

# Peak District Local Access Forum

**Date: 8 December 2016**

**Item: 9**

**Title: Green Lanes Update**

**Author: Sue Smith**

## **Purpose of the Report**

The report provides an update on progress with managing recreational motor vehicles in the National Park.

## **Traffic Regulation Order Update**

A consultation took place during November 2016 on the amendment to the NPA's proposal for a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to prohibit mechanically propelled vehicles at all times on the Washgate route save for named motorcycle trails (Bemrose, Reliance, Dave Rowland and Northern Experts). The LAF were notified under Regulation 12 of the National Park Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England) Regulations 2007. The Forum's response is at Appendix 1. The consultation documents can be viewed at [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/consultations).

On the 4 November 2016, National Park Authority members resolved to make a traffic regulation order which would permanently prohibit mechanically propelled vehicles at Derby Lane, near Monyash. When the order is made, notice will be served on consultees, landowners, and all those that have made representations.

## **Repairs**

The LAF has responded to Derbyshire County Council's consultations on surfacing and drainage works at Hurstclough and Chapel Gate and their responses are attached in Appendices 2 and 3.

## **One-off Green Lanes Forum**

The one-off forum for motor vehicle stakeholders, convened by Defra and Natural England, was held in November 2016. The NPA was invited to be involved. The group is going to meet up again in February 2017. It will have an independent status. No terms of reference have been identified but a number of workgroups are proposed to be established covering: traffic regulation orders, unsealed unclassified roads, illegal and inappropriate use, and standards, funding and maintenance.

## **Recommendations**

- 1. That the report is noted.**

## Appendix 1

 <p>PEAK DISTRICT LOCAL ACCESS FORUM</p>	Peak District Local Access Forum (LAF) C/o Peak District National Park Authority Aldern House Baslow Road Bakewell Derbyshire DE45 1AE
---	--

Sue Smith  
Rights of Way Officer  
Peak District National Park Authority  
Aldern House  
Baslow Rd  
Bakewell  
Derbyshire  
DE45 1AE

Your Ref:A.76226/SAS  
24th November, 2016  
sent by email

Dear Sue

**Washgate - Notification under Regulation 12 of the National Park Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England) Regulations 2007.**

Thank you for your letter of 3rd November and attachments, with the opportunity to comment on the proposed modification of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) before any decision is made on whether to exclude mechanically propelled vehicles save for named motorcycle trials.

This response follows consultation with all Peak District LAF members, and is subject to report at our meeting on 8th December. The LAF previously supported the making of a permanent full-time TRO on motorised vehicles following a unanimous decision by the Green Lanes Sub Group - Edwina Edward's letter of 14th July, 2015 as Chair of the LAF refers. The LAF has a long history of involvement with this route, and has sought to find ways to improve its management by advising both the Highway Authority and the National Park Authority on ways to do so.

In this case, we consider it is reasonable in principle to make exceptions, perhaps on a concessionary basis, to allow restricted and controlled/supervised use by some motorcycle trial events which have operated previously and are regarded as "historic" as set out in the consultation on the basis of the Draft Terms set out in Appendix 3 of your documents.

However, LAF members who have responded feel this needs to be with effective management essential in any option adopted to ensure sustainability through controlling the number of events, the numbers participating, good conduct through written notification in advance and submission of a permit from the national governing body. Additionally, there needs to be thorough monitoring and review. It would also seem reasonable to require a photographic record of surface condition to be done by the Club(s) before and after such events, with agreement that any damage will be made good by the Club(s) at their cost to the satisfaction of the National Park Authority.

In effect there are **2 options**:

**Option 1 - favoured by 3 members.** In this case, it is considered reasonable to make exceptions to allow the use by up to 4 motor cycle trial events set out in the consultation on the basis of the Draft Terms set out in Appendix 3 of your documents and the points referred to above.

**Option 2 - favoured by 7 members.** In this case, we consider that it is reasonable in principle, to allow use of some motor cycle trial events, of those set out in the consultation, on the basis of the Draft Terms set out in Appendix 3 of your documents and the points referred to above, but on a more restricted basis, perhaps 2 per year, than in Option 1.

In Option 2, caution is advised as the idea of allowing use by motorbikes on only 4 days may seem initially to be a very reasonable compromise, but there are concerns about the sustainability of this level of use. We wonder in the light of this if perhaps a reasonable compromise would be two events per year rather than four. Rather than select two and reject two, perhaps each event could take place every two years. This is put forward as a suggestion for your consideration, but some members are still uneasy about this level of use. Two members think in supporting a limit on numbers that 50 sounds a lot and feel that

their idea of an historic event, like say the London to Brighton car rally, is that its something that happens once a year only. In principle they it is right to allow the historic, and supervised event, but only on a concessionary basis. More thoughts related to Option 2 are in the Annex to this letter.

In conclusion, a consensus has not proved possible, but Option 1 gained 3 votes, the more stringent option 2 got 7 votes, 10 members did not respond and 2 members of sponsoring authorities abstained as is normal in such cases. Edwina, as Chair of the LAF, agrees this response is a fair reflection of members views following my consultation and their replies..

Yours sincerely

John

John Thompson  
Chair, Green Lanes Sub Group and  
Vice Chair, LAF

Annex Attached

cc: all LAF members, Mike Rhodes, Richard Pett and Gill Millward

## **Annex of Additional Points raised about details of Option 2 supporting more control**

The suggestion is made as it seems fair to say that if the four designated events are the only opportunities available for motorcyclists to use this route then there will be an increase in the numbers taking part. The maximum allowed for each event is 180 motorbikes. That is not the current level but, as indicated, these numbers can be expected to increase. If 180 vehicles use the route on four occasions, that is 720 per year. That is the equivalent of 1.97 per day. You should also bear in mind that these events are stewarded so motorbikes do not have to consider other users as they would if they were travelling alone which means that they will travel at higher speeds.

A member of the LAF has kindly looked back through the paperwork to find out what the current usage is and has ended up with the report that was presented to LAF in 2009. That gives figures for use during two periods of monitoring in 2007. The first of these was in February/March when 214 motorbikes were recorded over 36 days making an average of 5.94 per day. However, the quote in the report states: "Survey figures are inflated by the presence of a Sunday record of 126 motorbikes in one day, which is believed to have been an organised event." In June to August of the same year another survey was done and this gave a total of 190 motorbikes over 70 days which is an average of 2.71 per day.

The point here is that the "reasonable compromise" referred to earlier in the letter may not be reducing traffic by as much as we think, it may in fact be only down to 50% or 30% depending on which of the 2007 surveys you look at. Of course, there may be some more up to date figures which we have missed, and we would be grateful if officers could look at this to make sure we are not misreading the figures. However, we raise a question - Is reducing the traffic to 50% or 30% of 2007 levels what we want to achieve and is that level of use sustainable?

## **Appendix 2**

24 November 2016

### Surface and Drainage works to Hurstclough Lane - PDLAF response

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals to carry out surface and drainage work on a section of Hurstclough Lane.

The Peak District Local Access Forum is generally supportive of these much needed improvements, but has some concerns that motor vehicles may go faster as a result of the proposed work. We would therefore ask for consideration to be given to the provision of warning signs and speed bumps to help slow vehicles down. The speed bumps may also assist with drainage of the route. Some sympathetic cutting back of the hedges and clearance of shrubbery would improve visibility for users.

We would appreciate clarification about what will happen to the remaining paving stones which are an historic feature of the route and wondered whether these would remain in situ and be covered over by the new surfacing material or if they would be disturbed by installing the precast concrete drainage channel. There is also a need for on-going maintenance to keep the drainage channel clear of leaf litter.

We hope you will find our comments helpful.

Regards  
Mike Rhodes  
PDLAF Secretary

## Appendix 3

24 November 2016

### Surface and Drainage works to Chapel Gate - PDLAF response

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the revised proposals for repair/maintenance of Chapelgate. The LAF acknowledges that some concession has been made to earlier comments in the letter dated 13 January 2015, but there is some concern that elements of that letter have not been followed up.

In particular we support the proposal to reduce the height of the natural rock steps with stone-pitching, which we feel will help to retain the rugged and challenging character of the route whilst improving accessibility.

However, we are concerned that there are no plans to improve the top section of route where there is a large puddle which is forcing users to deviate onto the SSSI moorland. Repairs to this section are paramount in order to protect the environment and the surfaced, used route should be established as the legal line.

We are unclear about the proposed 'transverse stone pitched drainage channels'. Similar ditches on the Edale side of Chapelgate have become clogged with debris and should be cleaned out on a regular basis. These ditches have in places posed a hazard to cyclists and those which are proposed will require careful siting to prevent a reoccurrence. A good contractor is required to ensure they are constructed properly. More information is needed about where the water from these channels will be redirected as it is unclear how these will work in the holloway section – perhaps a typical cross-section similar to that in the Hurstclough Lane consultation plan would be useful.

We hope these comments are helpful.

Regards

Mike Rhodes  
PDLAF Secretary