

## APPENDIX 2

Cheshire East Council

### DEFINITIVE MAP MODIFICATION ORDERS: PROPOSED REVISED STATEMENT OF PRIORITIES June 2009

#### Background

Cheshire East Council, as Surveying Authority for the Definitive Map and Statement, has a duty to keep it under continuous review and make modifications as required. The Secretary of State recommends that Surveying Authorities should periodically publish a statement of priorities for dealing with Definitive Map Modification Orders.

A revised prioritisation system is proposed here, which takes into consideration the 4 thematic objectives of the Council's 'Rights of Way Improvement Plan', plus a fifth 'cross-cutting' objective to cover network considerations. It is based (with modifications) on a prioritisation system originally designed for ranking 'improvement' projects, considered and approved by the Cheshire and Warrington Local Access Forum in March 2005.

The scoring system is designed to permit a systematic yet flexible approach to dealing with a potentially large volume of applications and matters requiring detailed investigations.

**N.B. Any claimed route threatened by development will be taken out of turn regardless of the score it initially received.**

The higher the total score for a route, the higher priority it will be given for processing.

#### Application of scoring

- 1 = objective not met
- 2 = not met, but potential to meet
- 3 = partially met
- 4 = met
- 5 = met, with potential added value

<b>ROWIP objective</b>	<b>Score (1-5)</b>
<b>Health</b>	
Route would provide new or enhanced opportunity for exercise from home (e.g. helps form a new circular route, close to where people live).	
Route reduces traffic/vulnerable road user interaction.	
<b>Tourism/economics</b>	
Route would benefit local businesses in the area (e.g. by attracting walkers to local shops/pubs etc).	
Route would attract visitors from local area.	
Route would attract visitors from wider area.	
<b>Sustainable travel</b>	
Route would allow greater linkages between PROW network and Public Transport (e.g. termination point close to a bus stop).	
Route would provide pragmatic alternative to a car journey.	
Route would benefit people without access to a car (e.g. provides direct link from where people live to shops and services).	
<b>Social inclusion</b>	
Route would benefit people with mobility/visual impairments (e.g. route	

flat and accessible with surfacing potential).	
<b>Cross-cutting considerations</b>	
Route improves overall provision for horse riders and off-road cyclists.	
Addition would increase path density in an area of recognised poor provision.	
Improvement would increase path connectivity (e.g. a town-country link, link to an attractive area, link to an amenity, or link between two or more communities).	
Application coincides with existing ROWIP suggestion which has come from interest groups (e.g. riders, walkers, Parish Council, landowners etc.).	
Application has been on waiting list for more than 12 months <b>(automatically add 5 points for every year on the waiting list).</b>	
Application would resolve a mapping anomaly <b>(automatically add 5 points).</b>	
Claimed route coincides with a Discovering Lost Ways case route <b>(automatically add 2 points).</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	