly busy with traffic. We need a greatly enhanced network of safe and attractive cycle ways and footpaths, to sustain and enhance quality of life for residents.</p> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much better connectivity, especially for the cycling network.</li> </ul> <p><u>Future strategic access projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the new development in Shinfield and Arborfield should be linked with high quality off-road cycle ways. This should be just as much a priority as roads.</li> </ul> <p><u>Deficiencies in the network</u> There are very limited possibilities for cycling, particularly for families. Cycling with children is both pleasurable, and an opportunity to inculcate a healthy liifestyle. It should always be possible to cycle</p>	

		<p>from home - not everyone can load bikes into a car and drive to another location, plus that is much less environmentally responsible.</p> <p><u>Particular gaps / shortcomings</u>  Cycling from Lower Earley to Cutbush Lane, where do you go next without being on very busy roads? How to cycle from Shinfield towards Arborfield without using the A327? When walking between some of the public footpaths, there is presently a need to walk on the A327, e.g. crossing the Loddon, which feels dangerous when with young children (no footpaths). When cycling from Lower Earley to Dinton Pastures, there is no easy off-road route. We usually follow the Loddon alongside the Showcase cinema, crossing the pedestrian bridge, to regain a cycling route into Dinton. This involves use of some footpath (which we always navigate slowly and responsibly), but the only alternative seems to be Loddon Bridge Road, which is too busy and narrow to feel safe when cycling with children.</p> <p><i>Actions have been included within the plan to fill gaps in the network for cyclists [SOA 2.2(b)], create new Greenways [SOA 2.1(a)], develop more circular routes for cyclists [SOA 2.3] and to develop more cycle paths to link towns and villages [SOA 2.1(c)].</i></p>	
21	Respondent from Basingstoke	<p><u>Future needs</u>  The large number of housing developments in the area will cause increase in demand for peaceful and safe routes between settlements and for leisure</p> <p><u>Suggested improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better surfaces for multiuser sections (e.g. flexipave rather than gravel/hoggin), wider paths/tracks to reduce conflict between users, crossing facilities over busy roads</li> </ul> <p><i>Actions have been included within the plan to develop the Greenways, which will be surfaced with a permeable surfacing solution where appropriate. The plan also includes an action to improve and upgrade path surfaces where appropriate in urban areas [SOA 5.1(c)] and other paths where appropriate [SOA 5.1(b)].</i></p> <p><u>Deficiencies in the network</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor surfaces, overgrown vegetation, dangerous crossings, and narrow paths mean that the ROW network is only suitable for able bodied pedestrians, mountain bikers, and 4x4s. Wide, well-surfaced, well-maintained paths/tracks with good crossings will benefit all users.</li> </ul> <p><i>An action has been included in the plan to develop more routes for those with mobility restrictions [SOA 4.1], improve the surfaces [SOA 4.2] and ensure that all new paths are constructed to be suitable for mobility restricted users [SOA 4.1(c)]. Actions are also included to improve road crossings where public</i></p>	

		<p><i>rights of way cross busy roads [SOA 3.2(d)] and improve the interaction between the public rights of way and wider highways network [SOA 3.2(e)]. In terms of vegetation overgrowth a set of actions are also included in the plan to manage vegetation issues effectively [SOA 5.2].</i></p> <p><u>Particular gaps / shortcomings</u> Lack of links between settlements suitable for cyclists and horse riders</p> <p><i>An action has been included within the plan to develop more cycle paths to link towns and villages [SOA 2.1(c)] and to fill gaps in the network for cyclists and horse riders [SOA 2.2(b)]</i></p>	
22	Finchampstead Parish Council	<p><u>General</u> The RoWIP should be more about deliverables and less “aspirational”. Would prefer less content but what is included to be resourced, funded and delivered. Parish Councils and other interested bodies (Ramblers, BHS etc) to be more involved in delivering RoWIP not just in consultations and meetings. CIL funding opportunities and other developer involvement to be fully explored.</p> <p><i>As a 10-year plan the ROWIP is intended to be aspirational in its outlook and it does contain a wide ranging suite of actions for the improvement of the network. Some of these will require significant levels of funding which will need to be identified on a year-on-year basis. The plan contains specific actions to foster closer links with Parish Councils [SOA 5.8(c)] and user groups [SOA 5.8(b)] and work in partnership to improve the network for all users.</i></p> <p><u>Mapping</u> Agree that “mapping” should largely be based upon online content which can be downloaded and used on portable devices or printed by the user. Definitive map and online map need to be updated – noted that this is in progress. Finchampstead Parish is missing the “Tintagel loop” FP51 off Sandhurst Road, BP55 part of Wick Hill Lane, extinguishment of FP17 and possibly other additions/extinguishments. More frequent updating should now be possible online and will be important when Cemex restoration of sites in the south of the Parish is completed (and other associated network changes implemented).</p> <p><i>A set of actions is included within the plan to improve the current mapping and the information available to the public. Much of which will be via online content. [SOA 1: Improving information].</i></p> <p><u>New Links</u> Reference the proposals more completely for ease of reference. Carry out a “prioritisation/evaluation” of ideas to reduce the number to manageable and realistic level for further action. Involve all appropriate</p>	

		<p>groups. Make full use of Greenways project and contribution by footways/pavements to create circular routes and to linking other networks (byways/bridleways) particularly for safe cycle routes. Note other routes such as the Loddon Valley Way and Blackwater Valley which can provide further links. Cemex restoration in the south of the Parish to be pushed forward asap. Rights of Way should be “finalised” and dedicated immediately and opened to the public as soon as physically available, inspected and agreed fit for purpose. Delays due to “ownership” should not be allowed to delay this. Fully support Greenways programme and wish for closer involvement in the development of the local network, and information at an early stage.</p> <p><i>The list of proposed paths has been revised (Appendix 4) with references for all specific proposed paths, and have been categorised based on the type of proposal (New Footpath, New cycleway etc). The plan includes an analysis of the fragmentation of the network for all users which helps to identify priority areas for action (Appendix 3).</i></p> <p><u>Encourage Use of PRow</u> See mapping comments above. Expect that many Parishes would be keen to see their local maps updated (and circular walks in some cases) and WBC could play a coordinating and sourcing role at least to facilitate this (and give a standard look and feel) even if funding has to come from other sources organised by the Parishes. Health walks are a great idea and supported by the Parish Council and led by many of our councillors. Other walks are organised by Finchampstead Society, Blackwater Valley CP, Ramblers etc.. There seems to be little reason for the Borough Council to get involved. Provide counters on Greenways to evaluate usage.</p> <p>Work with partners on developing better management of shared space on existing network and future paths. Promote responsible and appropriate use of paths by all users – particular concern is cyclists use of inappropriate paths. Restrict access where needed and install preventive measures if necessary. NB Any shared usage of footpaths requires maintaining an adequate all year surface. Encourage Parkruns but monitor impact on other users of the network.</p> <p><i>An action has been included in the plan to assist Parish Councils and other groups in developing rights of way maps and other information. [SOA 1.8]. Actions are also included to reduce illegal use of paths [SOA 5.4] and to improve surfacing along rights of way [SOA 5.1].</i></p> <p><u>Access for all.</u> We support gap/gate/stile approach and now have relatively few stiles on the main network. All previous RoWIP Objectives remain valid.</p> <p><u>Looking after the Network.</u></p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Most of the previous objectives again remain valid.  Partnership approach is critical to prioritisation and effective action.  Greenways are excellent but should not consume all the funding available – the existing network needs continuing investment, particularly in surface maintenance  Byways need to be maintained for cyclists and equestrians with due recognition of wear and tear that ever increasing vehicle traffic brings with huge expansion of delivery traffic added to residents, essential services and other permitted vehicles. Noted that certain byways are being promoted as cycle routes on the WBC website but do not have appropriate quality surface. Eg BW24.  BW26 at its northern end has serious erosion and is an example of where significant work is required.</p> <p><i>Actions have been included in the plan to improve the surface of byways where they are predominately used by vehicles, as well as looking into potential restrictions [SOA 5.6], A specific action has also been included within the plan to identify patch with surface and drainage issues and implement effective solutions [SOA 5.1(a)].</i></p> <p><u>Planning for the future</u>  Developer funding. Please see comments regarding Greenways and the existing network above.  Explore opportunities for benefitting from the Social Value Act requirements on Developers.  Ensure compatibility of “paths” within SDLs and links to rest of network ie continuity of access for same user groups such as continuous bridleway routes.  Other objectives remain valid to mitigate/avoid effects of development on PRoW network.</p> <p><u>Delivering the Corporate Agenda</u>  Integration with other elements of WBC activity is clearly essential especially ensuring alternative safe forms of access to new and existing facilities of all types. This is particularly important for young people who are more likely to use cycling as a form of transport.</p> <p><i>The revised plan has undertaken an analysis of the current WBC strategies and policies and seeks to integrate with these strategies and details where each identified action has common goals and links.</i></p> <p><b><u>New Rights of Way for RoWIP 2019</u></b></p> <p>1/ Restoration of the Cemex sites at Fleet Hill and Manor Farm according to agreed plans and suitable standard for the type of RoW to ensure all year accessibility</p> <p><i>This is a project currently underway and is being dealt with as part of day-to-day management. It is outside the scope of the strategic plan</i></p>	
--	--	--

		<p>2/ FP 33 to be upgraded to Bridleway to connect The Village to new Bridleway network on Cemex sites.</p> <p>3/ Upgrade FP54 alongside Blackwater River (from FP17A to Mill Lane – Sandhurst) to Bridleway to link to new network on Cemex sites.</p> <p>4/ Provision of a link between BR34 and BR26 possibly using the route proposed in Finc3 of last ROWIP. Landowner agreement will be difficult to obtain (FPC has tried several times).</p> <p>5/ Provision of a safe cycle route from the North of Finchampstead to Wokingham.</p> <p>6/ Provision of an off road route (Greenway?) for Horse Riders and Cyclists between The Village and California Cross.</p> <p>7/ FP20 and continuation into Sandhurst to be upgraded to Bridleway across Ambarrow Lane to Lower Sandhurst Road following route of existing footpaths.</p> <p>8/ Create RoW from Rhododendron Corner (Finchampstead Ridges B3348) to BP26 near Ridge Farm using existing tracks.</p> <p>9/ Create footpath access from Gilbert Close to Rooks Nest Country Park.</p> <p><i>The specific routes detailed above have been included in the proposed new routes (Appendix 4).</i></p> <p><b>Comments on previous RoWIP priorities</b>  Noted that several of the previous RoWIP priorities have been superceded or are in hand, some through the greenway network.  Some items eg proposals around Eversley are unclear so we are unable to comment.  Finc 15 Bridleway/path alongside B3348 from Western end of the Ridges to Dell Road – highly optimistic. Note BW36 and BW27a/21 provide alternatives to some of this.  Finc 17 Path alongside B3348 from FP8/Fleet Hill Lane to A327 Tally Ho – again highly optimistic.  With the remaining ideas from the previous Plan we are happy to comment / offer our interpretation if required.</p> <p><i>The site specific suggestions from the 2010 ROWIP have been revised and a new list of proposed paths has been developed.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--