Evidence for decision not to impact assess

Policy/Function/Service	Waste and Countryside Services – Prioritisation and resolution of issues reported on the Public Right of Way network
Summary aims of the Policy/Function/Service • Why is it needed? • What does the authority hope to achieve by it? • How will it be ensured that it works as intended?	North Yorkshire County Council is responsible for managing the longest public rights of way network in England at over 10,000km. The Yorkshire Dales and North York Moors National Parks manage approximately 4,000km through an agency agreement with the County Council. The majority of issues on public right of way are identified and reported to us by members of the public. Reports are logged onto a Countryside and Access Management System which holds details of the nature of the issue, known landownership interest and the complainants contact details. Structures on the network (Stiles and gates) are the responsibility of the landowner, although it is the responsibility of the highway authority to ensure that they are in an acceptable condition and to make a contribution of no less than 25% towards their upkeep. Surfacing, signage and bridge structures are generally the responsibility of the Highway Authority, as is the requirement to keep routes free from obstruction. A matrix is used to prioritise and resolve issues on a risk management based approach calculation (Risk = Likelihood x Severity) to ensure the safety of the user. To allow all issues to be ranked in priority score order, the calculation also takes into account the priority of the route and the effect of the issue on the route (Priority = Likelihood x Severity + Route Priority + Effect on Route). This then determines how quickly resources are allocated to resolve the issue.

Evidence for decision not to impact assess

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="3"></td>
<td colspan="2">Route priority is determined by the following factors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Path Characteristics</td>
</tr>
</table>

Priority	Path Characteristics
High	- National Trails - Routes on the approved Promoted Route schedule - Routes providing access to employment & amenities - Routes linking communities - Routes within 1km of a community - Routes giving access to Open Access Land - Multi user paths with a clear public benefit
Medium	Routes not falling into the High or Low categories
Low	- Cul-de-sac routes with no terminal point of interest - Routes which are duplicated by another route of greater convenience

Whilst all issues can be scored using the model there are groups of issues which can be effectively dealt with as part of work programmes, which seek to maximise efficiency of resource. These include:
- Seasonal Undergrowth
- Ploughing and Cropping
- Signposting
- Bridge Replacement
- Major projects

However, the planning of additional work programmes are covered in a separate EIA and are therefore not included within the scope of this review.

Target beneficiaries for the Policy/Function/Service (identify relevant protected characteristics)	Target beneficiaries of the service are users the public right of way network within North Yorkshire and landowners/managers.
Stakeholders	Users of public rights of way and landowners within North Yorkshire

Evidence for decision not to impact assess

Relevance assessment	Include summary detail (bullet points)
Does this Policy/Function/Service deliver on objectives set out in a more strategic Policy/Function/Service? If so, what were the findings of the EIA for the more strategic function?	Prioritising and resolving issues falls within the County Council's duty to maintain the public rights of way network within North Yorkshire and to ensure the service provides a network that is safe to use.
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community?	All who live work and visit within North Yorkshire.
Is it a major policy, with a significant effect on how functions are delivered?	The process of prioritising and resolving issues on the network determines the level and timing of resource required and informs the development of future pro-active work programmes.
Will it have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (for example, partners, funding criteria, etc).	There are no significant effects on other organisations
Does it involve a significant commitment of resources?	Prioritisation of issues in terms of resource required is not significant, however the maintenance operation and resolution of those issues is significant and currently involves 13 FTE staff members and a maintenance budget in the region of £200K per annum
Does it relate to an area where there are known inequalities (for example, disabled people's access to public transport)	It is widely recognised that not all public rights of way by their very nature are accessible and easy to use particularly by people with a physical disability. However, issues relating to access and the use of public right of ways are covered in a separate EIA and is therefore not included within the scope of this review. The process of prioritising and resolving issues on the network is based upon level of risk and the priority of the route and not the protected characteristics of persons using the route or reporting the issue. Therefore the decision has been made not to undertake a full EIA.

Evidence for decision not to impact assess

Are any equality and diversity issues relevant to this policy/function/service? Include a short explanation of your assessment. Reference data/evidence used in this assessment (hyperlinks/attachments)[1]					
No equality and diversity issues have been identified as directly relevant to the process of prioritising and resolving issues on the rights of way network.					
Full equality impact assessment required?	Yes ☐			No ☒	
Relevance to equality and diversity	High ☐	Medium ☐		Low ☒	
Priority	High ☐	Medium ☐		Low ☒	
Assessment made by[2]:	Aidan Rayner				
Job title	Public Rights of Way Team Leader				
Approved by[3]:	Ian Fielding				
Job title	Assistant Director – Waste & Countryside Services				
Date:	21st November 2012				

---

[1] What aspects are particularly relevant to equality? Does this only relate to certain equality strands e.g. disability?

[2] Head of service or equivalent

[3] AD or equivalent