

**MEETING : CHESHIRE LOCAL ACCESS FORUM**  
**DATE : 10 DECEMBER 2010**

**REPORT OF : COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER**  
**Contact : Genni Butler**  
**Officer : 01606 271817**

---

**CHESHIRE EAST RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2011-2026:  
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PRIORITISATION METHODOLOGY**

- 1 As Members will be aware, it is a statutory duty under section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for every local highway authority to prepare and publish a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP).
- 2 The Draft ROWIP 2011-2026 was presented to the Forum in September 2010 ahead of public consultation. Comments received have been taken into consideration and the amended ROWIP 2011-2026 will be put before the Rights of Way Committee on 13 December 2010 with final sign off by the Portfolio Holder on 17 January 2011.
- 3 The ROWIP 2011-2026 document sets out the strategy by which the Council aims to improve the public rights of way over the next 15 years. Which improvements are to be made will be set out in 3-yearly implementation plans.
- 4 Suggestions for improvement projects have been submitted by members of the public. In order for these to be fairly assessed, a prioritisation methodology is required. Three options for this methodology, shown in Appendix 1, are put before the Forum in order for the most appropriate methodology to be selected and applied.
- 5 Each option contains the ROWIP policies and an assessment of the feasibility of the suggestion. Each option contains similar criteria, but each has a different emphasis, the first on resources, the second on need and the third on targets.
- 6 The selected prioritisation methodology will then be applied to the suggested projects in order to draw up the first of the Implementation Plans under the ROWIP 2011-2026. How many projects can be delivered will be a result of available funding sources.

**RECOMMENDED:**

**That Forum Members consider the appended prioritisation methodologies and select the most appropriate for use in drawing up the first Implementation Plan under the ROWIP 2011-2026.**

## Option 1: focus on resources

		Not met	Not met, but potential to meet	Partially met	Met	Met, with potential added value
	Criteria					
LTP/ROWIP Policies	H1 Promotion of active travel and healthy activities:work in partnership to promote walking, cycling and horse riding as active travel options and healthy activities	1	2	3	4	5
	H2 Green Infrastructure: protect and enhance our public rights of way and green infrastructure and endeavour to create new links where beneficial for health or access to green spaces	1	2	3	4	5
	S2 Walking: work with stakeholders to improve facilities for walking so that it is attractive for shorter journeys	1	2	3	4	5
	S1 Cycling: work with stakeholders to improve facilities for cycling so that it is attractive for shorter journeys	1	2	3	4	5
Staff Resources	Project could be delivered easily within current staffing levels	1	2	3	4	5
	Value for money: large improvement compared to staff resource	1	2	3	4	5
Financial resources	Project can be delivered within anticipated revenue and capital budgets	1	2	3	4	5
	Potential funding source already identified	1	2	3	4	5
	Value for money: large improvement compared to financial resource	1	2	3	4	5
Feasibility	Landowner agreement	1	2	3	4	5
	Community support (e.g. voluntary groups, local councils, councillors)	1	2	3	4	5
SCORES						
TOTAL SCORE						

## Option 2: focus on need

	Criteria	Not met	Not met, but potential to meet	Partially met	Met	Met, with potential added value
LTP/ROWIP Policies	H1 Promotion of active travel and healthy activities:work in partnership to promote walking, cycling and horse riding as active travel options and healthy activities	1	2	3	4	5
	H2 Green Infrastructure: protect and enhance our public rights of way and transport related green infrastructure and endeavour to create new links where beneficial for health or access to green spaces	1	2	3	4	5
	S2 Walking: work with stakeholders to improve facilities for walking so that it is attractive for shorter journeys	1	2	3	4	5
	S1 Cycling: work with stakeholders to improve facilities for cycling so that it is attractive for shorter journeys	1	2	3	4	5
Need	Route is in area of high level of deprivation	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving urban access to countryside	1	2	3	4	5
	Route is in area of with poor access provision or addresses gaps in the network	1	2	3	4	5
	Value for money: large number of potential beneficiaries compared to cost of project	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving disabled access	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving access for equestrians	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving access for cyclists	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving access to woodland, moorland or other landscape feature lacking in access, or area of interest	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving access in area of prospective development	1	2	3	4	5
	Obvious transport theme: link between communities and facilities to avoid road use	1	2	3	4	5
	Exisiting or new promoted route, providing more information for users	1	2	3	4	5
	Source of request - (e.g. 1 - single individual, 2 -multiple individuals, 3 - parish council, user group, 4 - multiple groups, 5 - multiple groups with support from other organisations e.g British Waterways)	1	2	3	4	5
By All Reasonable Means criteria	Tourism / visitor economy benefit	1	2	3	4	5
	Route / terrain - existing standard of route (e.g. 1 - remote and difficult so accessible only to a few individuals, 5 - flat and easy so accessible to most)	1	2	3	4	5
	Connectivity - route offers link between other routes or facilities like shops and schools	1	2	3	4	5
	Interest: route offers link to area of conservation or landscape value or other place of interest	1	2	3	4	5
	Demand - improvements will result in added demand from potential users	1	2	3	4	5
	Popularity - current route popularity	1	2	3	4	5
Feasibility	Landowner agreement	1	2	3	4	5
	Community support (e.g. voluntary groups, local councils, councillors)	1	2	3	4	5
	Funding source identified	1	2	3	4	5
	Staff resource demand: achievable with current staffing levels	1	2	3	4	5
SCORES						
TOTAL SCORE						

### Option 3: focus on targets

	Criteria	Not met	Not met, but potential to meet	Partially met	Met	Met, with potential added value
LTP/ROWIP Policies	H1 Promotion of active travel and healthy activities:work in partnership to promote walking, cycling and horse riding as active travel options and healthy activities	1	2	3	4	5
	H2 Green Infrastructure: protect and enhance our public rights of way and transport related green infrastructure and endeavour to create new links where beneficial for health or access to green spaces	1	2	3	4	5
	S2 Walking: work with stakeholders to improve facilities for walking so that it is attractive for shorter journeys	1	2	3	4	5
	S1 Cycling: work with stakeholders to improve facilities for cycling so that it is attractive for shorter journeys	1	2	3	4	5
National Local Transport Plan Goals	Reducing carbon emissions	1	2	3	4	5
	Supporting economic growth	1	2	3	4	5
	Promoting equality of opportunity	1	2	3	4	5
	Contributing to better safety, security & health	1	2	3	4	5
	Improving quality of life & healthy natural environment	1	2	3	4	5
LTP Objectives	1. Congestion: minimise congestion in our urban areas and on important routes and improve the overall efficiency of the highway network	1	2	3	4	5
	2. Accessibility: improve accessibility to key services (employment, education, health, shopping and leisure)	1	2	3	4	5
	3. Improve maintenance of the highway and transport network.	1	2	3	4	5
	4. Community: support community involvement and decision-making	1	2	3	4	5
	5. Health: support active and healthy lifestyles	1	2	3	4	5
	6. Safety: improve road safety for all users and increase personal and community safety	1	2	3	4	5
	7. Environment: protect and enhance our local and global environment	1	2	3	4	5
Ambition for All priorities for action	Nurture strong communities	1	2	3	4	5
	Create conditions for business growth	1	2	3	4	5
	Unlock the potential of our towns	1	2	3	4	5
	Support our childrens and young people	1	2	3	4	5
	Ensure a sustainable future	1	2	3	4	5
	Prepare for an increasingly older population	1	2	3	4	5
	Drive out the sources of poor health	1	2	3	4	5
Feasibility	Landowner agreement	1	2	3	4	5
	Community support (e.g. voluntary groups, local councils, councillors)	1	2	3	4	5
	Funding source identified	1	2	3	4	5
	Staff resource demand: achievable with current staffing levels	1	2	3	4	5
SCORES						
TOTAL SCORE						