PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE PERMISSIVE ACCESS IN STEWARDSHIP SCHEMES

DRAFT CONSULTATION

07/06/15

1.	Do you agree that funding should be provided for permissive access in stewardship schemes?
If y	es please answer the following questions in relation to the draft report:



If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.1. Do you agree with: Influence Government to provide immediate funding for "easy access" routes, as it is recognised that there are very few opportunities for countryside access for the disabled. Details for this proposal can be found in appendix B.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.2. Do you agree with: Influence Government and CAP to include funding permissive access on 10 year agreements for perpetuity to be bound into the 2021 CAP agreement and all the following CAP agreements, provided we are still part of the EEC. To ensure the LAFs have the best chance of success in this matter it will be necessary to start working on this action in 2016.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.3. Do you agree with: Influence Government to create a reasonable size pot of money, for funding permissive access. Urban LAFs may not have any HLS sites so they should have the option where they can then donate their funding to their neighbouring LAF. However the urban LAF should have a say in where the money is spent. This is to ensure people in their area benefit from the permissive route, as it would be one of the routes their users would be most likely to use e.g. close to the urban area as a link to the PRoW network.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.4. Do you agree with: Influence Government to allocate the pot of money available in accordance with the highway authority's area of land. With the highway authorities with the lowest land area being provided with a reasonable sum to ensure they can provide a reasonable amount of permissive routes.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.5. Do you agree with: Influence Government to announce the allocation percentage for each LAF by 2019, the minimum funds for small (by area) highway authorities and maximum funds for large (by area) highway authorities.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.6. Do you agree with: Influence Government to pass the responsibility for awarding permissive access funding to the LAFs. This is due to the LAFs having the knowledge of the access requirements of the locality. Hence the LAF will be responsible for the proportion of types of permissive routes in their LAF area. DEFRA would still be responsible for actual payment to landowners/farmers.

If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.

2.2.7. Do you agree with: Influence Government to create a permissive access rate for restricted bridleways.
If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.
2.2.8. Do you agree with: Influence Government to maintain a web site for all permissive routes in a format similar to the current permissive access web site:
http://cwr.naturalengland.org.uk/walk-ride.aspx
If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.
2.2.9. Do you agree with: Influence Government to create the option of the opportunity to upgrade PRoW to a higher level status through permissive access payments, whilst protecting its PRoW status, see appendix C.
If "No" please state what if any immediate action should be undertaken on an additional document.
3.What other questions should be on this consultation form? Please state how you would answer the additional questions.