

Representor ID: RCRP-022

UI Representor ID: 823

UI Representation ID: 886

Representor Name: James Walsh

Representor Organisation: MKCC Rights of Way

Policy: Policy GS18		
Legal Compliant:	Soundness Compliant:	Duty to Cooperate Compliant:
Yes	No	Yes
Paragraph		
Compliance Comment		
<p>A Public Bridleway crosses the site and adjoins the A4146, which is identified within this policy. On the other side of the A4146 in Buckinghamshire is another Public Bridleway which continues on at this point linking to the wider countryside across the County border. This location is therefore a significant strategic location on the PRoW network and provision to ensure users can safely cross the A4146 is crucial. The need to consider this scenario is set out within NPPF paragraph 105, which reads "Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users". Policy GS18 (C)(9)(a) on page 67 outlines the need for "segregated routes for active travel and the provision of interchange hub that integrate well with Eaton Leys etc". Whilst this could be interpreted to potentially cover provision for this important bridleway junction it does not specifically describe the bridleway currently in-situ here. Given the importance of this crossing, the increase in traffic associated with the development of this site would potentially make the road impossible to cross, and any attempt to cross could be highly hazardous to both bridleway users and drivers. Therefore it is imperative that the existence of the current bridleway is specifically outlined within this policy to ensure an appropriate and necessary crossing is achieved in compliance with the NPPF. Without specific mention, the concern would be that any future development here may not appropriately address what is required here to mitigate the issue this development would bring.</p>		
Modification Comment		
<p>The simplest way to achieve this would be specify the presence of the existing bridleway within policy GS18 (C) (9)(a) with the addition of the three words as outlined below:-</p> <p>"Segregated routes for active travel 'including existing bridleway' and provision of interchange hubs that integrates well with Eaton Leys, South of Bow Brickhill Strategic City Extension and the surrounding area and network of active travel routes and routes for public transport;". A preferred alternative and more all-encompassing approach would be the provision of a new point within this section to categorically address this issue, suggested wording below:-</p>		

“Provision for suitable safe crossing for pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists across A4146 at strategic cross- county bridleway connection“.

Appear at examination?	No
-------------------------------	----

Appear at examination reason?

--

Representor ID: RCRP-022

UI Representor ID: 823

UI Representation ID: 886

Representor Name: James Walsh

Representor Organisation: MKCC Rights of Way

Policy: Policy GS10		
Legal Compliant:	Soundness Compliant:	Duty to Cooperate Compliant:
Yes	No	Yes
Paragraph		
Compliance Comment		
<p>There is a slight inconsistency between a point within policy GS10 and National policy. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 105 sets out that “Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails”. The proposed wording within Policy GS10 Movement and Access (B)(7) (page 47) reads as “Safeguard and, where possible, enhance access to public rights of way”. A concern is that the addition of ‘where possible’ unnecessarily dilutes down the intention behind the wording of “should” as set within the NPPF. This approach could allow a scenario for applicants who could reasonably make improvements to the Public Right of Way network as part of proposals to utilise the vagueness this wording introduces to not make enhancements where they perhaps should.</p>		
Modification Comment		
<p>The Rights of Way Team would request the removal of the words ‘where possible’ within Policy GS10 (B)(7) to bring the document in line with and remain consistent with the intention and wording set out within the NPPF. Given the growing evidence behind the tremendous health and wellbeing benefits an effective PRow network brings society, this simple change would address this issue succinctly.</p>		
Appear at examination?	No	
Appear at examination reason?		