

Shared-use routes and multi-user issues: on-line references:

Andy Mackintosh Natural England. February 2013.

A brief collection of links to on-line articles, publications and reports plus some short summaries of their main points.

Cornwall Council:

The Cornish Way: <http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=13405> Example of a multi-use trail network

Devon County Council

http://www.devon.gov.uk/index/environmentplanning/public_rights_of_way/devon-mu-report_final_draft.pdf 2003 Report for ROWIP preparation re: shared use issues

- Recognised 'equity dimension' of horse-riding – high percentage of female and children riders
- Need for evidence-based approach to management and planning of routes
- Deficiency of information re: users and usage as @ 2003
- Consultation very important
- Disadvantages in regarding different users as disparate groups – plenty of overlap
- Little evidence of actual conflict on multi-use routes in Devon and most of what there is can be resolved via providing relevant information to users.
- Multi-use code should be developed
- Difference in perception between public and users re: conflicts - actual trail users more tolerant of other users.

Equestrian Access Forum:

Making Ways for Horses. 2012

http://www.bhs.org.uk/~/_media/BHS/Files/PDF%20Documents/Making%20Ways%20For%20Horses.ashx

A review of existing access for equestrians and a series of 41 proposals to address access need and current issues. E.g. Proposal 1 - Access is for everybody.

Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management - IPROW

http://www.iprow.co.uk/gpg/index.php/Shared_Use_Routes Good-practice guide overview with links to research

Also link to:

CSS Countryside Working Group: Report on the Surfacing of bridleways

<http://www.iprow.co.uk/docs/uploads/CSSbridlewayreport.pdf> 2004

Conflict perception: actual conflict a rare occurrence on off-road routes and perception of conflicts more of an issue than actual conflicts. **1. Perceived Conflict** Perceived conflict is defined as “A multi-casual, negative psychological state, reached through variable combinations of psychological, social and environmental factors”. **2. Actual Conflict** Actual conflict is defined as “The Physical Interruption of, or interference with, a person’s actions or intended actions, by other users or by characteristics of the environment, which either blocks a person’s behaviour, or violates their collision zone”

- Multi-use code of conduct
- Bridleway surfacing issues

Local Access Forum report

(to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead) by Sarah Church (BHS) 2011

[http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/minsys3.nsf/d9c360870262e3708025765d004cf06a/113c07c05a771fd6802578760027f765/\\$FILE/meetings_111213_Item%204%20\(Multi%20Use%20Paths\).pdf](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk/minsys3.nsf/d9c360870262e3708025765d004cf06a/113c07c05a771fd6802578760027f765/$FILE/meetings_111213_Item%204%20(Multi%20Use%20Paths).pdf)

An example of a local report re: the case for conversion of cycle tracks to multi-use paths.

Natural England:

How people interact on off-road routes

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/50065> 2001 CRN 32

- Defined conflict
 - Hostility
 - Intrusiveness
 - Competition
 - Disagreeableness
- Identified users and their behaviours and the importance of perception whether ‘real’ or ‘imagined’.
- Difference between actual and perceived encounters Two weeks after the event, respondents remembered twice as many encounters with others as those they identified at the time. This implied that passing other users was a more memorable event than travelling alone, with people reporting more interactions than actually occurred. This is consistent with other work on event memory and provides an insight into why the perceptions of conflicts may be greater than the actual experience of them.
- The experience of actual and perceived conflict No respondents reported hostility and few reported intrusion, competition or disagreeableness. Where conflict did register with users, it was associated with intrusion, caused by the unpredictable movement of other users, journey purpose, speed and inadequacies in the signing and maintenance of routes.

- The consequences of conflict: Among both users and non-users, the principal consequence of perceived conflict - particularly intrusiveness and hostility - was anxiety and fear about personal safety. This feeling was intensified by a number of factors, including crowding, cyclists travelling at speed, meeting groups (especially young people) and encountering poor environmental conditions that reduced sight lines and visibility. In the extreme, these perceptions can lead to people avoiding shared-use routes.

How people interact on off-road routes Phase 2.

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/65057?category=60007> 2003 CRN 69

- Measuring conflict – actual and perceived
- Identifying barriers to use
- Discussing conflict escalates conflict
- Case studies

By All Reasonable Means: inclusive access to the outdoors for disabled people (CA215) 2005

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/45015>

Guide to improve accessibility for disabled people but with an understanding that access improvements will benefit all visitors

On the Right Track – Surface requirements for share-use routes:

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/41018?category=211280> 2005 CA 213

- User requirements for surfaces
- Planning, consultation and avoiding conflict
- Creation and Maintenance of shared use routes

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

Physical activity and the Environment Review 1: Transport

<http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/pdf/word/Transport%20evidence%20review.doc>. 2006.

See Ch 4 Multi-use Trails: Summary of findings

SUSTRANS:

The Merits of Segregated and Non-segregated Traffic-free Paths

http://www.sustrans.org.uk/assets/files/Publications/merits_of_segregated_and_non_segregated.pdf 2008

Literature-based review including:

- Benefits of traffic-free paths
- Perceived risk and user behaviour

- Cases for segregated/non-segregated routes. No ideal form of segregation and different approaches needed for different situations
- Little firm guidance available
- Summaries of multi-use conflict research

Horses on the National cycle network Technical Information Note no.28 2011

<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/assets/files/design%20and%20construction/Technical%20Note%2028%20-%20Horses%20on%20the%20NCN.pdf>

Design of routes, issues encountered and their management.

Ways through the Countryside Information sheet FF27 – where the National Cycle Network shares other routes <http://www.sustrans.org.uk/assets/files/Info%20sheets/ff27.pdf>.

The Trails Trust:

The case for inclusive use on all cycle paths throughout England and Wales 2007

<http://www.thetrailstrust.org.uk/documents/TheCaseforInclusiveUseonallCyclePaths09.pdf>

Case put to Government, councils and landowners for inclusive access on all off-road minor highways including cycle paths and greenways.

- Needs
- Benefits
- Risk – no unacceptable risk to users

Creating Multi-user public Rights of Way 2011

<http://www.thetrailstrust.org.uk/docs/TrailsTrustDownload.php>

The benefits of multi-user routes plus procedural and management mechanisms for creating routes.

Overseas research:

Share the Trail: Minimizing User Conflicts on Non-Motorized Facilities

http://www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikesafe/case_studies/casestudy.cfm?CS_NUM=604

Canadian research from 2005(?)

Conflicts of multiple-use trails: <http://world.std.com/~Jimf/biking/conflicts.html> 1995

Federal US report distributed in the interest of promoting a clearer understanding of, and resolution to, conflicts among and between trail users and managers: