

P4C End of Scheme Report

Annexes

Annex 1 – P4C Grants Panel Terms of Reference.....	2
Annex 2 - Grants Panel – Rolling Schedule	6
Annex 3 – Summary Statistics on all funded P4C projects.....	10
Annex 4 – Letter from defra re. EDCL	17
Annex 5 – Case Story example – Beck Linear Park.....	22
Annex 6 - P4C Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.....	29

Annex 1 – P4C Grants Panel Terms of Reference

1 Roles and responsibilities

The P4C Grants Panel (the Panel) will be Chaired by a senior member of the Natural England People & Access Team, with members drawn from Natural England, Defra and a number of external organisations.

The role of the Panel is to make informed decisions on project funding.

The Panel will meet monthly, mostly by telephone conference but occasionally face to face.

The Panel has the power to award grants of between £5,000 and £150,000.

The Panel will make decisions based on information and suggestions supplied to it by the Natural England P4C Project Team. However, the decisions are independent and the Panel has the right to over-ride the suggestions of the Project Team.

The Panel ensures that through the approval of grants the objectives of the scheme and conditions of the Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) are achieved

2. Grant awards

The Panel will consider all grant applications presented to it and may 'recommend a grant award', 'recommend an award with conditions', 'recommend that the application be reworked and resubmitted' or 'reject an application'. The Panel will request all information it considers necessary to reach a decision to be made available and will call upon external advice as it sees fit and appropriate. Members of the P4C Project Team may be called upon to provide additional information at the meeting.

Decisions of the Panel will be made with consideration for the scheme eligibility and assessment criteria. The Panel will also need to have regard for the scheme budget profile.

At each meeting the Panel will be presented with:

- A rolling schedule of all applications received listing the project, its status (assessed by LGO, assessed by grants panel, awarded, awarded with conditions, rework requested, rejected) its location, funds offered, claim date(s).

- List of applications presented to meeting and completed assessment form for each;
- Full application forms for each project to be considered at meeting;
- P4C Monthly Project Report

Responsibility for awarding of grants is delegated to the Chair of the Panel. In the Chair's absence the decisions reached by the Panel will be presented to the Chair of the P4C Board (Liz Newton) for approval and ratification.

3. Composition of the Panel

The aim will be to establish a pool of Panel members with a range of specialist knowledge and particular expertise in public access to the natural environment, community empowerment, tourism, land management, environmental management and partnership-working.

The Panel will meet on a monthly basis, subject to applications coming forward. Most meetings will be held by telephone conference but it will be important for the Panel to meet face to face at certain key parts of the process.

A core of four Panel members must be available to vote at a Panel meeting, comprising one member from Natural England, one from Defra and two independent Panel members. Each member will have one vote. Grants will be approved by a simple majority vote system. The Chair will have an additional casting vote where required.

Panel members will be appointed to serve the duration of the Scheme (due to conclude 31 March 2014). If a Panel member misses three or more meetings then they may be replaced.

4. Standards

The Panel members will abide by the general principles of conduct which underpin public life. These seven principles are selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership. The Panel will adhere to a code of conduct including the following principles:

- a. A Panel member must not promote any matter in the Panel in return for payment.
- b. A Panel member who has a financial interest, direct or indirect, must declare that interest and stand down from the Panel whilst that project/issue is being discussed and agreed.

- c. In any dealings with or on behalf of the Grant Scheme, Natural England, Defra or the RDPE, a Panel member must always bear in mind the overriding responsibility which exists to the public and to the national interest. This is particularly important in respect of activities which may not be a matter of public record, such as informal meetings and functions.
- d. In fulfilling the requirements on declaration and registration of interests and remuneration, and disposing of contracts, a Panel Member must have regard to the purpose of those requirements and must comply fully with them, both in letter and spirit.
- e. It is a well established and recognised rule that no panel member should accept gifts, hospitality or services from anyone which would, or might appear to, place him or her under an obligation.

5. Disclosure of interests and conflict of interest

A Register of the Panel's personal or professional Interests will be compiled immediately after the Panel is established. The Panel Chair will remind members of their obligations at the start of each Panel meeting and request confirmation that no changes have occurred. Panel members do not vote on, or give approval for, any grant applications in which they may have an interest. The Register will give a clear description of the nature and scope of the interests declared. An electronic version of the register will be available and updating will be immediate. Members will be required to add to the Register any contracts relating to the provision of services and the level of annual remuneration for these services will be recorded.

Disclosure of interests goes a long way to reducing the risk of impropriety, but even when an interest has been disclosed, it may still be necessary in the public interest for the person with the interest to withdraw from the business in question.

Membership (as at August 2012)

Panel Members	Job Title / Business Function	Panel Role
Wendy Thompson	Natural England	Panel Chair
Clare Webb	Natural England P4C Team	Secretary (non voting)
Martin Shaw	Natural England Senior Adviser P4C	Member, Chair of Officer Group
Margaret Read	Defra Principal Policy Officer	Panel Deputy Chair
Robin Barnett	Defra Policy Advisor	Member
Jason Freezer	Head of Destination Management, Visit England	Member
Sue Steer	RICS	Member
Richard Gething	NALC	Member
Emma Noyce	IPROW	Member
Mike Ogden	ADEPT	Member

Annex 2 - Grants Panel – Rolling Schedule

Last updated 22nd October 2013

P4C Reference	Project Title	Date presented to Grants Panel	Status	Funds offered	Offer accepted
P4C_EM_M_20120615a	Discover Mersea	14/11/2012	Award	£22,621.50	11/12/12
P4C_North_C_20120517a	Ellerburn Multiuser Trail	14/11/2012	Reject	N/A	n/a
P4C_SE_U_20120903a	Godmersham Multi User Link	14/11/2012	Award with condition	£105,090	11/01/13
P4C_North_D_20120730a	Greno Woods Part 1	14/11/2012	Award with condition	£10,151.25	10/12/12
P4C_North_A_20120618a	Viking Way	14/11/2012	Rework and Resubmit	N/A	n/a
P4C_North_B_20120525	Dane Meadow (Holmes Chapel)	14/11/2012	Rework and Resubmit	N/A	n/a
P4C_North_B_20120525	Dane Meadow - resubmission	12/12/2012	Award with conditions	£148,896	16/01/13
P4C_North_A_20120723	Jubilee Trail – Feasibility Study	17/01/2013	Reject	N/A	n/a
P4C_North_C_20120601	Wakefield Cycle Forum – Phase 1	17/01/2013	Award with conditions	18,500.00	08/02/13
P4C_North_B_20120708	Mid Cheshire Bridleways	17/01/2013	Award with conditions	£30,995.00	11/02/13
P4C_SW_P_20120720	Bike Safe Oxfordshire – Feasibility Study	17/01/2013	Reject	N/A	n/a
P4C_North C_20121129	Ellerburn Multiuser Trail - resubmission	14/03/2013	Award with conditions	£74,925	26/07/2013
P4C_North A_20121203	Elwick Community Partnership for Pathways	14/03/2013	Award with conditions	£13,137.50	11/04/13

P4C Reference	Project Title	Date presented to Grants Panel	Status	Funds offered	Offer accepted
P4C_EM_Q_20120515	Forest of Marston Vale Access Enhancement and Interpretation Project	14/03/2013	Award	£23,424.12	28/03/13
P4C_SW__20120815	The Kilmersdon Link	23/04/2013	Award with condition	£2,052	20/05/13
P4C_WM_E_20120910	Connecting North Lichfield	23/04/2013	Award with conditions	£6,770	12/06/13
P4C_SE_U_20120525	Rodmell to Southease Bridleway	23/04/2013	Rework and Resubmit	0	n/a
P4C_WM_E_20120612	Nesscliffe Hills	23/04/2013	Award	£20,800	23/05/13
P4C_EM_M_20121008	Weald Park Bridleways	23/04/2013	Award	£87,868.12	07/06/13
P4C_SE_U_20120525	Rodmell to Southease Bridleway - resubmit	16/05/2013	Rework and resubmit	0	n/a
P4C_EM_K_20130219	Coton Countryside Reserve Bridge Project	16/05/2013	Award	£18,135	12/06/13
P4C_EM_M_20120926	Walton Trail	16/05/2013	Reject	0	n/a
P4C_North_C_20130220	Wakefield Phase 2 – Chevet Branchline	16/05/2013	Award	£43,000	07/06/13
P4C_North_D_20130226	Steel Valley	16/05/2013	Award	£38,111.04	20/06/2013
P4C_North_F_20120705	Heart of the Forest	16/05/2013	Award	£50,110.06	12/06/2013
P4C_SE_U_20120525	Rodmell to Southease Bridleway - resubmit	18/06/2013	Award	£117,308	16/07/2013
P4C_WM_E_20120612	Oswestry Circle	18/06/2013	Rework and Resubmit	0	n/a
P4C_SW_W_20121219	West Penwith	18/06/2013	Award	£15,691.00	29/07/2013
P4C_North_A_20120706	BRAG – Yellow Brick Road	18/06/2013	Award with	£65,819.50	02/08/2013

P4C Reference	Project Title	Date presented to Grants Panel	Status	Funds offered	Offer accepted
			condition		
P4C_EM_Q_20130314	Kingfisher Way	18/06/2013	Award with conditions	£26,700	15/07/2013
P4C_SW_W_20121005	Penrose - National Trust	16/07/2013	Award	£112,163	07/08/2013
P4C_EM_K_20120821	Pilsgate Path	16/07/2013	Award with condition	£32,246	06/08/2013
P4C_EM_K_20120702	Peakirk	16/07/2013	Award with condition	£21,666	29/08/2013
P4C_SE_S_20120822	The Priest's Way	16/07/2013	Award with conditions	£137,187.59	23/09/2013
P4C_North_B_20130116	Friends of the Carrs	16/07/2013	Rework and Resubmit	0	n/a
P4C_North_B_20130312	Oakmere Way – Phase 2	16/07/2013	Award with conditions	£76,086	08/08/2013
P4C_North_D_20130110	Lady Cannings Plantation	16/07/2013	Award	£15,952	14/10/2013
P4C_North_B_20120611	Routes Around Rosse	16/07/2013	Award with conditions	£113,493.99	08/08/2013
P4C_North_C_20120522	Heart of Teesdale	15/08/2013	Award	£45,786.28	16/09/2013
P4C_North_D_20130729	Greno Woods 2	15/08/2013	Award	£16,715.25	02/09/2013
P4C_SE_R_20120828	Watermead	15/08/2013	Award with conditions	£0	Offer not accepted (see note)
P4C_EM_M_20121124	Stoke by Nayland	15/08/2013	Award	£30,708	12/09/2013
P4C_EM_K_20130427	St Albans	15/08/2013	Award with conditions	£45,820	26/09/2013
P4C_SW_N_20120622	Chipping sodbury	15/08/2013	Award with conditions	£17,740	01/10/13
P4C_SW_N_20120731	Bishops Canning	15/08/2013	Rework and	n/a	n/a

P4C Reference	Project Title	Date presented to Grants Panel	Status	Funds offered	Offer accepted
			resubmit		
P4C_North_B_20130520	Wakefield Phase 3	15/08/2013	Award	£24,100	23/09/2013
P4C_North_B_20130116	Friends of the Carrs Resubmission	17/09/2013	Award with conditions	£125,100	15/10/2013
P4C_SW_N_20120731b	Bishops Canning Resubmission	17/09/2013	Award	£12,174	24/10/2013
P4C_North_B_20130226	Kirkham	17/09/2013	Award with conditions	£15,250	08/10/2013
P4C_SW_O_20130829	Berrow	17/09/2013	Award with conditions	£79,483	16/10/2013
P4C_SE_S_20130708	Windsor Walkway	17/09/2013	Reject	0	n/a
P4C_SE_S_20130327	Marsh and Ham	17/09/2013	1 st reserve - Award	£19034	28/10/2013
P4C_SW_W_20130724	Buckland	17/09/2013	Award	£7,946	14/10/2013
P4C_North_F_20130415	Friends of the Beck	17/09/2013	Award with conditions	£73,609	04/10/2013
P4C_North_B_20130809	Countess of Chester	17/09/2013	Award with conditions	£144,590	15/10/2013
P4C_North_A_20121210	Swarland	17/09/2013	2 nd reserve - Award	£20,452.80	21/10/2013
P4C_North_C_20120607	Pennine Heritage	17/09/2013	Award with conditions	£16,366	29/10/2013
			TOTAL offered	£2,143,844	

Note – Watermead did not accept the grant offer due to concerns about the time left to complete the project.

Annex 3 – Summary Statistics on all funded P4C projects

Summary of P4C projects we have offered with the key benefits they will provide.

P4C Ref and Project Name	Total project costs	Total P4C funds paid	Grant rate %	Footpath creation (km)	BW creation (km)	P4C Grant £/metres created	Volunteer time actual hours	Letters of support	legal mechanism used to create or upgrade	Other deliverables (e.g. Promotion, landowner payments etc)
P4C_WM E_20120612 a Nesscliffe Hills & District Bridleway Association - Humphrey Kynaston Way	25273.99	18872	74.67	0	0.8	23.59	752.75	4	S 25	9 gates, 152 fingerposts, 1004 waymarks, 17 horse warning signs, guide book, signage/waymark improvements to 51 miles (82km)
P4C_WM E_20120910 a Connecting North Lichfield	11119.08	6549.08	58.9	1.2	0	5.46	98	0	s 25	Promotion
P4C_EM K_20120702 a Maxey Cut to the River Welland Link - Northern Footpath Forum - Peakirk	22215	21530	96.92	1.082	0	19.9	143	6	s 25	New footpath links and 2 bridges
P4C_EM K_20130219 a Coton Countryside Reserve (CCR) - Bridge Project	43474.96	23791.09	54.72	0.554	0	42.94	0	1	s25	Demolition and installation of footbridge, x4 gates and fencing

P4C_EM Q_20130314 Kingfisher Way Enhancement Project	31495	26495	84.12	0.674	0	39.31	0	0	Creation by the owner section 38	Signage And interpretation. Footpath has cycling rights.
P4C_EM K_20130427 Wheathampstead, Nomansland, Sandridge link FP32	43225	37821.88	87.5	0	1.114	33.95	0	4	s 25	Creation of new multiuser route connecting village to wider countryside
P4C_EM M_20121008 Weald Park Bridleways	97820.72	89345.72	91.34	0	6.285	14.22	761	7	sections 24 & 25	Signage (x70)
P4C_EM M_20121124 Stoke by Nayland Safer Village Path	18831.5	18160	96.43	0.302	0	60.13	44	1	s 25	Safe multi user route connecting villagers to .local services
P4C_EM Q_20120515 Forest of Marston Vale Access Enhancement and Interpretation Project	24541.54	22733.86	92.63	0	2.852	7.97	0	0	s 25	Signposting and publicity, horse stile and gate, interpretation includung geocache trails
P4C_EM M_20120615 Discover Mersea - St Peters Well Meadow Maritime Heritage & Nature Trail	22229.65	17429.65	78.41	0.349	0	49.94	193	3	s 30	Boardwalk for wheelchair access, handrail and steps, artwork for interpretation, 121 metres improved PROW
P4C_EM K_20120821 Pilsgate Path	42323.26	31140.26	73.58	1.405	0	22.16	284.5	3	s25 + s16 CROW cycling rights	New path with cycle rights connecting villages with rural attractions

P4C_SW O_20120815 Kilmersdon Link	3449.2	2052	59.49	0	0.06	34.2	53.5	0	s 30	Promotion
P4C_SW W_20130724 Buckland Monachorum Community Path Improvement	8308.5	7396	89.02	0.09	0	82.18	60	0	s 25	New footpath offering increased access to Dartmoor
P4C_SW N_20120622 Diamond Jubilee Path - Chipping Sodbury	23573	17740	75.26	1.16	0	15.29	0	0	s 25	Access for all footpath linking population centre with playing fields and network
P4C_SW W_20121005 Penrose - Loe Pool Links for Communities	147185.1 8	108659	73.8	4	11.2	7.15	0	6	EDCL	Major programme to increase accessibility in and around Lizard Peninsula
P4C_SW W_20121219 St Euny Well to Tredinney Moor - West Penwith Bridleways Association	24851	22801	91.75	0	0.185	123.25	170.25	4	EDCL	Interpretation at historic site
P4C_SW N_20120731 b Bishop's Cannings - A361 Tunnel Crossing	13174	12174	92.41	0.15	0.109	47	0	1	S 62 HA 1980	Use of disused agricultural tunnel to create new bridleway and footpath links across a busy road
P4C_North A_20121210 Swarland Woods Footpath 17 upgrade	28607	20412	71.35	0	0.79	25.84	593	1	s 25/26	Creation of new multiuse route

project										
P4C_North A_20120706 Yellow Brick Road	52105.63	39936.63	76.65	0	2.6	15.36	717	4	s 25 & 26	Footbridge, extensive drainage works
P4C_North A_20121203 Elwick Community Partnership for Pathways	17833	13137.5	73.67	0.897	0	14.65	160	3	s 25	Footbridge, fencing, kissing gates, self closing gates, signage
P4C_North C_20121129 Ellerburn Multi User Trail	102804	74925	72.88	2.175	0	34.45	0	2	s 25	1.6 km DDA compliant surface to provide a route accessible to wheel chairs, push chairs, mobility scooters, and adapted bikes. DDA compliant signage
P4C_North D_20120730 Greno Woods Part 1	37472	26720.75	71.31	0	2.526	10.58	0	0	EDCL	Interpretation boards and signage, promotion, horse hops, squeeze stile, field gate, pond and wetland
P4C_North D_20130729 Greno Woods Part 2	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	0	0	EDCL final application form not on file this was taken from draft appl	Creation of new Bridleway

P4C_North C_20120522 Part 1 - Flatts Wood and Tees Bank Restoration Project	53801.38	40113.43	74.56	1.229	0	32.64	0	2	public path creation	New paths plus bridge replacement
P4C_SE S_20120822 The Priest's Way	160339.5 1	140564.5 1	87.67	0	5.28	26.62	1025	3	EDCL	New route linking 2 villages
P4C_SE S_20130327 Marsh and Ham - Paths and Disability Ramp	20366.2	17286.2	84.88	0.34	0	50.84	258	0	S25	New footpath and disabled access ramp
P4C_SE U_20120525 Rodmell to Southeast Bridleway	79757.35	75757.35	96.19	0	0.8	94.7	252	5	EDCL or S25	Signage and publicity
P4C_SE U_20120903 Godmersham to Chilham Community Multi User Link	136345.7 2	98994.1	72.61		1.4	70.71	0	1	s 26	Promotion
P4C_North B_20120525 Dane Meadow	173503.9 6	146082.9 6	84.2	0.36	0.27	231.88	1500	3	deed of dedication	High spec bridleway surface, steps on hillside, seating and bins, signage
P4C_North B_20120611 Routes around Rossendale	174979.3 6	132579.3 6	75.77	0	1	132.58	147.25	6	s 26	New bridleway, promotional events and training
P4C_North B_20130312 Oakmere Way - Part 2	£92,843.3 6	£73,371.3 6	79.03	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	0	2	s 25	Route construction, fencing and demolition works

P4C_North B_20130809 Countess of Chester - Ways to the Countryside	203281	144591	71.13	2.225	0	64.98	0	1	EDCL	Cyclimg rights created; surfacing, information, bridge works
P4C_North D_20130226 Wigtwizzle Bridleway	62106.44	48190.64	77.59	0	0.83	58.06	0	3	deed of dedication	Promotion, horse hops, squeeze stile, field gate, pomid and wetland
P4C_North B_20120708 Oakmere Way - Part 1	38806	30438	78.44	0	3	34.6	0	2	s 25	Gates, fencing, earthworks, access to a landlocked piece of open access land
P4C_North B_20130116 Multiuse Path, The Carrs, Wilmslow	146376.7 8	124600.1 1	85.12	0	0.9	138.44	458	5	s 25	A new surfaced bridleway linking leisure, tourism and active travel opportunities
P4C_North B_20130226 Calder Close open space and cycle path	17578.73	13673.3	77.78	0	0.413	33.11	884	2	EDCL	Access to developing nature area for users of all ability
P4C_North B_20130520 Chevet Branch Line bridleway project - Phase 3	25980.47	23600	90.84	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	84	4	s 119 & s 25	Creation of new multiuser route on disused railway line
P4C_North C_20120601 Chevet Branch line bridleway project - Phase 1	25201.98	18500	73.41	0	5.2	16.37	320	3	s 119 and s 25	Signage, 100m improvement to existing ROW

P4C_North C_20120607 Pennine Heritage	33941	16366	48.22	1.733	0	9.44	1767.5	2	S 25	Creation of new paths/improvements to existing, better signage and information, to encourage new walkers
P4C_North C_20130220 Chevet Branch line bridleway project - Phase 2	45513.59	43000	94.48	see part 1	see part 1	see part 1	130	4	s 119 and s 25	Link to Trans Pennine Trail, signage and maps
P4C_North D_20130110 Lady Cannings Plantation and area	20357.4	15952.35	78.36	0	1.37	11.64	146	2	EDCL	Bridleway including link loop suitable for disabled riders
P4C_North F_20120705 Opening the gateway to the Heart of the Forest	61407.8	47284.01	77	0	2.59	47.47	0	4	s 25	Interpretation panel, 494 metres of improves PROW
P4C_North F_20130415 Beck Linear Park Path	82099	58609	71.45	1.5	3.3	12.21	784.5	3	S 53	New footpath and bridleway links to a local nature reserve
Totals	2,496,429	1,969,376	79	21.425	54.86	46.05	11786.25	107		
	Total	Total	Av	Total km	Total km	Average	Total	Total		

Annex 4 – Letter from defra re. EDCL

Dave Waterman
Landscape & Outdoor Recreation
Zone 1/09, Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6EB

Tel: 0117 372 3570
Fax: 0117 372 8587
Email: Recreation.Access@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Website: www.defra.gov.uk



Paul Johnson
Principal Specialist - Statutory Access
Access and Engagement Management Team
Natural England

19 November 2012

Dear Paul

EXPRESS DEDICATION AT COMMON LAW

1. This letter is intended to offer guidance on legal and practical issues relating to the express dedication of public rights of way at common law (EDCL) in England, as context for Natural England's administration of the Paths for Communities Scheme (P4C).

2. The guidance is non-statutory and has no legal effect. It is for landowners, and users (or proponents) of the way, and ultimately for the courts, to settle these issues in relation to any particular case. However, it represents our view of the current law and we are content for it to be circulated as general guidance to interested parties such as local community groups who are contemplating making a bid for P4C funding, and local authorities.

EDCL as an alternative to statutory path creation mechanisms

3. EDCL enables voluntary groups or individuals to negotiate agreements directly with landowners to create public rights of way. It enables the landowner to dedicate a new or upgraded public right of way unilaterally, as a common law alternative to signing a statutory public path creation agreement:

- with a local authority, under section 25 of the Highways Act 1980, or
- with the parish council, under section 30 of the same Act.

Capacity of a landowner to dedicate at common law

4. At common law, subject to what follows, the freehold owner of land may unilaterally dedicate a new public right of way across it or a higher right along an existing public right of way over his land, for example converting a footpath to a bridleway.

5. By making an EDCL, the freehold owner of land declares his intention on behalf of himself, binding all future owners of the land, to dedicate that land as a public highway, such that the public will have the permanent right to pass and repass along the route in accordance with the usual law applicable to the class of highway dedicated. So it is important that anyone contemplating this step gives the matter careful consideration, and takes independent legal advice on its implications as necessary.

6. Subject to acceptance by the public (see below), the freehold owner may create a new or upgraded right of way, for example, by signing a suitable dedication document under witness. (Other means of dedication are possible, but whatever means are used must constitute sufficient evidence of the landowner's intention to dedicate the way.) It is not necessary for him to make a statutory agreement with the highway authority, the parish council or anyone else in order for the right of way to come into effect. However, it is desirable that there should if possible be prior discussions with the highway authority about the practicalities of what is proposed. Following this good practice will help to ensure that the surveying authority is able to record the new right on the definitive map and statement (DM&S) as quickly and straightforwardly as possible, subject to what follows.

Factors affecting capacity to dedicate

7. Anyone contemplating EDCL should bear in mind that before recording the new right on the DM&S, the surveying authority will need to be satisfied on a number of detailed points that have a bearing on capacity and therefore on whether the right is actually created. This is equally true of rights of way created by statutory agreement. The following are relevant considerations:

- a) There needs to be reliable evidence that the dedicator currently owns the freehold of the land in question. This may take the form of an entry in the register of title recorded in the Land Registry, or (if one is not available) the dedicator's title deeds showing this. Subject to (d) below, it is not enough merely for the dedicator merely to assert that he owns the land.
- b) The dedicator must be the person or organisation named in the register of title or deeds as the freehold owner. If, for example, ownership actually rests with a company or a settled trust or charity, it is that body that needs to make the dedication, not the individual in control of day-to-day management of the land.
- c) If there is any legal charge holder, such as a bank or mortgage company with a loan secured against the land, or anyone else with a legal interest,

such as a leaseholder or tenant, there must be evidence of their consent to the dedication.

- d) A situation sometimes occurs where there is no record of ownership of an existing way, perhaps running along the space between two field boundaries. In this situation there is a rebuttable presumption at common law that the landowners on either side own the soil of the way up to the mid line. If those owners are willing jointly to upgrade the status of the way, for example to bridleway, and there is no affirmative evidence that they do not own the land in question, this is sufficient to warrant the surveying authority accepting the dedication as valid subject to the other considerations in this letter.
- e) If the route would cross or affect an ancient monument, or a site of special scientific interest, special protection area or special area of conservation, the relevant statutory authority (English Heritage or Natural England, respectively) should be asked for advice ahead of dedication and will be able to advise whether its prior statutory consent to dedication is likely to be required in the particular circumstances of the case.
- f) An existing highway (such as a public footpath) may not be upgraded if the dedication of higher rights (such as bridle rights) would cause a nuisance to existing users of the highway. In our view, a nuisance will seldom arise so long as the upgraded highway is capable of accommodating all users. But a nuisance may arise where the upgraded highway is particularly narrow, or otherwise unsuitable for new classes of users.

The common law requirement for public acceptance of the right

8. Where through EDCL the freehold owner of land dedicates a new or upgraded public right of way, there is a requirement at common law for there to be some evidence of public acceptance of the grant of this right in order for it to come into effect.

9. In our view the standard of proof of acceptance is relatively low. It is only necessary for evidence to be produced that the route has come into actual use subsequent to the execution of the dedication deed. In the case of a P4C project it may be possible to place a contractual requirement on the local community group seeking P4C support to submit evidence of such actual use within a short period after the signing of any EDCL deed. This might take the form of a simple document detailing one or more occasions when named individuals actually used the whole of the dedicated route for its intended purpose – perhaps supported by photographs of the use taking place.

10. It does not matter whether this use takes place spontaneously, or is encouraged by the local community group that made the P4C bid, perhaps through an organised event. What counts is that there is some evidence that the use actually took place. Nor does it matter whether the use documented is by local residents or by members of the wider public.

11. The requirement for evidence of acceptance should not be confused with the requirement for evidence of long use of a claimed way as of right. It is not necessary in the case of EDCL to show that a dedicated way has been used by significant numbers of people, or for a substantial period of time, or that the use was 'as of right'. It is necessary only to show that the route has come into actual use.

12. The fact that the use actually takes place in effect discharges the second of the two requirements for EDCL, and brings the right of way into existence. The existence of the public right of way does not depend on its having been recorded on the DM&S.

What is the correct mechanism for recording an EDCL on the DM&S?

13. An EDCL is a legal event for the purposes of sections 53(2) and 53(3)(a) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. This means that so long as the above conditions are fulfilled, the surveying authority must make a legal event modification order to record the new or upgraded public right of way on the DM&S. There is no necessity for the authority to follow up the EDCL with any kind of statutory creation agreement. Nor is the evidential DMMO process appropriate in such a case.

What are the highway authority's duties towards the new right of way?

14. The highway authority has a duty under section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 to assert and protect the rights of the public to use and enjoyment of all the highways in their area, including any created through EDCL; and to prevent so far as possible the stopping up or obstruction of all such highways, including by adjoining crops, overhanging vegetation etc. There is a range of more detailed duties and powers that the highway authority also has including those in relation to signposting and waymarking and dealing with any misleading notices, unlawful cultivation or failure to restore a right of way after cropping.

15. This is the case whether or not the highway authority elects to adopt a completely new route as publicly maintainable. It would seem good practice for the highway authority to do so, consistently with these core duties towards the route. In a case where higher rights are dedicated along an existing public right of way, there is a particularly strong practical case for the highway authority to adopt the path at its upgraded status rather than continuing to maintain it at its original status, while asserting it on behalf of the public at its upgraded status. We note that under agreed P4C projects, the initial establishment costs for an upgraded route are likely to have been met by the project.

Can an EDCL agreement recognise existing or proposed limitations on the right such as gates etc?

16. Yes. The right is created at common law subject to the presence of any existing or proposed limitations of this type that are recorded on the EDCL document referred to in paragraph 6, and that are consistent with the right intended to be created by the document. These limitations will then be recorded

on the DM&S and will not require authorisation by the highway authority.

17. Any additional limitations on the exercise of the right of way that are not recorded on the EDCL document (and subsequently on the DM&S), but are then proposed in the future, will either require the prior consent of the highway authority, or may be unlawful.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Waterman', with a stylized flourish at the end.

DAVE WATERMAN
Landscape & Outdoor Recreation

Annex 5 – Case Story example – Beck Linear Park

Paths for Communities - Your Experience

Save form

We would like to understand and learn from your experience with the P4C scheme. We would also like to share these experiences with others and maybe inspire them to make improvements to the network of public rights of way in their local area.

This document is a prompt - there are no right or wrong ways to present your story. Quotes will really make your story come to life, use them wherever you can.

We have developed this template to enable you to work in a logical fashion from the original idea after hearing about the funding until completion of the route and the launch event. If you're in need of some help and need some assistance talk to your local grant officer.

Project details

Project name	Beck Linear Park Path	
Lead contact	Margaret Armiger	
Grant was awarded in [date]	26/9/13	
Total project cost [£]	£82,099	
Grant awarded [£]	£73,609	
Match funding [£]	£8420	
Volunteer hours committed		
Length of PROW created	footpath	1.5km
	bridleway	approx 3.3km
Major capital works [eg bridge]	new route creation and surfacing, boardwalk in nature reserve.	
Other works undertaken [eg gates, signposting, surface improvements]	signposts,gates and motorbike inhibitors.	
Business letter of support [how many and from whom]	Pink Pig The Beckwood	

Who was involved....

This is an example of the groups and contacts you had to work with in your project. Each link tells a story and we would like to know how that worked for you.



Key:

- Public Footpath No. 41
- To be Extinguished
- To be Created
- De Facto access to Hartsholme Housing Estate

Developing the idea...

The story starts from when you heard about the funding, then developing your idea. This covers the time before you completed the paperwork. Start with your first conversations with Natural England.

We are a small Voluntary Group known as the 'Friends of the Beck' established in July 2012, initially, to litter-pick, plant flowers, control trees and generally create a tidy and pleasant walk for the local community. We were very quickly picked up by the Environment Agency who own the Beck because it has been designated a main river, and, therefore, take a massive interest in all activities in and around the river. Out of this contact we were introduced to John Brewington, MURCI, who introduced us to 'Living Streets' and they, jointly with the FOB, held two Community Walks to discover what, how and why the locals wanted for this jewel of an asset in our area. The major feature to come out of this activity was a mud-free footpath! Discussions with other groups from Barton and Brigg raised P4C and Natural England. I followed this up with our local Parish Council who researched the information and steered us to the WEB site. We wrote a letter of intent to apply and received a response from Philip Robinson who became our mentor and much valued friend throughout our form filling application which, on reflection, took us much longer to complete than it should have done. This was due largely to the complexity of the site and acquisition of the necessary documentation. We needed the complete and utter support of our regional - North Lincolnshire Council with whom we had had little contact as our own Bottesford Parish Council more than adequately supported us up until this time. It took some time to build the trust. We were just a little voluntary action group suddenly asking for support, not only to apply for the funding to create a path but to gain the permission to actually have a path on Council land. Over the months we took to complete the application we set out to build a relationship with everyone associated with the river known as Bottesford Beck. We are very proud that we have the support and meet regularly at the NLC offices with participating organisations including Severn Trent Water, EA, Tata Steel, through which the Beck runs before it reaches our Park, the farmers and Holme Hall Golf Club, all bordering the river. It has been a fascinating experience, constructing a 4.5 km bridleway alongside the river and around the lake, incorporating a 100 m boardwalk across one area where there was insufficient land to construct the final part of the bridleway. We approached three contractors for quotes regarding the construction of the bridleway and North Lincs Environment Department assisted with the final choice. The local community have taken a great interest in the development of the bridleway and our ultimate coup was negotiating an A-frame access through the fence to the rear of Morrison's, giving access to the Lakeside Retail Park. The footfall along the pathway has increased considerably and we encourage cycle riders, who use it to circumnavigate their route to

What was that like? Did you understand the information available? What did you do to get the project to application stage?

Words to prompt you...

Why
Aims
 Where
 Ideas...
 Site suitability
 Wider picture
Local needs
 Partnership
 What
 Bridleway
 Footpath
 Cycling
 Existing route?
 ...safety
 Business support
 Choice of site
 Landscape
 Access for all
 Community
 need...
 Healthy lifestyle
 Outdoor education
 Youth group
 Scouts

Quotes will make your story come alive, use them whenever you can

What did you do...?

Think about the process from completing the forms to developing the project on the ground. Was it straightforward? What about the partnership, did it work well? Did you have to modify your plans on costs, location, construction, or anything else? Think about the process for contacting Natural England, was the advice clear? Was it straightforward to deliver the project? Did anything go

town and to the Tata Steelworks. The lake, until fairly recently was an asset of the works, originally created by mining and eventually purchased by NLC to become a Nature Reserve.

The P4C Application Form was complex and onerous simply because we, as novices, did not know the teams and organisations we needed to gain support from, for example the local access forum. However, the Environment Section of NLC, including the Paths Co-ordinator, could not have been more supportive. We now have a Bridleway, accessible to, and used by, horses, prams, pushchairs, wheelchairs, cycles, runners, walkers and dog walkers. The general consensus is one of gratitude for access by all to our wonderful river, lake and parkland area.

As indicated above, understanding Natural England came directly from Phil Robinson who has been a real gem in supporting the FOB and, in particular, myself as the FOB Secretary. This was a totally new experience for me - I have to admit to needing considerable guidance and support. It was unfailing. The same has to be said of Tim Allen and Dave Sanderson (NLC Paths Co-ordinator) both of whom have been there for us from the onset of our application - and still are. Some of the language, specific to the purpose of the P4C form was jargon to myself and without this considerable help and support I could easily have gone off at a tangent.

With regard to 'Project Management' we are fortunate to have on our team (as well as volunteers who support us without being committee members) ex Tata employees who worked at engineering level when they were employed there. Now their skills come in very useful when maintenance work and advice are required. For instance, we erected 9 finger posts along the length of the river and two days after one, near to the main road, was put up, someone cut through it with a saw and left the top half on the ground. Two of our engineers retrieved it, drilled four holes and glued steel rods inside it. Then, with a template, did exactly the same to the post still in the ground and made an excellent repair to the post. Some spiteful person (not children as it is far too heavy) pulled it out of the ground this morning, complete with concrete base!! It was later discovered in the river. Our Council Paths man will retrieve it tomorrow and on Wednesday when our team meet with him it will be reinstated in accordance with our Civil Engineer's instructions, which he says will render it impossible to remove again.

wrong? Would you do things differently next time?

Words to prompt you...

Process

Application form...

Bridleway

Footpath...

Cycling

Landowners

Wheelchairs

Less able

Right of way

Business

Community

Interpretation

Local

...Action

Understanding

Natural England

Hurdles

£££ Estimates

Construction...

Project Management-

When

Site clearance

challenges

If I did it again I'd...

Quotes will make your story come alive, use them whenever you can

What did you achieve...?

Use this section to record what happened once the route was complete. Did it complete on time? Tell us about the launch event. Use quotes from users of the new route to record what they think.

The bridleway was just about completed to deadline bearing in mind Christmas fell in December wiping out about two weeks' worth of work. However, latterly the weather has been atrocious leaving everywhere soaked. The ground is in a dreadful state - we have had flooding in and around Bottesford but not the Beck, directly. North Lincolnshire Council has made donations to those victims worst affected and it has been an 'all hands to the rescue' situation. With regard to our bridleway we can now see areas which could be better served with a little more topping but with the ground being so wet Tim Allen will not allow any machinery to pass over the grassed areas in case of unsightly damage; we have the enjoyment of our community to consider now!!! So some improvements will be made as soon as the weather and conditions allow.

As part of our matched funding the 'Friends of the Beck' created a car park area in Vale Wood - an rather muddy area previously used by car owners to park their vehicles whilst walking their dogs. The FOB cleared and levelled the area, increasing the size from a 4 car space to twice the size and put a wooden skirting before levelling with a slag surface. This is now a very well used car park.

We have volunteered to do a one-year survey for URS and when we tested the questionnaires a couple of weeks ago the feedback was gratifying and rewarding. Everyone was thrilled to have the opportunity to walk in such beautiful surroundings - free from mud. It was a weekday and there were runners, cyclists, families, etc; a real selection of the community and all agreed they would gladly be involved with the survey when we begin it for real.

The FOB have worked hard to be inclusive and to maintain good relations with all our partners. We just about finished within the agreed timescale and believe we have been instrumental in creating a safe environment for the local community and those visitors who are beginning to take an interest.

We plan a formal 'Opening Ceremony' and invited everyone who has supported the FOB, taken an interest in what we have been, and still are, trying to achieve and those who have contributed to our efforts. Last year we planted a thousand snowdrops (donated by Unite the Union) and will do the same again this year. They are just beginning to flower. Another supporter has contributed 40 flat pack bird and bat boxes for construction by children in the local schools; and we plan an outdoor classroom by one of the ponds whereby the youngsters can undertake pond-dipping and outdoor biology studies.

Words to prompt you...

Launch
Promotion
 Facebook
 Achievements...
 Definitive map?
 Who is using the route
Benefits
..expected
..unexpected
 Health benefits
 Safer route
 costs
 Partners
 timescale
 Miles...
 ...Start to finish
 Community
 cohesion
 Increased visitor numbers
 Tourists
 Local
 More users...
 Co-operation
 Understanding
 What it looks like!
 If I did it again I'd...

Quotes will make your story come alive, use them whenever you can

What next...?

Well what now? Think about the lessons learnt and sustainability of the partnership. Tell us if there are any new opportunities as a result of completing this route.

In October we were nominated, independently by our local MP, Nic Dakin, and by the Town Clerk for Bottesford Parish Council, Lesley Liddle for a North Lincolnshire Council Community Award. We achieved Runner-up and were presented with a certificate which takes pride of place in the Civic Hall, Bottesford.

The Bottesford Beck Bridleway has now been adopted by NLC and will form part of the ever-extending Ironstone Walk which commences at the Civic Centre, Scunthorpe and takes different directions round the town and into the surrounding areas.

We had hoped to put a bridge over the Beck down towards Tata Works but taking the path onto another public footpath and into the village of Holme. Unfortunately, we have hit a problem with one of the farmers who is objecting to the path going onto his land. The FOB have made a good friend of this farmer who has other serious problems relating to the flooding of his land. Again, we are all working together to try and resolve this problem which won't happen over night. Lesson learned - get the necessary permissions prior to commencing the Bridleway Construction process.

North Lincolnshire Council have recently adopted many pathways within the town, those mostly constructed by developers when initial building took place. It is the intention to continue to create more routes in and around the Scunthorpe and Bottesford areas.

Everyone is enthusiastic for the future and the FOB have more plans in progress. Through the support of Tata we have been awarded a Mondegreen Landfill Tax Award which we plan to use to create a Linear Park alongside the Beck, providing seating, wild flower meadows, more trees and shrubs and, as already mentioned, bird boxes and an outdoor classroom which will double as a picnic area for weekend walkers.

We are on Facebook under Friends of the Beck but are wrestling with it, hoping to gradually become more expert. We have a web site in progress by a couple of whizz kids but this is slow due to pressure of work. We will get there, eventually.

Words to prompt you...

Visitor satisfaction

lessons learnt

Increased visitor numbers

Do it again...

More routes?

Next project

Maintenance

Access for all

Enthusiasm

Continue the group?

Website

Twitter

How to find out more?

Quotes will make your story come alive, use them whenever you can

Have you got anything else to give us or tell us...

The 'Friends of the Beck' are an effective Pressure Group. We were instrumental in forming the Bottesford Beck Working Group, Chaired by Cllr Neil Poole to clean-up the river through de-silting and improved river management. We, the FOB, are involved with Waterside Care who have supplied us with much of the equipment we need in order to enable us to enter the river and remove overgrown trees, items of tipping and dumping and generally to remove weeds which are interfering with the flow of water. We do this on a regular basis and the affect is there for all to see!

In October through a combined effort of the Trent Regional and Coastal Drainage Board, the team already outlined earlier and our local MP, Nic Dakin, we were able to apply for inclusion in the Government Pilot River Maintenance Scheme which is supposed to remove some of the legalities around de-silting. We were one of only eight rivers successfully included in the scheme and presently have Drainage Engineers working with the EA to create the methodology for the clean-up. The fact that the Beck flows through the local steelworks, Tata, there has, over many years, been a build up of metals and toxins which are of concern and which are better left undisturbed, otherwise the removal of the silt will be a very costly exercise. That is where we are at this moment in time.

Annex 6 - P4C Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

V5 (with annex) 18 October 2012

1. Introduction

1.1 Paths for Communities (P4C) is a funding scheme established to:

- develop and enhance public rights of way (PROW);
- deliver benefits (social and economic) for rural communities.

The scheme was launched in May 2012 with £2 million of Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) to spend by March 2014.

2. Background

2.1 So far over 150 Expressions of Interest have been received and around 50 applications are the subject of discussion with Local Grant Officers. No full applications have so far been received but we expect the first to arrive for consideration by the Grants panel in November 2012.

2.2 It is critical that plans for evaluation and monitoring are considered in advance of the first grant offer so that data collection can be arranged, particularly if grant conditions are required to ensure successful applicants collect information before and after works have been undertaken.

2.3 No budget has been allocated to monitor or evaluate P4C and the working assumption is that this would be kept straight-forward (a light touch) with minimal requests for information from the successful applicants. At this stage it is unlikely that there will be resource to undertake complex evaluation but it is expected that some level of analysis of the effectiveness of the scheme should be undertaken.

3. The need for monitoring and evaluation

3.1 **Monitoring** is required to collect and provide information on the day to day running of the scheme and to inform the evaluation. It is expected to help to:

- manage budget and workloads;
- identify any policy or process changes required to make the scheme more effective; and
- focus and prioritise promotion and other communication about the scheme.

3.2 **Evaluation** is required to assess the impact the scheme has made. This will be important to:

- demonstrate whether the scheme has delivered the objectives set for P4C;
- inform wider NE activity and advice regarding the design and implementation of new access;
- create case studies to share lessons learnt with other similar schemes, land managers and communities;
- assess the level of demand for this type of funding, therefore supporting the need for any similar future schemes.

Monitoring and evaluation is also a requirement of the RDPE programme under the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF). These requirements will be incorporated into the P4C Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. If further work is required beyond the scope of the data collection proposed in this paper the Project Board will be advised.

4. Audience for reports on evaluation and monitoring

- 4.1 The audiences for evaluation and monitoring reports will include:
- The Natural England project team, Project Board and Grants panel to inform decisions about running the scheme and grants to award;
 - Ministers – to demonstrate innovative spend of the RDPE and benefits to rural communities;
 - Defra Policy and senior directors – to demonstrate that Natural England has delivered the scheme efficiently and effectively to plan and delivered a Key Performance Indicator;
 - Defra (RDPE) - to contribute to Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and to demonstrate benefits to rural communities;
 - Natural England (and other bodies running grant schemes involving community groups) – to share lessons about running the scheme;
 - Applicants – to demonstrate fairness and openness and to celebrate success;
 - Stakeholders (including local authorities, The Trails Trust, IPROW, Adept, NALC, LAFs, BHS, The Ramblers, other user groups, landowner interest groups) - to inform how improvements to the PROW network can be achieved;
 - Rural businesses and VisitEngland/tourism sector - to inspire further improvements to PROW and opportunities for outdoor recreation and tourism.

5. How would information be captured?

5.1 Monitoring and evaluation questions have been developed in consultation with the Project Board, Local Grants Officers and Natural England Evidence team. These are listed in a 'Monitoring and evaluation framework' table (Annex 1) along with proposed sources of data.

- 5.2 Information will be collected from:
- application forms and claim forms;
 - applicant post payment questionnaire;
 - observations by Local Grant Officers who are likely to be in a position to add depth and colour to the information provided by applicants;
 - a small number of case stories where there is applicant and partner support and sufficient time. For example from highway authorities involved in projects.

5.3 The Applicant Handbook states "More complex projects will be required to submit 'case story' material that describes the project and its planned impact (particularly in terms of community empowerment / engagement and economic impact). The bigger the project, the more detail will be required." Paragraph 6.1.05, will be amended to notify applicants that post project information will also be collected and that this will be a condition of the grant. It is important to let applicants know this and also to provide them with an indication of what will be required. The intention is to minimise the burden on successful applicants particularly when the grant is small. Larger grants will be asked for more information.

5.4 In considering how information could be collected the idea of self-led or LGO facilitated interviews and video clips with community groups and leaders was proposed. This type of information can add a rich vein of material and stories which will be useful to bring to life the factual and objective information collected. However at this stage it has been decided that with no resource and limited time it will not form a standard part of data collection. This will be reconsidered if time or money becomes available, or where partners are keen to work with Natural England.

6. Analysis and reporting

6.1 As no budget has been allocated for evaluation and monitoring of P4C any information collected will need to be analysed and summarised by Natural England. Data collection will be a 'business as usual' element of the P4C team work.

6.2 The analysis and reporting of data collected will also be undertaken by the P4C team but will require some dedicated staff time beyond the lifetime of the P4C scheme. Natural England will absorb this within current and future work programmes.

6.3 The Natural England central P4C team will prepare monthly project statistics; quarterly monitoring reports for the Project Board to help to identify any issues and actions required; an annual monitoring summary and a final evaluation report at the end of the two-year scheme.

6.4 At this stage no provision or planning has been made to assess longer-term impacts. The Project Board are invited to advise on whether Natural England should consider a long term review, say after 5 years.

6.5 There is a risk that the low key approach to collecting data for monitoring and evaluation will not provide sufficient information to meet the needs of all stakeholders. Whilst the best effort has been made to collect useful information that will meet expectations the Project Board is recommended to note this risk on the risk register.

7. Summary

7.1 The P4C Project Board is invited to endorse the proposals in this paper for evaluation and monitoring P4C. Specifically the Project Board is asked to:

- Confirm the approach and the direction outlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Annex 1;
- Advise on whether Natural England should consider evaluation of the long-term impacts beyond the end of the project;
- Agree that the P4C Project team continue to implement the approach and report back to the Project Board on progress in three months.

Paths for Communities Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Annex 1

Broad questions	Specific questions	Stakeholders	Source of data	Methodology	Report frequency
Monitoring: Scheme effectiveness and efficiency					
1. Is there sufficient interest in the scheme?	1a. Number of Expressions of Interest received 1b. Geographic spread of projects by Expressions of interest received, Grant applications received and Grants offered 1c. Type of applicant and types of organisations involved in projects	NE Project Team P4C PBoard P4C Grant Panel [Defra Policy] [Defra RDPE] [NE Executive]	Project management log (P4C central team)	Tabular information and graphs created from data collected direct from EoIs, applications and weekly calls with LGOs.	Monthly
2. Is NE receiving sufficient good applications?	2a. Number of EoIs rejected 2b. Number of application forms issued 2c. Number of completed applications received 2d. Number of projects supported (and rejected) 2e. (Average) age (months) of EoI 2f. Length of time from EoI to application	NE Project Team P4C PBoard P4C Grant Panel [Defra Policy] [Defra RDPE] [NE Executive]	Project management log (P4C central team)	Tabular information and graphs created from data collected direct from EoIs, applications and weekly calls with LGOs.	Monthly
3. Will the budget allocated be spent?	3a. Total funds applied for 3b. Total amount of funds offered to projects 3c. Total amount of funds claimed 3d. % of budget spent	NE Project Team P4C PBoard P4C Grant Panel [NE Executive]	Project management log (P4C central team) Informed by weekly calls with LGOs.	Tabular information and graphs created from data collected direct from EoIs, applications and weekly calls with LGOs. Prepare predicted profile of applications and grants spend.	Monthly
4. Are changes to process or policy required?	4a. Reasons for unsuccessful EoI and applications 4b. Issues that block or enable projects to succeed to application 4c. Issues that block or enable projects to deliver	NE Project Team P4C PBoard	Project management log (P4C central team) Informed by weekly calls with LGOs.	Tabular information and graphs created from data collected direct from EoIs, applications and weekly calls with LGOs. But note, may not be comprehensive as many don't say why they pull out	Monthly
5. To what extent	5a. Has the process of managing and	P4C PBoard	Independent	Propose asking Evidence	Annual

Broad questions	Specific questions	Stakeholders	Source of data	Methodology	Report frequency
has Natural England managed the programme effectively and efficiently?	<p>steering the programme been effective and efficient?</p> <p>5b. Has the process of selecting projects been efficient?</p> <p>5c. Has the process of selecting projects been effective in terms of securing a spread of grant aid across regions, project and application types?</p> <p>5d. To what extent has the process of gathering information from successful projects been effective and efficient?</p> <p>5e. Have projects had access to the right support at the right time?</p> <p>5f. To what extent have opportunities to improve programme management been identified and acted upon?</p> <p>5g. Were processes clear and easy to follow and what would have helped applicants?</p> <p>5h. Was promotion effective?</p>	Defra Policy Defra RDPE NE Executive	<p>interviews with P4C team and Project Board, Grants Panel</p> <p>Post project questionnaire with successful applicants.</p> <p>Something on website for those who don't apply?</p>	colleagues to undertake this independent analysis.	
Monitoring: Project delivery					
6. How well are projects progressing against their proposed timescales/action	<p>6a. To what degree have projects been able to meet their proposed timescales and action plans?</p> <p>6b. What challenges and barriers have emerged in relation to delivering the project work plans and how have they been</p>	NE Project Team P4C PBoard	<p>Applications and claim forms.</p> <p>Post claim questionnaire.</p>	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Monthly?

Broad questions	Specific questions	Stakeholders	Source of data	Methodology	Report frequency
plans?	addressed/ overcome?		LGO Feedback		
7. What have P4C projects delivered – improvements to PROW network?	7a. Number of new PROW links created to improve network 7b. Length of new PROW created (per type of PROW) 7c. Cost per length of new PROW created 7d. Length of PROW improved 7e. Cost per length of PROW improved 7f. Type of capital items funded (number of stiles, gates, drainage, surface works etc) 7g. Level of one off payment to facilitate access paid (including £0) 7h. Mechanism used to create new PROW (including EDCL).	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE Stakeholders*	Applications and claim forms.	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Quarterly
8. What have P4C projects delivered – benefits to rural communities?	8a. Number and type of rural business benefiting	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE Stakeholders*	Applications and claim forms.	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Quarterly
9. What have P4C projects delivered – volunteer hours?	9a. Number of volunteer hours recorded	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE Stakeholders*	Applications and claim forms.	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Quarterly
Evaluation: Scheme impact					
10. What contribution has the P4C scheme made to rural areas/ communities?	10a. Economic benefits: Number and type of rural business benefiting 10b Social benefits: Number of routes connecting people and local services (eg shops, schools, employment) 10c. Social benefits to health and well-being: (see later ref to HEAT tool) 10d. Type of applicant and types of	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE [Minister]	Application and claim form (for 10a and 10d) Post project questionnaire. [A small sample of post project	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Quarterly

Broad questions	Specific questions	Stakeholders	Source of data	Methodology	Report frequency
	organisations involved in projects		case stories.]		
11. What contribution has the P4C scheme made to applicants?	<p>What difference has involvement made to people's lives on a personal level? What changes have taken place at a personal or local community level as a result of P4C?</p> <p>Explore what changes have come about for participants as a result of their involvement with P4C. This could include exploration of unexpected impacts and something on the attitudes of landowners to the scheme.</p>		<p>Post project questionnaire.</p> <p>Sample selected for a more in-depth analysis with project case stories. Specify the elements that need to be covered.</p>	<p>Interview and questionnaire.</p> <p>Analysis by P4C central team.</p>	Post 2 years
12. What contribution has the P4C programme made to Natural England's strategic outcomes?	<p>Outcome 2.2: People are increasingly able to visit and enjoy the natural environment. KPI 2.2.1 = We work locally with stakeholders, partners and community groups to deliver improvements to and economic benefits from access infrastructure</p> <p>12a. Number P4C projects supported (2d) 12b. Number of partners involved overall (10d) 12c. Number and type of economic business benefitting (8a)</p>	P4C PBoard NE Executive	<p>Applications and claim forms.</p> <p>Project management log (P4C central team)</p>	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Quarterly? Annual
13. How effective has P4C been at creating new Rights of Way?	This can be viewed in terms of performance against the objectives set: grant spent, where spent, outputs. We could also use basic monitoring information in question 7 above to determine how many rights of way or how many miles/km of RoW were created over the life of the scheme in total and the mechanisms used. This could be compared	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE Stakeholders*	Applications and claim forms.	Data gathered by P4C central team.	Annual/Post 2 years.

Broad questions	Specific questions	Stakeholders	Source of data	Methodology	Report frequency
	with the length of RoW created by Highway Authorities over a similar length of time and the associated costs. This will tell us the most cost-effective use of public money to deliver new rights of way.				
14. What impact has P4C had on the level of use of Public Rights of Way in an area?	<p>Level of use would need to be established before and after P4C for comparison. Needs further investigation. Consider using people counters on some projects.</p> <p>This might best be applied to a stratified sample of projects, rather than all projects.</p>	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE Stakeholders	Bespoke surveys/ people counters.	<i>Use of Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) to calculate the answer to the following question: if x people cycle or walk y distance on most days, what is the economic value or mortality rate improvements?</i>	Post 2 years
15. What would make a future scheme more successful?	Use questions 1-5 above to inform how any future scheme might be made more successful.	P4C PBoard Defra Policy Defra RDPE Stakeholders			Post 2 years

*Stakeholders: ADEPT, British Horse Society, Byways & Bridleways Trust, CLA, Cycle Touring Club, Fieldfare, IPROW, National Association of Local Councils, NFU, Open spaces Society, Ramblers, RICS, The Trails Trust, Sport and Recreation Alliance, Sustran