The economic and social value of walking in England

Summary

This report examines the economic and social value of walking in the English countryside. The key findings from this report are that:

- The walking resource in the English countryside includes
  - Over 188,000 km of rights of way.
  - Over 33,600 km of long distance paths
  - Many shorter, local promoted paths
  - 1 million hectares of open access land will become available following the introduction of the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW).
- There are over 527 million estimated walking trips made annually to the English countryside.
- The expenditure associated with these trips is in the region of £6.14 billion.
- The income generated from this expenditure is estimated to be between £1.473 billion and £2.763 billion and supports between 180,559 and 245,560 full-time equivalent jobs.
- There are an estimated 177,760 obstacles and 105,600 missing signposts.
- The average number of obstructions per 10km of rights of way is 5.2.
- Walkers can expect to come across a serious obstruction every 2km.
- There are over 1000 paths which cross busy roads where no or inadequate provision is made for pedestrians and other vulnerable users.
- It would cost an estimated £69.2 million to restore the existing path network to an acceptable standard for public use, and then £18.55 million per year to maintain the network.
- The total benefits from walking are greatly in excess of the costs of path restoration and maintenance.

Although further research is needed, it is likely that additional access rights, through the provisions of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act for open access land, and greater efforts to restore the existing rights of way network, has the potential to offer significant extra economic and social benefits, with associated additional income and job creation.

The research also highlights a number of areas where future research may be useful. These include:

- the effect that path improvement has on the usage of paths.
- the economic value of the social benefits (e.g. health and spiritual benefits) that are associated with walking.
- An assessment of the current condition and the level of use of open access land to provide a benchmark from which to assess how the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 affects people's use of the countryside.

Dr Mike Christie
(Lecturer at the Institute of Rural Studies, University of Wales Aberystwyth)

and

Jon Matthews
(Independent Research Consultant)

September 2003

Table of Contents

The economic and social value of walking in England

This report, commissioned by the Ramblers' Association, aims to provide an independent review of the economic and social value of walking in England. To achieve these aims, the research draws on existing data on walking in England. The report is organised into eight sections. Section 1 provides a review of the resources available in England for walking. The resources examined include the rights of way network, promoted routes and open access areas. Information on the condition of these resources is provided in Section 2. In Section 3, an assessment is made of (i) the volume of walking trips in the English countryside and (ii) the levels of expenditures associated with these walking trips. The economic impact of walking in England is then estimated in section 4 by multiplying the expenditure data from section 3 with relevant multiplier coefficients to provide an estimate of the income and employment impacts of walking in England. The social value of walking is examined in Section 5. In Section 6 we turn to examine the costs associated with the restoration and maintenance of the path network. Section 7 draws on the information reported in earlier Sections to provide a comparison of the benefits and costs associated with maintaining the English walking resource. Finally, Section 8 provides a critical discussion of this report and outlines some key areas for future research.

1. Resources for walking in England

Walking in the English countryside may take place as a linear activity (e.g. walking along paths) or as an area-based activity (e.g. walking over open countryside). Legal rights of access to these resources are defined under many acts of parliament including the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Highways Act 1980, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the Rights of Way Act 1990 and the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. This latter piece of legislation is in the process of being implemented. In addition to these legal rights of access, walking may also be permitted on a temporary or voluntary basis. We now outline the various forms of access rights that walkers have to (i) linear routes and then (ii) open countryside.

1.1. Resources for linear access to the English countryside

England's network of paths provides a major and significant resource for walking. Public rights of access to paths may be attained through the rights of way network or through permissive access agreements. In the former, access rights are secured through legislation, while permissive agreements are not subject to right of way law and as such the right of access could be withdrawn at any time. In section 1.1.1 below, we outline the extent of England's rights of way network. This is then followed in section 1.1.2 with a discussion of promoted access routes which tend to attract large numbers of walkers.

1.1.1. England's Rights of Way network

England's rights of way network comprises a network of paths on which a legal right of access has been defined through a raft of legislation, and the law of highways forms one of the most ancient parts of the common law. Rights of way legislation defines four different types of access rights, all of which allow access on foot:

- **Footpaths** over which the right of way is on foot only;
- **Bridleways** provide a legal right of access for walkers, horse-riders and cyclists;
- **Restricted byways** will provide a right of passage for non-motorised users including walkers, horse-riders, cyclists and horse-drawn carriage drivers. Restricted Byways will replace Road Used as a Public Path (RUPPs), which will soon be abolished following the implementation of the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000.
- **BOATs** (Byways Open to All Traffic) are carriageways over which there is a right of access for walkers, horse-riders, cyclists and motorised vehicles. However, BOATs are used mainly for the purposes for which footpaths and bridleways are used (i.e. by walkers and horse-riders).

The Countryside Agency (2001a) estimate that the rights of way network in England incorporates 188,700 km of paths. Table 1 provides a breakdown of England's rights of way network by type of right of way and by English region.

TABLE 1: LENGTH AND DENSITY OF ENGLAND'S RIGHTS OF WAY NETWORK BY REGION

Region	Network length (km)					Network density (km/km²)
	Footpath	Bridleway	RUPP	BOAT	Total	
East of England	19866	3613	767	994	25240	1.1
East Midlands	15104	3520	221	216	19061	1.5
North East	7178	2073	86	137	9474	1.4
North West	17982	2761	341	199	21283	1.7
South East & London	25008	6529	1230	992	33759	1.2
South West	26368	6980	2956	947	37251	1.2
West Midlands	18410	2586	328	148	21472	1.6
Yorkshire & The Humber	16719	4337	34	116	21206	1.6
Total	**146635**	**32399**	**5963**	**3749**	**188746**	**1.4**

Source: The Countryside Agency (2001a)

1.1.2. Promoted access routes

In England, there are a large number of walking routes that are actively promoted to the public. Such routes include paths that have been designated as national trails or recreational waymarked routes and other promoted unwaymarked routes. The high levels of recognition that these routes enjoy mean that the level and type of usage of these routes tends to get monitored.

National Trails

National trails are nationally recognised trails designated and managed by the Countryside Agency. They include some of the best-known routes in Britain, passing through some of its most beautiful countryside and areas of great historic interest. There are thirteen designated national trails in England. The total length of national trails in England is 3234 km (Table 2).

TABLE 2:
LENGTH OF ENGLAND'S NATIONAL TRAILS

National trail	Length (km)
1. Cleveland Way	177
2. Hadrians Wall Path	140
3. North Downs Way	246
4. Offa's Dyke	285
5. Peddar's Way & Norfolk Coast Path	150
6. The Pennine Way	429
7. The Ridgeway	136
8. South Downs Way	161
9. South West Coast Path	1014
10. The Thames Path	294
11. The Wolds Way	127
12. The Costwold Way	163
13. The Pennine Bridleway	560
Total length of national trails	3234

Source: DEFRA, (1999)

Figure 1: English national trails

Source: http://www.countryside.gov.uk/nationaltrails

Recreational Routes

In addition to the nationally recognised trails, there are many more waymarked routes, usually created with the involvement of local authorities and with the help of local Ramblers and other walkers. There is an enormous variety of these paths, from short health walks and urban 'green chains' to lengthy cross-country treks of several hundred kilometres. In England, over 500 of these routes have been designated as a long distance footpath. A comprehensive list of long distance routes over 32 km can be found on the Ramblers' Association website: http://www.ramblers.org.uk/info/paths/pathsregion.html. It is estimated that there are in the region of 33,667 km of promoted paths in England. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the length of these routes by English region.

TABLE 3: LENGTH OF PROMOTED PATHS IN ENGLAND BY REGION.

English region	Length of promoted paths (km)
South West	6808
South	6903
East	3050
East Midlands	3459
West Midlands	4125
North West	2485
Yorkshire	2485
North East	1682
Cumbria and Lake District	2669
Total	33667

Source: Based on information from the Ramblers' Association website
NB There is likely to be some double counting in the above table since the length of some paths (i.e. those which pass through more than one region) may have been included in the calculation for all regions which that path passes through.

Unwaymarked Routes

Finally, there are many 'unofficial' routes along existing public paths that have been described in print but are not waymarked on the ground. We are unaware of any statistics on the length of these routes.

1.2. Resources of access to the open countryside

Open countryside is the term used to describe areas of uncultivated open land such as mountain, moor, heath, down and common land. Access to open countryside is presently achieved through a number of provisions including:

- *Du Jure access rights*: These have been established through acts of parliament which have conferred legal rights of access over certain areas of land such as common land.
- *'Voluntary' Access*: The term voluntary here is usually a misnomer since certain laws compel or encourage landowners to allow access to their land. Examples of voluntary access include:
    - access to land owned by the public or voluntary agencies such as Forestry Commission, water companies and the National Trust;
    - land covered by schemes such as Countryside Stewardship and the Countryside Access Scheme;
    - 'conditionally exempt land and buildings scheme' which gives exemption from Inheritance Tax to landowners who allow access to their land;
    - voluntary access agreements with local or national park authorities;
- *Genuine 'altruistic' access*. Generally this occurs on land owned by charities or conservation organisations such as the RSPB and the Woodland Trust.

- *De facto* access: In some places access is tolerated by the landowner and walkers may assume they have a right to roam because they have always done so. However, the landowner could ask walkers to leave at any time.

The above situation is now about to change following the introduction of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. The Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 will eventually give the public a legal right of access on foot to open country. In the Act, 'open countryside' is defined as mountain, moor, heath, down and registered common land. Maps of these areas are currently being drawn up by the Countryside Agency, a process which should be fully implemented by late 2005. DEFRA (1999) estimate that there is approximately 1,350,600 Ha of open land in England and Wales (equivalent to 8% of the land area); of which 367,000 Ha is common land (DEFRA, 1999). Table 4 provides a breakdown of the area and type of land that is likely to be designated as open countryside in the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000.

TABLE 4: AREA OF LAND LIKELY TO BE DESIGNATED AS OPEN COUNTRYSIDE UNDER THE CROW ACT 2000.

Land Type – England and Wales	Area (ha)	% of Total
Mountain, Moor, Heath, which is also Common	441,000	32.7
Mountain, Moor, Heath	754,000	55.8
Down, which is also Common	3,400	0.3
Down	41,600	3.0
Common Land Only	110,600	8.2
Total	1,350,600	100.00

Source: DEFRA (1999)

2. Condition of walking resources in England

An estimate of the extent of linear and open access resources in England has been outlined above. However, it is clear that not all of these resources are in a condition suitable for walking. For example, some paths may be blocked by natural barriers (e.g. a fallen tree) or man-made barriers (e.g. a padlocked gate). In recent years a number of studies have been undertaken to assess the condition of the rights of way network. A summary of the key findings from these studies is provided below. Currently, there appears to be no data on the condition of open access areas. However, it is likely that the introduction of the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 will improve the accessibility of these areas since the Act requires open access areas to be recorded on maps and be waymarked.

2.1. Condition of Rights of Way in England

Information on the condition of right of way in England can be attained from two sources:

- The Best Value Performance Indicator on the 'ease of use' of rights of way (BV178),
- The Countryside Agency's (2000a) 'Condition of Rights of Way' report.

2.1.1. Ease of use of rights of way performance indicator

In 2001/02 the Government introduced a new 'Best Value' performance indicator for the ease of use of rights of way (BV178). This indicator examines the percentage of the total length or number of footpaths / other rights of way which are easy to use. Data for the indicator was collected from highway authorities. However, not all highway authorities submitted information and the accuracy of the data from some authorities has been questioned. Furthermore, since 2001/02 was the first year of operation for this new performance indicator there are is no comparable data from previous years.

Leaving these issues aside, the Audit Commission's audited results indicate that on average only 69% of paths in England are 'easy to use'. However, there is great variability between councils. For example, Sandwell Council report that only 3% of its paths are easy to use, while ten other Councils report that all their paths are easy to use. A full breakdown of the ease of use of paths performance indicator by councils is provided in Table 21 to Table 24 in the Appendix.

2.1.2. Rights of Way Condition study

The second report of interest is the Countryside Agency's (2001a) report on the condition of the rights of way network in England and Wales. The report stems from an agreement between the Countryside Commission and local authorities in 1987 to set national targets for the condition of rights of way. These targets were that all rights of way in England should be legally defined, properly maintained (easy to find, follow, and use) and well publicized by the end of the century. The 2000 condition survey aimed to measure progress towards achieving these targets.

The results from the survey indicate that no region had attained the national target. In particular, no region met the 'easy to find' target (which stated that 95% of rights of way should be signposted).

The survey also provides data on the problems caused by obstructions to rights of way. This included obstacles such as fences and hedges, vegetation, boggy or flooded sections and un-bridged watercourses. The average number of obstructions per 10km of right of way (for all users) in England was 5.2. In other words, walkers can expect to come across an obstruction every 2 km. There was, however, much variation between regions: Cornwall had the most obstructions (14.4 per 10 km), while Worcestershire only had 1.1 obstructions per 10 km. The number of obstructions encountered by walkers also varied according to the classification of right of way (Table 5), with footpaths being the most obstructed.

TABLE 5: OBSTRUCTIONS BY CLASS OF RIGHT OF WAY

	Obstructions per 10 km encountered by walkers
Footpath	4.5
Bridleway	2.0
BOAT	1.2
RUPP	2.0

Source: Countryside Agency, 2000

2.1.3. You're Either Quick or Dead

In April 2003, the Ramblers' Association published *You're Either Quick or Dead*, a dossier of locations where walkers need safe and convenient crossings of trunk and other dangerous roads in England. The report listed over 1000 road crossings where increased traffic volumes and speeds have made it difficult for walkers to cross roads that sever the footpath network.

3. Volume of walking and spending associated with walking in England

Statistics on the volume of walking in England and associated spending may be derived from a number of sources. National statistics on walking in England include the UK Day Visits Survey, the UK Tourism Survey and the International Passengers Survey.

3.1. UK Day Visits Survey

The UK Day Visits Survey (UK DVS) is administered by Social and Community Planning Research on behalf of a consortium of UK national tourism agencies. In the UK DVS, day visits are analysed as 'leisure day visits' and 'tourist day visits'. 'Leisure day visits' are defined as round trips made from home for leisure purposes, to locations anywhere in the UK. In this definition people must start from, and return to, their home within the same day, but there is no lower time limit. 'Tourist day visits' are defined as a subset of leisure day visits in that tourist day visits are trips that last for three hours or more which are not taken on a regular basis.

3.1.1. Leisure day visits

During 1996, 5063 million leisure day visits were made in England. Of these, 26% (1302 million trips) were made to the countryside, 3% (154 million trips) to the seaside and 71% (3607 million trips) were made to towns / cities. Fifteen percent of leisure day trips (759 million) involved a 'walk, hill walk or ramble' which, when broken down by location, include 429 million walks in the countryside, 32 million walks by the seaside / coast and 324 million in towns / cities (Table 6).

Table 6 also provides information on the English regions where leisure day walking trips occur. Over 191 million leisure day walking trips (one quarter) were undertaken in the East of England, with the North West, Heart of England and South East regions all supporting over 10% of the walking trips.

TABLE 6: VOLUME OF LEISURE DAY WALKING TRIPS IN ENGLISH REGIONS (MILLIONS OF TRIPS)

	Cumbria	Northumbria	North West	Yorkshire and Humberside	Heart of England	East of England	London	South West	Southern	South East	All England
Countryside	5.0	9.2	45.2	38.9	55.1	124.4	9.6	32.0	40.3	53.1	429
Seaside	0.8	3.2	5.3	1.3	0.1	7.6	0.2	6.1	1.9	5.3	32
Town	3.0	16.5	49.1	33.7	31.2	59.9	58.8	26.8	22.9	19.4	324
Total	8.8	28.9	99.5	73.9	86.4	191.9	68.6	64.9	65.0	77.8	759
%	1.1	3.8	13.0	9.6	11.3	25.1	9.0	8.5	8.5	10.2	

Source: Derived from the UK Day Visitor Survey, 1996
Note: The information above is based on the location of the home address of the respondents to the UK DVS survey as opposed to the actual location of walking trips. However, the fact that the mean duration of leisure day trips was 3.5 hours and also the fact that 99% of trips were undertaken in the respondent's home country suggest that the above figures are likely to provide a reasonable estimate of the location of walking trips in England. Also note that some of the figures above may not add up due to rounding up of the data.

The total expenditure undertaken during leisure day visits in England was estimated to be £45.39 billion in 1996: £6.7 billion in the countryside, £1.6 billion at the seaside and £37.7 billion in towns / cities. The average expenditure per trip on all leisure day trips was £9.10 per trip. Average expenditure, however, varied by location type: the average expenditure per trip was £5.15, £10.39 and £10.45 for trips to the countryside, seaside and town/city respectively. The total expenditure on walking leisure day trips in England can be established by multiplying the average trip expenditures with the volume of leisure day trips. It is thus estimated that spending on leisure day walking trips in England in 1996 was in the region of £5810 million, of which £2124 million was spent on walking trips in the countryside, £328 million on walking trips to the seaside / coast and £3357 million on walking trip in towns and cities (Table 7). Table 7 also breaks down these spending figures according to the English regions.

TABLE 7: SPENDING (£M) ON LEISURE DAY WALKING TRIPS IN ENGLISH REGIONS.

(£mllion)	Cumbria	Northumbria	North West	Yorkshire and Humberside	Heart of England	East of England	London	South West	Southern	South East	All England
Countryside	25.47	47.55	232.65	200.38	283.59	640.21	49.25	164.72	207.18	273.40	2124.39
Seaside	8.73	32.73	54.55	13.09	1.09	78.55	2.18	63.27	19.64	54.55	328.36
Town	31.04	172.14	512.67	351.81	326.41	626.49	614.26	280.32	238.93	203.18	3357.25
Sub total	65.24	252.42	799.86	565.28	611.10	1345.24	665.69	508.31	465.74	531.13	5810.01
%	1.1	4.3	13.8	9.7	10.5	23.2	11.5	8.7	8.0	9.1	

Source: Derived from the UK Day Visitor Survey, 1996
Also note that some of the figures above may not add up due to rounding up of the data

3.1.2. Tourist day visits

The UK Day Visits Survey also estimates the number of tourist day visits. Tourist day visits are a subset of leisure day visits and are defined as trips from home that last for more than three hours. In 1996, it was estimated that there were 1026 million tourist day visits made in England. Of these, 232 million trips were made to the countryside, 67 million to the seaside and 727 million to towns. Fifty-one million (5%) tourist day trips were reported to have walking as the main activity. Table 8 summarises the volume of tourist day trips that included walking as an activity by location.

TABLE 8:
VOLUME OF TOURIST DAY TRIPS IN ENGLAND WHICH HAD WALKING AS THE MAIN ACTIVITY

	Volume of tourist day trips that had walking as the main activity (million)	Percentage of tourist day trips that had walking as the main activity (%)
Countryside (million)	25.52	11%
Seaside (million)	5.36	8%
Town (million)	14.54	2%
Total	51.3	5%

Source: Derived from the UK Day Visitor Survey, 1996

The average spend of tourist day visitors (£18.40) was almost double that of leisure day visitors (£9.10). Broken down by location types, the average spend was £12.30 on trips to the countryside, £15.10 on seaside trips and £20.70 on trips to towns / cities. The total spend on walking tourist day trips can again be estimated by multiplying the average trip spend with the volume of tourist day visits that had walking as the main activity (Table 8). It is thus estimated that the total expenditure by tourist day visitors on walking trips in England is £695 million; of which £313 million is spend during countryside walks and £80 million on seaside / coastal walks and £300 million is spend on walking trips in towns and cities (Table 9).

TABLE 9: SPENDING (£M) ON TOURIST DAY WALKING TRIPS IN ENGLAND.

	Expenditure during tourist day trips that had walking as the main activity (£ million)
Countryside (million)	313.90
Seaside (million)	80.94
Town (million)	300.98
Total	695.81

3.2. UK Tourism Survey

Information on UK domestic tourism is collated for the four UK national tourist boards in the UK Tourism Survey. Domestic UK tourist trips are defined as tourist trips made by UK residents that include a stay of one or more nights away from home for holiday, business trips or visits to friends/relatives. In 2001, the UK tourism survey estimated that there were 131.9 million domestic tourist trips in England, of which 80.1 million trips were defined as holiday trips, 31.2 million trips were associated with visits to friends, and 18.4 million trips were business or work related.

Walking is examined in the UK Tourism Survey in terms of the volume of trips that have (i) walking as the main activity and (ii) have walking as a component part of that trip**.** In terms of the former, the UK Tourism Survey estimates that there are 3.4 million tourist day trips which had walking as the main activity. Multiplying this with the average spend per tourist trip (£214 per trip) suggests that the tourist expenditure associated with trips that had walking as the main activity was £727 million in 2001.

The UK Tourism Survey also estimates that there were 65.5 million tourist trips that included walking as one of the activities undertaken (Table 10). The study also specified the type of walking undertaken during the tourist trip. Short walks (up to 2 miles) accounted for 46 million trips, while long walks accounted for 19.5 million trips. Long walks were further disaggregated into hiking / hill walking (5.3 million trips), rambling (5.3 million trips) and other types of long walk (8.7 million trips). Detail of this breakdown, along with the location of where these walks were undertaken in terms of tourism region, can be found in Table 10.

TABLE 10: VOLUME OF WALKING TRIPS UNDERTAKEN ON HOLIDAY BY DOMESTIC TOURISTS

million trips	Cumbria	North-umbria	North West	Yorkshire	Heart of England	East of England	London	South West	South-ern	South East	England Unspecified	Total England
Volume of all tourist trips	4.5	4.3	13.7	11	22.2	13	16.9	19.8	13.3	12.6	4.2	131.9
Volume of holiday trips	3.5	2.5	7.8	6.7	13	7.8	8.2	14.3	7.7	8	3	80.1
Short walks (up to 2 miles)	2.4	1.4	4	4	7.2	4.5	3.6	9.1	4.6	5.1	1.9	46
Long walks (more than 2 miles)	1.5	0.6	1.5	1.7	2.7	1.9	1.5	4.1	1.8	2	0.9	19.5
- Hiking or hillwalking	1	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.2	1.2	0.4	0.5	0.3	5.2
- Rambling	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.2	1.5	0.7	0.8	0.4	6.7
- Other type of walking	0.3	0.2	0.9	0.7	1.2	0.9	1	1.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	8.7
All walks (short + long)	3.9	2	5.5	5.7	9.9	6.4	5.1	13.2	6.4	7.1	2.8	65.5

Source: UK Tourism Survey, 2001.

The total expenditure of tourists on trips that included walking as an activity can be estimated by multiplying the volume of walking trips (Table 10) with the average nightly expenditure per trip (£49 per night)[1]. Thus, total expenditure by UK tourists on holiday trips that included walking as an activity is estimated to be £3.3 billion. Of this, £2.3 billion was associated with short walks (under 2 miles) and £0.9 billion with spending on long walks (Table 11).

[1] Note that in this calculation, average expenditure per night is being used as opposed to average trip expenditure. The argument for using a single night's expenditure here is that these tourists, by definition, are unlikely to go walking on the majority of days during their holiday. Thus, by assuming only one night's expenditure we provide a realistic, if perhaps conservative, estimate of the actual expenditures made during the trip directly associated with walking.

TABLE 11: SPENDING (£ MILLION) OF DOMESTIC TOURISTS ON WALKING DURING HOLIDAY TRIPS IN ENGLAND.

£ million	Cumbria	North-umbria	North West	Yorkshire	Heart of England	East of England	London	South West	Southern	South East	England Unspecified	Total England
Short walks (up to 2 miles)	£118	£69	£196	£196	£353	£221	£176	£446	£225	£250	£93	£2,342
Long walks (more than 2 miles)	£74	£29	£74	£83	£132	£93	£74	£201	£88	£98	£44	£990
- Hiking or hillwalking	£49	£5	£10	£25	£39	£15	£10	£59	£20	£25	£15	£270
- Rambling	£29	£15	£20	£29	£44	£34	£10	£74	£34	£39	£20	£348
- Other type of walking	£15	£10	£44	£34	£59	£44	£49	£88	£39	£39	£20	£441
All walks (short + long)	**£191**	**£98**	**£270**	**£279**	**£485**	**£314**	**£250**	**£647**	**£314**	**£348**	**£137**	£3,332

Source: UK Tourism Survey, 2001.

3.3. Overseas tourists

The International Passenger Survey (IPS) is a survey of 250,000 passengers entering and leaving the UK. Unfortunately, the International Passenger Survey does not specifically identify trips made by overseas visitors to the English countryside. To overcome this shortfall, the total number of visits and associated spending by overseas visitors is first adjusted to provide an estimate of the number of visits and spending in the English countryside. This is achieved following a method used by Countryside Agency (2000b) which identified the proportion of total tourist spend on countryside locations by English regions. These figures for visits to the countryside are then further adjusted to identify the number of visits and spending by overseas visitors on walking using UK Tourism Survey figures on the proportion of countryside trips that involved walking; i.e. roughly half of tourism trips included walking as an activity. Based on these calculations, it is estimated that overseas visitors undertake just over one million walking trips to the English countryside and spend £355 million.

TABLE 12: OVERSEAS VISITORS BY REGION, 2000

	Total Visits (000s)	Total Spend (£million)	% of total spend spent on countryside visits	Visits to the countryside (000s)	Country-side Spend (£million)	Walking visits (000s)	Walking Spend (£m)
North East	445	169	5	22	8.4	11	4
North West	1606	499	8	128	39.9	64	20
Yorkshire	917	255	16	147	40.8	73	20
Heart of England	2304	745	21	484	156.4	242	78
East of England	1772	654	18	319	117.7	159	59
London	13145	6901	1	131	69.0	66	35
South West	2349	734	12	282	88.1	141	44
South East	4137	1359	14	579	190.3	290	95
All England	**26675**	**11316**		**2092**	**710.7**	**1046**	**355**

3.4. Total volume of walking and spending on walking in England

The total volume of walking in England and associated spending can now be established from the data outlined above and is summarised in Table 13. It is estimated that annually there are 527 million walking trips to the English countryside. Expenditure associated with these walking trips is in the region of £6.1 billion. The majority of walking trips (87%) are undertaken from the home (i.e. leisure day trips), however tourist based walking trips account for 57% of the expenditure. This higher level of average expenditure by tourists can be explained by the fact that tourist based walking trips include expenditure on accommodation.

TABLE 13: TOTAL VOLUME AND SPENDING ON WALKING IN THE ENGLISH COUNTRYSIDE.

	Volume of walking trips (millions)	Average expenditure per trip (£ per trip)	Total expenditure on walking (£ million)
Leisure day walking trips to the countryside[1]	429	£5.15	2,124
Leisure day walking trips to the seaside / coast[1]	32	£10.39	328
Tourist trips that include a short walk as an activity[2]	46	£49.00	2,342
Tourist trips that include a long walk as an activity[2]	19.5	£49.00	990
Overseas visitors[3]	1.0	£355.00	355
Total	**527.5**		**6139**

1: Source UK Day visits survey, 1996. Note that Tourist day trips are incorporated within the Leisure day trips.
2: Source: UK Tourism Survey, 2001.
3: International Passengers Survey, 2000
Also note that some of the figures above may not add up due to rounding up of the data

4. The economic impact of walking

Spending by walkers provides significant benefits to local economies in terms of income and job generation. Multiplier analysis is an economic tool that can be used to measure the overall impact of an introduction or 'injection' of expenditure into an economic system (Christie *et al*., 1998). Such expenditures may include walkers' expenditure on food, accommodation, transport etc. The injection of these expenditures into the local economy will stimulate an increase in the level of economic activity that, in turn, will generate additional income and employment to the area. Multiplier analysis can be used to measure the size of these impacts.

The theory underlying multiplier analysis is as follows. The initial round of spending created by the original injection into an economy is known as the direct expenditure. As the recipient businesses of the direct expenditure then re-spend this money in successive indirect rounds, the number of transactions rise and the overall output expands. With this expansion in output comes an increase in the wealth of local residents, who consequently increase their consumption expenditure (induced effects). The overall impact on the level of economic activity is expressed in terms of the changes in output, income or employment that arise in the recipient economy. This is expressed numerically by the multiplier coefficient, which is calculated by dividing the sum of the direct, indirect, and induced effects with the direct effects. The ultimate size of the multiplier coefficients is thus a reflection of the extent to which injections of expenditure are retained within the local economy. Various factors will affect the size of an economy's multiplier coefficient. The more narrowly the local economy is defined, the higher the leakages and the lower the multiplier (TRRU, 1975).

Small scale tourist businesses such as B&Bs tend to generate higher multipliers than national businesses such as hotel chains (Slee, *et al.*, 1997). Remote rural locations also tend to have a higher multiplier effect since poorer communications reduce leakages from the local economy. In economic impact studies, the total economic impact of an initial injection of expenditures within a local economy may be estimated by multiplying that expenditure with a relevant multiplier coefficient. In terms of this study, the income and employment impacts of walkers may be determined by multiplying the walkers' total expenditures with relevant income and employment multiplier coefficients.

The actual multiplier coefficients used in a study may be established either through primary data collection or by 'borrowing' coefficients from similar studies. For this research, a 'borrow' coefficient was used. A review of UK multiplier studies, undertaken by the RSPB, found relatively consistent impacts of visitor expenditure (Rayment, 1995). Typically, £1.00 of visitor expenditure generates between £0.24 – £0.45 income within the local economy. The same study also found that one full-time equivalent (FTE) local job is created per £15,000 – £25,000 of visitor expenditure (Rayment, 1995). Perhaps of more direct relevance was a study commissioned by the Countryside Agency (2000b) which examined the economic impact of recreation and tourism in England. In this study, they established an employment multiplier coefficient in the region of one FTE job created per £34,000 tourist expenditure.

These studies provide a rough indication of the likely size of multiplier coefficients for use in this study. It is proposed that Rayment's (1995) income coefficients of 0.24 and 0.45 are used to provide low and high estimates of the income impact. Similarly, the Countryside Agency's (2000) employment coefficient of £34,000 per FTE job will be used to establish a lower bound estimate of the employment impacts, while Rayment's (1995) £25,000 per FTE job be used to estimate a high bound.

Estimates of the income and employment impacts of walking in England are presented in Table 14. In terms of income impacts, it is estimated that walking in England generates between £1,473 million to £2,763 million income annually in rural areas. In terms of employment generation, it is estimated that between 180,558 and 245,560 FTE jobs are supported as a result of walkers' expenditure. Thirty eight percent of these income and employment benefits are generated from the expenditures of tourists on short walks, 35% from the expenditures of leisure day walkers to the countryside and 16% from the expenditures of tourists on long walks. Expenditures by leisure day walkers to the seaside and overseas walkers both contribute towards 5% of these impacts.

TABLE 14: INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT IMPACTS OF WALKING

	Expenditure on walking (£ million)	Income impacts[1] (£ million)		Employment impacts[2] (FTE jobs).	
		Lower bound	Higher bound	Lower bound	Higher bound
Leisure day walking trips to the countryside	2,124	510	956	62,471	84,960
Leisure day walking trips to the seaside / coast	328	79	148	9,647	13,120
Tourist trips that include a short walk as an activity	2,342	562	1,054	68,882	93,680
Tourist trips that include a long walk as an activity	990	238	446	29,118	39,600
Overseas tourist	355	85	160	10,441	14,200
Total	**6,139**	**1,473**	**2,763**	**180,559**	**245,560**

1: Lower and higher bound estimates of income impacts are respectively based on income multipliers of 0.24 and 0.45.
2: Lower and higher bound estimates of employment impacts are respectively based on employment multipliers of one FTE job generated per £34,000 and £25,000 expenditure.

The results above provide an estimate of the total level of expenditures undertaken by walkers in England, and the subsequent income and employment impacts to rural economies in England. We now provide a critique of these figures.

Table 15 provides a summary of the results from a number of related economic impact studies. Generally, the values derived from our study would appear to fall into the expected range compared to these other studies. For example, the level of income generated from walkers in England is equivalent to a quarter of income from all types of tourists to the English countryside (RDC, 1997). Furthermore, the income and employment impacts associated with walking in England appear to be in proportion to those reported for Scotland (Crabtree *et al.*, 1992; HIE, 1996) and Wales (Midmore, 2000). These facts provide further evidence of the validity of this study's results.

TABLE 15: COMPARISON OF STUDIES ADDRESSING THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF TOURISM AND RECREATION.

Sources	**Volume of trips (million)**	**Expenditure (£ million)**	**Income generation (£ million)**	**Employment impacts (FTE jobs generated)**
Walking in England (this study)	*527.5*	*6,139*	*1,473 to 2,763*	*180,559 to 245,560*
Recreation and tourism in the English Countryside (Countryside Agency, 2000).	5,287	11,545	-	339,600
Tourism in England (RDC, 1997)	-	-	8,000	350,000
Open-air recreation in Scotland (Crabtree *et al.*, 1992)	-	732 (Range: 346 to 1,673)	299 (Range: 137 to 715)	29,647 (Range: 13,407 to 72,076)
Mountaineering in the Highlands of Scotland (HIE, 1996)	0.506	104	34	3,960
Walking in Wales (Midmore, 2000)	-	170	55	3,000

5. The social value of walking

Many social benefits can be attributed to walking, from social interaction to a greater appreciation of the countryside. Evidence and data to access the levels of such benefits is however lacking.

The one area where social benefits from walking have been studied is that relating to the health benefits that walking can provide. Examples of such research are given below.

DEFRA states that "*Walking as a form of exercise has a particular role in the protection of cardiovascular health and function*" and from the same report that walking "… *is the most popular and accessible form of exercise irrespective of age, lifestyle or location*". The report recognizes that when attempts are made to evaluate the private benefits to individuals from recreational access in the countryside, it is rarely obvious that respondents are fully informed about the health benefits that walking may provide. The report also indicates that there may also be public sector financial benefits from providing greater opportunities for exercise by reducing the burden on public health expenditure (Powell and Blair, 1994).

A further example comes from the UK Parliament Select Committee on Environment, Transport and Regional Affairs (2001) memorandum "*Walking in Towns and Cities*" which also examined the health benefits of walking. Key findings included the Surgeon-General's report (US Department of Health and Human Services, 1996) (http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/sgr/sgr.htm) which reviewed the evidence on physical activity and health noted that the benefits of physical activity include:

- lower overall mortality;
- reduced risk of cardiovascular disease mortality;
- reduced levels and risk of high blood pressure;
- improved mood and reductions in symptoms of depression and anxiety;
- decreased risk of cancer of the colon;
- lower risk of developing diabetes;
- reductions in falls in older adults;
- reductions in obesity, and better weight control;
- improved health-related quality of life.

This report also states that …*"Walking has the potential to influence health in a variety of ways. These include the potential benefit of walking as enjoyment and in providing contact with natural environments, social contact, economic benefits through promotion of local economies, exposure to environmental (including road traffic) danger and the influence of physical activity*."

It is clear from these studies that walking provides significant health benefits. However, to date, the economic values of these benefits have not been measured.

6. Costs of improving the path network

A detailed study of the costs of improving the path network was incorporated into the Countryside Agency's (2001a) 'Rights of Way Condition Survey 2000' report. This report estimated the amount of work that would be required to bring the path network up to the conditions set in the national target and the likely cost of this work. In particular, the report examines these costs in terms of the costs of (i) upgrading and maintaining crossings (e.g. stiles, gates, bridges and steps), (ii) dealing with obstacles that make a path inconvenient or unusable (e.g. walls, fences, slippery slopes etc) and (iii) replacing missing signposts.

Table 16 provides a summary of the condition of crossings found in English paths. The Countryside Agency (2001a) estimate that there were nearly 590,000 stiles, gates, and bridges on the path network, of which 80% were in a satisfactory condition, 15% needed attention and 5% were in an unusable condition. A breakdown of Table 16 by English county can be found in Table 5 in the Appendix. Standard costs for upgrading and maintenance of this crossing furniture is shown in Table 17

TABLE 16: STANDARD OF CROSSING FURNITURE FOUND IN ENGLISH PATHS

Condition	Stile	Gate	Bridge	Steps
Satisfactory	264,500	150,500	67,500	19,500
Needs attention	36,500	37,000	6,000	1,500
Unusable	5,500	19,000	1,000	300

Source: Countryside Agency (2001a)

TABLE 17: STANDARD COSTS FOR UPGRADE AND MAINTENANCE OF CROSSING FURNITURE.

Condition	Stile		Gate		Steps	
	Upgrade cost	*Maintenance*	*Upgrade cost*	*Maintenance*	*Upgrade cost*	*Maintenance*
Satisfactory	£0.00	£11.67	£0.00	£16.00	£0.00	£45.00
Needs attention	£85.00	£11.67	£80.00	£16.00	£50.00	£45.00
Unusable	£140.00	£11.67	£160.00	£16.00	£105.00	£45.00

Source: Countryside Agency (2001a)

Table 18 reproduces the Countryside Agency's estimates of the total number of obstacles across the whole path network, along with estimates of the number of missing signposts. The most common obstacles found were steep slippery slopes and walls/fences/hedges that blocked the path.

TABLE 18: ESTIMATED NUMBER OF OBSTACLES AND MISSING SIGNPOSTS

Obstacles	Footpaths	Other ROW
Wall/fence/hedge	35000	5000
Electric fence	8500	450
Unbridged stream	4000	700
Steep/slippery slope	115500	103500
Crops/ploughed surface (km)	6740	1000
Natural surface vegetation (km)	4190	2365
Natural vegetation (side or above) (km)	145	585
Narrow path/linear hazard	185	335
Muggy/boggy/flooded (km)	1030	913
Rough surface/deep ruts (km)	450	817
Misleading signs	2000	3100
Erosion (km)	20	64
	All	**Missing**
Signpost	324250	105600

Source: Countryside Agency, 2001a

Standard costs for the upgrade and maintenance of path obstacles and signposting is provided in Table 19.

TABLE 19: COSTS OF UPGRADE AND MAINTENANCE OF PATH OBSTACLES

	Longevity (years)	Upgrade cost footpaths	Maintenance cost footpaths	Upgrade cost other ROW	Maintenance Costs other ROW
Wall/fence/hedge	12	£140.00	£11.67	£160.00	£13.33
Electric fence	12	£140.00	£11.67	£160.00	£13.33
Unbridged stream	10	£350.00	£35.00	£700.00	£70.00
Steep/slippery slope	5	£12.00	£2.40	£12.00	£2.40
Crops/ploughed surface	1	£0.25	£0.25	£0.25	£0.25
Natural surface vegetation	1	£0.25	£0.25	£0.25	£0.25
Natural vegetation side/above	1	£0.25	£0.25	£0.25	£0.25
Narrow path/linear hazard	N/A	£0.25	N/A	£0.25	£0.00
Muddy/boggy/flooded	15	£12.00	£0.80	£12.00	£0.80
Rough surface/deep ruts	N/A	£10.00	N/A	£10.00	N/A
Misleading sign	N/A	£25.00	N/A	£25.00	N/A
Erosion	10	£10.00	£1.00	£15.00	N/A
Signpost	12	£45.00	£3.75	£45.00	£3.75

Source: Countryside Agency (2001a)

The Countryside Agency (2001a) report concludes that to improve the condition of the path network to the standard envisaged by the national target would require a total investment of £69.20 million. In addition, they estimate that it would cost an extra £18.55 million per year to then maintain the network at its optimum condition (Table 20). These figures equate to a cost of £366 per km to upgrade paths and an annual maintenance cost of £95 per km (Countryside Agency, 2001a).

TABLE 20: TOTAL COSTS TO UPGRADE AND MAINTAIN PATH NETWORK

	Upgrade cost (£m)	Maintenance cost (£m per year)
Signposts	£4.75	£1.22
	£4.75	**£1.22**
Crossings		
Stile	£3.86	£3.58
Gate	£6.02	£3.31
Bridge	£1.88	£3.37
Steps	£0.11	£0.45
	£11.87	**£10.71**
Hazards		
Wall / fence / hedge	£5.70	£0.48
Electric fence	£1.25	£0.10
Unbridged stream	£1.95	£0.20
Steep / slippery slope	£2.63	£0.53
Crops / ploughed	£1.93	£1.93
Surface natural vegetation	£1.64	£1.64
Natural vegetation at side or above	£0.18	£0.18
Narrow path	£0.13	£0.00
Muddy / boggy / flooded	£23.29	£1.55
Rough surface / deep ruts	£12.59	£0.00
Misleading or intimidating sign	£0.13	£0.00
Erosion	£1.17	£0.02
	£52.59	**£6.63**
TOTAL	**£69.20**	**£18.55**

Source: Countryside Agency (2001a)

6.1. Sources of funding for paths

The protection and maintenance of paths is a statutory requirement of local authorities and as such it can be difficult to find additional sources of funding for this type of work. Opportunities for obtaining additional funds from government resources may be possible if it can be demonstrated that the additional money produces 'added value' to what would otherwise be done. For instance, core money may only enable a path to be cleared, however, additional monies could be obtained for a project to provide waymarking or path furniture such as picnic areas, seating or view points.

Many charitable trusts are restricted to funding activities that support other charitable organisations. Therefore, a partnership approach may be necessary to carry out the work. For example, wildlife trust volunteers or organisations helping unemployed people into employment could undertake path restoration work in conjunction with a local authority. In these examples the 'added value' could be increased wildlife / habitat creation or job training /employment skills for disadvantaged people. The local authority would get its work completed and the charitable organisation is able to further its aims. Whatever approach is taken, some lateral thinking is usually needed to make best use of what grant funding may be available.

Examples of potential funding sources:

- Land Fill Tax Credit – This enables landfill site operators to donate an element of their landfill tax liability to environmental projects and is administered by ENTRUST
- European Structure Funds (limited areas)
- Charitable Trusts – Ford Foundation, Sainsbury Foundation, Groundwork, Lottery - New Opportunities Fund

New government schemes, notably the Local Public Service Agreement, and Local Transport Plans, have provided additional funding to local authorities for work on rights of way, including statutory-duty work.

7. Cost benefit analysis

This report has drawn from a wide range of existing research material to provide an overview of the resources available for walking in the English countryside, the level of use of this resource and an assessment of the economic and social benefits associated with walking in the English countryside. Also in this report, we have examined the condition of the path network and reported the likely costs required to bring this network up to standard and maintain it. In this section we attempt to compare the socio-economic benefits associated with walking in the English countryside with the costs required to maintain England's walking resource. This analysis forms the basis of a discussion on the cost-effectiveness of using public monies to fund and promote walking activities.

Table 14 summarises our estimate of the current level of expenditure associated with walking in the English countryside (£6.139 billion), and gives an estimate of the likely income and employment impacts of this expenditure (£1.473 billion-£2.763 billion income and 180,559 – 245,560 FTE jobs respectively). These economic benefits relate to the current level of use of the path network.

In Section 6 we report the findings from a Countryside Agency report on the condition of the path network. This report concluded that the cost of upgrading the path network in England would be £69.20m, while the annual costs of path maintenance would be £18.55m.

The first point to highlight from these figures is that both the expenditures undertaken by walkers and the income which this generates are greatly in excess of the costs of bringing footpaths up to standard and maintaining them. This fact provides some evidence to support the investment in the path network.

However, a more important question to ask is: what economic and social benefits will accrue from this extra path availability? Unfortunately, there does not appear to be any research to show what effect improvements to a path have on the use of that particular path. Also, it is unclear whether improving a path would generate additional walking activity, or displace current activity from one path to another, and whether the additional walking opportunities would result in benefits such as reduced use of transport and reduced travelling times. These issues need to be properly investigated before any real conclusions can be formed on the economic and social benefits that may be derived from the extra walking opportunity.

One issue that also needs further investigation relates to the economic value of the social benefits of walking. In Section 5 we highlighted the various types of social benefits that have been associated with walking: for example, health and spiritual benefits. However, little or no research has been undertaken to quantify the economic value of these social benefits. It is argued that these social benefits should also be included in a cost benefit study on path improvements.

Evidence suggests that walkers encountering an obstructed path are unlikely to return to that path. A number of similar experiences may lead walkers to avoid a particular area in the future. Given the level of obstruction on English paths (31% difficult or impossible to use) the disincentive effect on return visits to areas notorious for obstructed paths is likely to be significant. This effect reduces the overall level of resources available for walking in England.

Although further research is needed, it is likely that greater efforts to restore the existing rights of way network, by removing obstructions and opening paths, would offer significant additional economic and social benefits in that area.

8. Future research needs

Although this research has drawn some useful conclusions on the economic and social value of walking, the research has also identified a number of issues that have limited the scope of this desk study. We therefore now report some of these limiting factors and propose further research that could usefully be undertaken to overcome some of them.

- The research reported here was restricted to the measurement of the total benefits associated with the English path network. The research, however, was unable to make a proper assessment of the level of extra benefits that are likely to be generated as a result of paths being restored to public use. In order to examine these extra benefits, new research would have to be undertaken to examine the economic and social effects of path restoration to public use, and the effect any restoration to public use has on the usage of other paths. For example, does the repair or clearance of a path lead to new walking activity or does it displace existing walking activity from other paths? Also, the effect of poor path condition should also be investigated in greater depth to examine the disincentive effect of poorly maintained paths: whether this results in people reducing their levels of walking, or in people walking on other paths (and if so, what are the economic and social consequences of this?) Furthermore, research is needed on the effects any displacement has on the costs and benefits to walkers (e.g. increased / decreased travel costs and travel time) and also the wider economic impact of this displacement.
- This research has also highlighted the fact that currently there does not appear to be any data on the economic value of the social benefits (e.g. health and spiritual benefits) that are associated with walking. It is recommended that this be researched and that the value of these social benefits be incorporated into the cost benefit analysis of improving the path network.
- Much of the analysis undertaken in this research is based on data from national studies that provide estimates of the level of walking activity at a national scale. Although this data is clearly useful, it would have been useful to examine in more detail where people walk. For example, do people walk most on high profile paths, or local paths? Although it is acknowledged that data does exist on the levels of use of high profile paths such as national trails and other long distance routes, there is very little data on the levels of use of local paths. Further case study research on this may be useful.
- One further issue that limited this research is related to the fact that much of the data on the path network was reported at different scales. For example, some data was only reported at a national level, while other data was reported at the local authority level or public agency unit level. One issue that would have been interesting to investigate relates to the relationship between the level of ease of use of a local authority's path network and the level of benefits associated with that network. It is envisaged that such an analysis could be undertaken if resources were available to allow more detailed analysis from the raw data sources. On a related issue, it is proposed that more effort is made by the relevant authorities to ensure that data on paths is made more comparable in the future.
- Finally, the majority of this research has examined issues relating to the path network. The imminent introduction of the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 and its measures for providing access to open countryside will open up further issues relating to the condition of open access areas and the benefits associated with these new areas. An assessment of the current condition and level of use of open access land would be useful since such work could provide a benchmark from which to assess how the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 affects people's use of the countryside.

9. Bibliography

Audit Commission (2002). *Best value performance indicators: Footpaths* (BV178)

Christie M, Keirle I and Scott A (1998) *The economic impact of Welsh national nature reserves.* CCW: Bangor.

The Countryside Agency (2001b). *Resources for public rights of way 1999/2000*. Countryside Agency: Cheltenham,

The Countryside Agency (2001a). *The Rights of Way Condition survey 2000*. Countryside Agency: Cheltenham,

The Countryside Agency (2000). *The economic impact of recreation and tourism in the English Countryside 1998*. Countryside Agency: Cheltenham,

Crabtree B, Appleton Z, Thomson, K, Slee, B, Chalmers, N and Copus, A (1992). *The economics of countryside access in Scotland*. SAC: Aberdeen

DEFRA (1999). *Appraisal of Options on Access to the Open Countryside of England and Wales*, DEFRA, London.

DEFRA, *Walking in Great Britain – Transport Statistics Report*

Select Committee on Environment, Transport and Regional Affairs (2001), Memorandum by the Health Development Agency (WTC 34) *Walking in Towns and Cities*

Highlands and Islands Enterprise (1996). *The economic impacts of hillwalking, mountaineering and associated activities in the highland and islands of Scotland*. HIE: Inverness

Midmore (2000). *The economic value of walking in rural Wale*s. Working Paper No. 13. Welsh Institute of Rural Studies: Aberystwyth.

Powell KE, Blair SN (1994) *The public health burden of sedentary living habits: theoretical but realistic estimates*. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise 1994;26(7):851-6.

Rayment (1995) *Nature conservation, employment and local economics: A literature review*. RSPB: Sandy

Rural Development Commission (1997). *Tourism in England*. RDC

Slee B, Farr H and Snowdon (1997). *The economic impact of alternative types of rural tourism*. Journal of Agricultural Economics 48(2), 179-192.

TRRU, (1975). *The economy of rural communities in the National Parks of England and Wales.* Research Report 47, Edinburgh.

Social and Community Planning Research (1996). *UK Day Visitors Survey 1996*. SCPR: London.

10. Appendices

Table 21 to 24 provide a detailed breakdown of the 'ease of use' of paths in England Council type. It should be noted that Inner London boroughs were exempt, and also that not all highway authorities submitted information. An asterisk next to the council's name indicates that the Audit Commission also queried the statistics. A hash indicates that the council failed to provide any data.

The codes used in 'Methodology' column indicate the following:

N = Percentage of the total **number** of rights of way classed as 'easy to use'
L = Percentage of the total **length** of rights of way classed as 'easy to use'

TABLE 21: BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR FOR EASE OF USE OF PATHS (BV178) 2001/2002 – OUTER LONDON BOROUGH COUNCILS

Outer London Borough Councils	BV178	Methodology	Position in category
Barking & Dagenham	100%	N	1
Barnet	100%	L	1
Bexley	99%	L	8
Brent	97%	N	9
Bromley	73%	L	14
Croydon	97%	L	9
Ealing	88%	L	12
Enfield	89%	N	11
Haringey	62%	L	16
Harrow	75%	N	13
Havering	63%	L	15
Hillingdon	32%	L	19
Hounslow	#		n/a
Kingston-upon-Thames	100%	L	1
Merton	59%		17
Newham	100%	L	1
Redbridge	56%	L	18
Richmond upon Thames	100%	L	1
Sutton	100%	L	1
Waltham Forest	100%	L	1
Average	**84%**		

TABLE 22: BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR FOR EASE OF USE OF PATHS (BV178) 2001/2002 – METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCILS

Metropolitan District Council	BV178	Methodology	Position in category
Barnsley*	57%	L	18
Birmingham*	7%	N	32
Bolton	57%	N	18
Bradford	53%	L	22
Bury	69%	L	12
Calderdale	#		n/a
Coventry	#	N	n/a
Doncaster	54%	N	21
Dudley	23%	L	31
Gateshead	45%	N	27
Kirklees*	61%		15
Knowsley	95%	L	2
Leeds	55%	N	20
Liverpool	40%	L	28
Manchester	69%	L	12
Newcastle upon Tyne	79%	L	9
North Tyneside	83%	L	7
Oldham	47%	N	26
Rochdale	5%	N	33
Rotherham	96%	L	1
Salford	50%	N	23
Sandwell*	3%	L	34
Sefton	80%	L	8
Sheffield	73%	L	10
Solihull*	49%		24
South Tyneside	95%	L	2
St Helens	95%	L	2
Stockport	60%	N	17
Sunderland	48%	L	25
Tameside	65%	L	14
Trafford	39%	N	29
Wakefield	29%	L	30
Walsall	61%	L	15
Wigan	71%	L	11
Wirral	95%		2
Wolverhampton	87%	L	6
Average	63%		

TABLE 23: BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR FOR EASE OF USE OF PATHS (BV178) 2001/2002 – COUNTY COUNCILS

County Councils	BV178	Methodology	Position in category
Bedfordshire	71%	N	10
Buckinghamshire	74%	N	9
Cambridgeshire	79%	N	4
Cheshire	75%	L	7
Cornwall	51%	L	22
Cumbria	#		n/a
Derbyshire	47%	L	25
Devon	78%	N	6
Dorset	43%	L	28
Durham	#	L	n/a
East Sussex	64%	L	12
Essex*	55%		21
Gloucestershire	#		n/a
Hampshire	83%	L	2
Hertfordshire*	49%		23
Kent	60%	L	19
Lancashire	63%	L	16
Leicestershire	79%	L	4
Lincolnshire	59%	L	20
Norfolk	45%	L	27
North Yorkshire	#		n/a
Northamptonshire*	64%	N	12
Northumberland	64%	N	12
Nottinghamshire	62%	N	17
Oxfordshire	69%	L	11
Shropshire	46%	L	26
Somerset	#		n/a
Staffordshire	62%	N	17
Suffolk*	48%	N	24
Surrey	89%	L	1
Warwickshire	83%	N	2
West Sussex	#		n/a
Wiltshire	75%	N	7
Worcestershire	64%	N	12
Average	66%		

TABLE 24: BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR FOR EASE OF USE OF PATHS (BV178) – 2001/2002 UNITARY COUNCILS

Unitary Councils	BV178	Methodology	Position in category
Bath & N E Somerset	80%	N	16
Blackburn with Darwen	43%	L	39
Blackpool	60%	L	30
Bournemouth	97%	N	5
Bracknell Forest	97%	N	5
Brighton & Hove	95%		9
Bristol	67%	N	25
Darlington	95%		9
Derby	45%	N	37
East Riding of Yorkshire	75%	L	18
Halton	62%	N	28
Hartlepool	99%	L	3
Herefordshire	37%		40
Isle of Wight	#		n/a
Isles of Scilly	#		n/a
Kingston-upon-Hull	#		n/a
Leicester	60%	L	30
Luton	100%	L	1
Medway Towns	72%	L	21
Middlesbrough	52%		35
Milton Keynes	51%	L	36
North East Lincolnshire	64%		26
North Lincolnshire	45%	L	37
North Somerset	69%	L	23
Nottingham	100%	N	1
Peterborough	88%	N	11
Plymouth	69%	N	23
Poole	98%	N	4
Portsmouth	#		n/a
Reading	83%	N	14
Redcar & Cleveland	59%	N	32
Rutland*	72%	L	21
Slough	#		n/a
South Gloucestershire	35%	L	41
Southampton	64%	L	26
Southend-on-Sea	97%	L	5
Stockton-on-Tees	81%		15
Stoke-on-Trent	21%	L	42
Swindon*	84%		13
Telford & Wrekin	75%	N	18
Thurrock	76%	L	17
Torbay	62%	L	28
Warrington	53%	N	34
West Berkshire	74%	L	20
Windsor & Maidenhead	88%	N	11
Wokingham	96%	N	8
York	57%	N	33
Average	**71%**		

TABLE 25: ESTIMATED TOTAL NUMBER OF CROSSINGS AND HAZARDS BY SURVEY REGION

	Stile			Gate			Bridge			All Obstacles	
Region	***S***	***NA***	***U***	***S***	***NA***	***U***	***S***	***NA***	***U***	***I***	***U***
Avon	8722	1228	97	2298	472	124	622	152	7	1845	514
Bedfordshire	1416	658	100	723	330	155	777	915	34	4156	2407
Berkshire	1296	266	76	1329	118	173	346	13	53	617	460
Buckinghamshire	3896	1214	76	2565	772	444	877	455	76	10265	1679
Cambridgeshire	1036	136	17	667	258	227	1801	47	0	2971	1777
Cheshire	9289	483	23	2225	596	239	1697	85	47	2034	584
Cornwall	8548	945	69	2992	792	1142	732	40	0	5639	6793
Cumbria	8346	1299	84	17124	2216	639	3238	157	145	9428	1395
Derbyshire	13741	1158	77	4208	548	321	525	12	0	2330	767
Devon	4465	1407	57	9787	1600	1683	1839	20	79	6657	2262
Dorset	5375	645	215	6781	1643	1091	1707	199	0	3593	3786
Durham/Cleveland/Tyne and Wear	7774	595	102	5519	1539	746	1083	0	30	2307	2184
East Sussex	3921	654	318	3088	285	111	868	56	14	1051	1121
Essex	4205	973	156	957	153	117	3574	168	0	7697	4711
Gloucestershire	11892	1546	155	6664	2242	638	2927	193	0	6972	4562
Greater Manchester/Merseyside	4040	844	29	1720	213	45	1966	87	0	1938	713
Hampshire/Isle of Wight	5397	1064	246	2660	519	206	1085	109	21	1551	1173
Herefordshire	8551	544	272	3809	1124	272	1217	106	14	2368	1478
Hertfordshire	2718	611	44	1167	351	184	864	205	0	4462	1648
Humberside	1004	128	35	803	134	46	489	58	0	551	557
Kent	9542	909	587	4487	148	192	3006	44	59	7147	3374
Lancashire	13064	1706	129	6282	1508	579	2938	241	33	3674	1130
Leicestershire	6258	825	259	1994	850	629	2694	92	43	3133	2452
Lincolnshire	3158	449	131	1217	506	371	2915	190	50	3479	4155
Norfolk	1076	305	32	1315	173	107	1180	96	40	6388	2223
North	13839	3293	921	10687	4657	2952	2332	447	192	10737	6859
Northamptonshire	3632	917	97	2266	1701	435	2191	65	19	2305	2494
Northumberland	3629	340	49	6448	821	604	1379	86	12	6341	1926
Nottinghamshire	2855	519	52	1009	559	283	963	173	0	3118	2502
Oxfordshire	4003	1078	111	2611	760	314	1887	169	58	5800	3135
Shropshire	13688	601	82	5211	511	757	1908	46	0	2847	4267
Somerset	9811	1525	63	7374	2609	1751	2381	918	46	11770	3234
Staffordshire	14134	2035	145	4287	950	263	1381	0	5	3103	840
Suffolk	1710	280	93	972	8	31	1620	62	17	2418	1722
Surrey	2380	280	100	1637	455	131	1297	0	0	2456	533
Warwickshire/West Midlands	9363	805	21	3363	718	147	2494	117	0	2794	955
West Sussex	6612	807	175	2238	815	536	1941	105	33	5547	1209
West Yorkshire/South Yorkshire	12356	1177	103	2455	1020	247	2743	34	34	2959	1374
Wiltshire	4739	1428	0	4923	1415	118	410	87	0	6639	2507
Worcestershire	13107	877	0	2601	1088	44	1842	33	5	1108	512
All (rounded totals)	264500	36500	5500	150500	37000	19000	675000	6000	1000	172000	88000

S-Satisfactory, NA Needs Attention, U Unusable, I Inconvenient

Source: Countryside Agency 2001.