

Review Title: Equestrian Access on Pedestrian & Cycle Routes
Overview & Scrutiny Panel: Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability
Panel Chairman: Cllr. Peter Metcalfe
Overview & Scrutiny Project Manager: David Langman
Supporting Service Officer: Rab Smith, Transportation Planning Team Leader

Process for Tracking O&S Recommendations - Guidance note for Executive Members

The enclosed table lists all the recommendations arising from the above Overview & Scrutiny Review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Executive Members (or whole Executive in the case of a whole Executive referral) as listed in the '**Exec Member**' column of the table. In order to provide the O&S Panel with an Executive response on each recommendation, the named Executive member (or whole Executive) is asked to complete the last 3 columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response

The Executive has the following options:

- **Accept** the Panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the Panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future Executive decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget considerations, etc.

Implementation Date

- For 'Accept' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented.
- For 'Defer' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered.
- For 'Reject' decisions this is not applicable so write n/a

Rationale

Use this space to explain the rationale for your decision response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

Equestrian Access Review: Recommendations

Recommendation	Exec Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
It is the unanimous opinion of the Panel that:				
<p>1. A 12-month trial period on the routes identified by the Executive Paper of November 2004 should go ahead.</p> <p>Shared access on multi-use paths is a fundamental goal for the Council to work towards. It is in line with the government's guidance to Local Authorities for transport planning. The Council has a duty to open up facilities wherever possible for all relevant modes of transport and consider that the objections raised do not provide sufficient rationale compared with the benefits that may be achieved by inclusive access.</p>	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Accept	Following actions identified in recommendations 2 and 3	In line with requirements improve access for sustainable means of transport and need to protect vulnerable users.
<p>2. Prior to the implementation of the 12 month trial period, the Executive Member is recommended to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consultation is conducted with Executive Members from our neighbouring Authorities, particularly where trial routes run over borders, and take notice of any concerns raised. • A code of conduct, user guidelines and signage (including emergency procedures) for use during the trial period are developed. This must be done in conjunction with representatives from the 	Sir Elgar Jenkins	Accept	End June	<p>Need to ensure sufficient time to allow user and consulted groups to respond to consultation.</p> <p>Report conclusions before end of 12 month period.</p>

<p>consulted groups identified in the course of the Panel's investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A robust monitoring regime in consultation with the primary user groups is put in place to provide a range of data that will enable the trial to be effectively evaluated. • Upon conclusion, the findings reported be brought back to the Panel for consideration and comment to the Executive Member. 				
<p>3. All of the proposed routes are again independently risk assessed in terms of safety for all of the potential user groups.</p> <p>The Panel believes the assessments should be less risk averse and need to take account of probability – a dimension missing from the initial assessments. Factors such as what is a reasonable path width within the context of local circumstances and how routes are managed to achieve effective maintenance are to be taken into consideration. Results of these fresh assessments and actual experiences during the trial period should be used to define whether specific, generic, or indeed any risk assessments are required in the longer term.</p>	<p>Sir Elgar Jenkins</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>Start consultation on methodology by end April with aim of completing by September 05</p>	<p>Accept on assumption that risk assessment to be carried out in-house, following consultation on methodology with user groups, before routes opened.</p>
<p>4. A designated officer should be appointed to manage the trial period.</p>	<p>Sir Elgar Jenkins</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>now</p>	<p>Transportation Planning Team to manage trial period (contact Rab Smith)</p>
<p>5. In future, any new route builds should be designed and constructed to support multi-use.</p>	<p>Sir Elgar Jenkins</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>now</p>	<p>Accept in principle.</p>

<p>6. The panel was again very seriously concerned that the quality of public consultation had not been sufficiently comprehensive or robust. In the Panel's December 2003 Call-In report for Wellsway it asked the Executive to:</p> <p>“consider that there are lessons to be learnt for Bath & North East Somerset Council as a whole on handling consultation on significant Ward issues and involving Ward Councillors at the earliest opportunity and on giving suitable feedback. The Panel recommend that the Council Executive should examine this matter further.”</p> <p>The Panel asks again that this matter is now given a high priority by the Executive.</p>	<p>Sir Elgar Jenkins with whole Executive</p>	<p>Accept</p>		
--	---	---------------	--	--