Ref.	Comments received on Draft ROWIP	Comment made by :	SBC Response
1	benefit in change of structure of document i.e. existing network before use & demand section	Natural England	amended plan
2	map of area at start of plan - North Shore/Bowesfield and Riverside	" "	to consider in final plan
3	3.3 (p13) Conclusions - inc. ROW improvements will facilitate the creation of interest packaged days out etc.	" "	amended
4	4.2.2. (p15) Awareness and Perception - Stockton has achieved a good work in this area	" "	no admend. req.
5	4.5.5 (p18) People with Physical & Sensory Disabilities - excellent research and good points	" "	no admend. req.
6	4.6.4 & 4.6.5 (p21) Health & Green Space - further information is required to strengthen section	" "	amended plan
7	4.6.6 (p21) Opportunity to inc. additional information regarding Tees Valley Equestrian Study	" "	amended plan
8	5.1 (p25) Discovering Lost Way needs updating, as Natural England are no longer researching Lost Ways	" "	amended plan
9	5.11 (p33) Cross Boundary's issues - good to see it inc. in plan	" "	no admend. req.
10	Motor Vehicles & Carriage Drivers users not inc. in plan	Mr Harrison	amended plan
11	No comment	Cllr Cains	no admend. req.
12	No comment	British Horse Society	no admend. req.
13	Confusion between local development framework & core strategy (page. 57 & 58)	Planning Dept.	amended plan
14	(p14) - no mention of Ramblers Ass. **(can be found within user groups on p.14)**	Mr Atkinson	no admend. req.
15	(p10) object to council tax funds being used on bridleways	" "	no admend. req.
16	(p5) vision statement - unlikely all aspirations of all users can be met	" "	no admend. req.
17	bridleways maintenance should not be funded out of council tax funds	Mr Moon	no admend. req.
18	update Definitive Map	Ramblers Ass. (Rep.)	amended plan
19	Inc. Tees Valley Access Forum (TVLAF)	TVLAF	no admend. req.
20	page 7, the access network - network to inc. cycle paths, quiet roads etc. at begin of plan to make it more clear	Parks & C'side Section	amended plan
21	page 9, additional Strategies to be included into plan	" "	amended plan
22	page 12, bridge link between Ingleby Barwick and Yarm as part of Connect 2	" "	amended plan
23	page 13, more postive conclusion regarding access & prow	" "	amended plan
24	page 14, concerned data is 4 years old	" "	no admend. req.
25	page 19 - should refer to Black and Minority Ethnic Communities	" "	amended plan
26	page 15 - who was consulted regarding people with physical and sensory disabilities	" "	amended plan
27	page 27 - should read Wynyard Woodland Park and not centre	" "	amended plan
28	page 27 - what is Tees Corridor and Ancient Hedgerow (**already states in promoted routes section 4.3)**	" "	no admend. req.
29	page 31 - should read Cowpen Bewley Woodland Park and not centre	" "	amended plan
30	Action Plan (Table 7) suggest dates should be deleted and add clear milestone and targets	" "	no admend. req.
31	page 31/32 single heading - local nature reserves	" "	no admend. req.
32	between Darlington Back Ln & Bishopton rd. west - gen. condition of footpath (not rec.PROW - adopt. footpath	Cllr S Fletcher	no admend. req.

33	cycleway from Bishopton Road west bridge to Harrowgate lane - gen. condition (not rec. PROW - adopt. footpath)	" "	no admend. req.
34	no mention of Newham Grange Park in ROWIP	" "	no admend. req.
35	promoted walks - not heard of before **(arrange to send leaflets of walks listed in plan section 4.3)**	" "	no admend. req.
36	cycleway from Bishopsgarth to Stockton town - (not rec. PROW - adopted footpath)	" "	no admend. req.
37	mayor sponsored walk along Teesdale Way - problems with access on mobility scooter through barrier along route	" "	no admend. req.
38	access through Teesdale site (no rec. PROW)	" "	no admend. req.
39	agree with replacing stiles with kissing gates - where apprioriate	" "	no admend. req.
40	no description of Hardwick Dene in ROWIP - (no. rec. PROW - permissive rights of way only)	" "	amended plan
41	agree - more interesting signposting, to more interesting walks	" "	no admend. req.
42	press releases about organised walks - (PROW section does not carry or arrange organised walks)	" "	no admend. req.
43	agree more permissive routes should become PROW - for more protection for the future	" "	no revise required
44	4.5.1 - spelling mistake, should read 'of' and not 'or'	Cllr J Fletcher	amended plan
45	5.3 - how can public obtain leaflets about promoted routes - (info on sbc website, country parks etc).	" "	no admend. req.
46	5.6 - anomailes on DM - 19 anomalies identified on DM and legal process is required to regularise this problem.	" "	no admend. req.
47	Action plan (10) - all LA'S still waiting guidance from Natural England for Discovery Lost Ways project	" "	no admend. req.