

## **LAF Vehicles Sub-group Aldern House, 14 June 2012**

### **Attendees:**

John Thompson (JT) (Chair), Bob Berzins, Henry Folkard, Richard Entwistle, Charlotte Gilbert, Sue Weatherley, James Kellie, Mike Johnson  
Caroline Hanson – observing from LAF  
Mike Rhodes, Sue Smith, Richard Pett

### **Apologies:**

Dick Peart

### **1. Introduction**

JNT welcomed Caroline Hanson to the meeting of the sub-group. JT advised that item 2 on the agenda would be consideration of the LAF response to the TRO consultations on Long Causeway and the Roych in accordance with the decision to delegate authority to the Vehicles Sub-group agreed at the morning's LAF meeting.

JT asked for a volunteer to represent LAF in his place at the Green Lanes Forum on 28 June and Henry kindly agreed.

### **2. Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Consultations – Long Causeway & The Roych**

JT introduced the item by asking SAS to summarise the Sub-group's previous advice on these routes. SAS read out from the route summary reports and action plans for Long Causeway and the Roych and the update notes of the Special meeting of the LAF in March 2012. JT summarised the comments made by LAF members at the morning's meeting. SAS summarised the process for TRO consultations as set out in the LAF report, the questions that were being asked in the consultation letter, and the grounds for making a TRO as set out in the Defra guidance document to accompany the regulations. The Authority would consider any proposals at Committee on 20 July. Attached to these minutes are notes of the views and discussion. The recommended actions were agreed for JT to prepare a letter, circulate for members comments, and send to the Peak District NPA, copies to Derbyshire and Sheffield HA's:

#### **Long Causeway**

This route is an important feature in the landscape and there are issues about the structure which go beyond the surface. Long Causeway is also part of the Sheffield Country Walk – a 54 mile promoted walk. One member stated the condition of this section is undoubtedly the worst one and most walkers avoid it because it is so bad.

Richard Entwistle thought repairs should be done and monitored first and a TRO would not seem necessary until Derbyshire CC have carried out an inspection on the revetment and carried out the work. However, the rest of the Sub Group strongly felt that use of this route by recreational motor vehicles, whilst lawful, should be subject to a permanent TRO in respect of 4WD motor vehicles. Additionally, a One Way restriction downhill was proposed (as the voluntary arrangement is not working effectively and signage was not agreed by Sheffield CC). Going downhill is less damaging for the track and less noisy. Speed of motor bikes is also an issue and consideration should be given to a 20mph speed limit, although it was recognised there may be enforcement issues.

Action by the National Park Authority is appropriate for reasons of natural beauty and cultural heritage and to address recreational user conflicts. The concern for safeguarding the historic interest is covered by the term 'natural beauty' as defined in

the Defra guidance. This can be reviewed over the course of time and repairs may cause that to be reconsidered as a permanent TRO.

The sub group also urged that appropriate works are costed and fully funded by the Highway Authorities (Derbyshire CC and Sheffield CC), to carry out repairs. There is a major issue that use by heavy vehicles and water/nature have combined to damage the surface and revetment. In that case, there is a need for Derbyshire CC to check the "tell tales" for any evidence of movement. Overall, coherence from the two authorities on cross border is imperative, Sheffield, Derbyshire and NPA need to work together.

The current usage and problems mean the route is considered to be unsustainable and the TRO action sought is therefore essential to address problems which those involved in the Stanage Forum believe started in 2005.

### **The Roych**

The sub group felt the present vehicular use of the route is not sustainable given major conflict between users on this section of the Pennine Bridleway National Trail and Charlotte said it is the worst section of that route (being in very poor repair) from that point of view. The expectation of users is that it should be better, should be repaired to a higher standard and managed effectively to avoid present conflicts between users.

Members unanimously agreed that use of this route by recreational motor vehicles, whilst lawful, should be subject to a permanent TRO in respect of all motor vehicles on the culs-de-sac section, and in respect of all motor vehicles at weekends on the rest of the route. A One Way restriction should be made from east to west as the voluntary restraint is not working effectively - seems to work with 4 WD, but less so motorcycles.

The group felt problems of vehicles leaving the highway and causing damage and disturbance to National Trust land managed by tenant farmers should be addressed by DCC working with the NPA and NT and National Trust as a matter of urgency. Further repairs are needed to the route, but we the group were very mindful of the considerable expenditure already made by DCC, with doubts expressed by some members about the public expenditure involved and the lack of sustainability of route. A permanent TRO could be subject to review in the light of making repairs and reviewing sustainability.

One member would have preferred action to restrict 4x4s at all times.

### **3. Routes to consider following Survey returns**

JT suggested we were best to consider these at a special meeting and it was agreed it should be the first item then with the following routes: Eyam – Riley Lane, Eyam – Nether Bretton BOAT, Taddington – Sough Lane NC, Wheston CP – Hay Dale NC, Monyash – Derby Lane, Ballidon – Minninglow/Gallowgate Lane, Birchover – Clough Wood NC, Outseats – Hurstclough Lane

**4. Other items** - HLF is going to circulate a draft for templates for consideration.

### **5. Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 1 August 2012 at 10am, Aldern House