

[REDACTED]

From: Bob Milton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 19 March 2020 12:00
To: Standards_Enquiries@highwaysengland.co.uk
Cc: Wade, Jonathan; Andrew Shuttleworth; 'Langford, Pippa (NE)'; Kate Ashbrook; Mark Weston
Subject: GG142 Walking, Cycling and horse riding assessment and review

Sirs
In line with the statement on page one of the document and statements made by government officers I believe the changes to the wording in the WCHAR document are insufficient to enable a reasonable person to be sure that HE officers carry out the assessment in proposals for infrastructure changes and updating. It continues to reinforce the idea that equestrians are only horse riders by still referring to the document as a whole and many various sections as a horse-riding review and assessment. The definition used on p8&9 of the document confuses the reader with no detailed definition of equestrian whilst still referring to horse-riding. It must be clear that this does include carriage drivers in any form or size.

To that end the recent application for works to J10/M25 falls at the first hurdle in not making any provision for carriage drivers to link with the road network north and south of the M25 and to enable ridding equestrians to access the whole of the contiguous s193 common lands and public open space, in particular this includes the various exchange lands over the last thirty years.

It is also, I believe, the case that the changes to the non-motorised user facilities made to the original published and consulted proposals for the J10/M25 scheme are so great as to constitute a new plan, and it, accordingly, should have been consulted on as a separate proposal. The scheme as applied for did not carry out its obligations set out in the process summary.

As someone who was involved in the original stakeholder consultation, I was not informed of the substantial changes made to the proposed scheme that went to the Planning Inspectorate in July 2019 until 10th January 2020. Item 2.2.1 Large Highway Schemes does refer to equestrians, but the scheme put forward removed any carriage driving access to multiuser paths by removing all multiuser paths as part of the carriageway and instead specifying bridleways on the commons. It is also, I believe, the case that there has been lack of competency, as an example I would refer you to the inclusion of demand light control for cyclists only where bridleways cross or interact with the road network. We, the BHS, in conjunction with the Highways Agency went to a great deal of trouble and cost providing Pegasus crossings on the J10 north side slip roads, yet not one appears on the proposal. The J10 scheme likewise excludes the statutory requirement of appropriate lawful access across the common land and public open space exchange lands for equestrians. This is not the first time this has happened both here and as an example for the A3 Tunnel. There has been no attempt to put right the wrongs of the past [s4.15] across the board for equestrians in terms of the rights of way network and the common land and public open space provisions including the exchange lands

The document goes onto to deal with the expected competencies and continues to mix the requirements referring to horse-riding instead of equestrian access. Sections 4 /5 refer, in the majority, to horse-riding.

Bob Milton
[REDACTED]