

Non-Motorised User Routes Adoption Criteria - Public Path Diversion Applications

Criteria		Maximum available score	C01 Chittering	C03 West River Bridge	C04 Meldreth FP10	C07 Harston FP 4	C08 Ely N Jn	C08 Ely N Jn (2)	C08 Ely N Jn (2) if width resolved	C09 Second Drove	C10 Coffue Drove	C14 Eastrea Cross Drove	C15 Brickyard Drove	C16 Prickwillow	C17 Prickwillow	C20 Leonards Jan 17 DF	C21 Newmarket Bridge	C22 Newmarket Bridge	C24 Cross Keys	C24 with CCC request	C29 Cassells Jan DF	C25 Clayway	C26 Poplar Drove	C27 Willow Row/Road	C31 Littleport Station
No.	Item (SOA = Statement of Action in ROWIP)																								
1	Pre-application consultations have been carried out with the prescribed bodies.	Pass or Fail	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	Not assessed as policy not relevant
2	The existing route is available for use and any 'temporary' obstructions have been removed, in order to allow a comparison to be made. Any request for exemption will be decided by the Director Highways & Access as to whether or not that is appropriate.	Pass or Fail	P	P	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	F	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
3	No objections are received to the proposals during the statutory consultation period prior to making an order. However, the County Council will review this criterion in individual cases in light of objections and potential public benefit of the proposal. If the County Council consider the objection to be irrelevant, this will class as a pass.	Pass or Fail	P	F	F	F	F	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	F	F	F	P	P	F	F	P	F	
4	A minimum width of 2m is provided for a diverted footpath, and a minimum width of 4m for a diverted bridleway. In exceptional cases, e.g. cross-field paths, the County Council may, taking into account all the available facts, require such a width as it considers reasonable and appropriate.	Pass or Fail	P	P	F	P	F	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	F	F	
5	If maintenance liability is significantly greater than existing, the landowner has agreed to undertake or fund future maintenance.	Pass or Fail	P	P	P	P	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	
6	The proposed route would have no stiles or gates, or allows for access for people with mobility issues.	Pass or Fail	P	P	P	F	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	F	F	
7	Significant negative impact on a class of user - Equalities Act	-2	-1	0	-2	-2	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	-2	-2
8	Significant increase in accessibility - Equalities Act	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
9	Resolves long-term maintenance problems	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10	The proposed new route is not less convenient for maintenance than the original.	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11	The effect the order would have on the land served by the existing path and also the land across which the new path would run.	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
12	The proposed new route is substantially as convenient to the public as the original.	3	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	
13	User enjoyment	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
14	There are no other reasonable or viable alternatives	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
15	A suitable alternative path is provided for every path that is to be diverted.	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
16	The proposal maintains or improves usefulness of the Rights of Way Network	2	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	
	Total Score /20 (Pass mark 70% ie 14)	20	6	8	0	-2	3	5	10	11	13	11	11	13	13	6	6	6	6	8	3	1	1	1	