

**LAF Green Lanes Sub-group  
Aldern House  
17 June 2013**

**Attendees:**

Edwina Edwards (Chair), Henry Folkard, Charlotte Gilbert, Mike Johnson, James Kellie, Richard Peart, Richard Entwistle, Clare Griffin  
Mike Rhodes, Sue Smith, Gill Millward

Alan Kind and John Richardson, LARA for item 1 only.

**Apologies:**

John Thompson, Sue Weatherley

**1. Presentation by LARA on its Traffic Management Hierarchy**

John Richardson introduced LARA's published documents ([www.laragb.org](http://www.laragb.org)) which provide their good practice model for a least restrictive access approach on BOATs and UCRs. The following points were noted:

- driving on byways is a well-established activity
- there is no reliable figure for the amount of byways in England and Wales
- seasonal restrictions on motors are the most common type of order and are accepted by the member organisations of LARA
- changes in standards of repair are a result of weather events and a downturn in HA budgets
- a traffic light approach is proposed with most routes being a graduated amber
- red routes are where any vehicles or significant numbers would cause unsustainable impact
- the default condition should be to retain as robust amber and a balance is required between the character of the byway, the character of traffic and the means to keep in repair.

A discussion took place over the criteria for classifying routes in the context of the NPA's priority routes. Repair was only an issue for some of these routes. Alan Kind stated that LARA haven't defined their criteria beyond the examples given in the report. Members considered that it was therefore difficult at this time to understand how LARA's approach to classification could be applied.

The extent of repair was considered in terms of whether the expectation was for too good a condition. LARA considered that many routes were robust stone roads and most issues were down to drainage. Volunteers can make routes adequately useable although some routes will be marginal for heavy vehicles. Mike Rhodes reported that some routes in the NP were impassable for some users and beyond the scope of volunteers.

Members highlighted the special nature of the National Park: surrounded by conurbations; facilitate access for all; different access requirements; pressured place; some irreconcilable differences; importance of visitors for the local economy; important ecosystems which are rare world-wide. Behaviour affects perceptions: in the White Peak recreational vehicles are viewed as a nuisance; in the Dark Peak there is the opportunity to get away from man-made intrusions and vehicles are viewed as an antithesis of quiet enjoyment.

Members considered more dialogue is required with vehicle users. Vehicle users are now starting to consider issues rather than focusing on rights. Responsible users are the best ones to influence. If there is a perception that the NP are trying to ban then this is not a balanced way to move forward. LARA have 20 member organisations and could contact 100,000.

Alan Kind reported that LARA would look to incorporate criteria and behavioural issues within the hierarchy.

John Richardson and Alan Kind then left the meeting.

## **2. Chapel Gate**

The LAF's consultation response on Chapel Gate was agreed at the June Forum meeting. John Thompson will finalise for submission.

Derbyshire County Council have a closure in place on the lower part of the route until June 2014. Over the last couple of months, drainage works and resurfacing using road planings has been carried out on this section of the route. DCC propose a Phase 3 covering surfacing and fencing on the upper section with an estimated cost of £35k.

**ACTION: John to circulate and submit LAF response on Chapel Gate**

## **3. Legislation and Guidance**

The NPA's Chair is meeting with Defra on green lane issues within the NP. The briefing note was circulated.

Charlotte reported that GLEAM are feeding in on legislative changes.

John's draft paper on legislation and guidance issues, which takes forward discussions by the sub-group, was circulated for comment and suggestions as to how to proceed in terms of lobbying for further legislative change and consideration of perceptions and expectations relating to the NPA's Strategy.

Gill reported that their legal team needs to comment in detail on John's paper. She set out the legislative framework for PINS decisions, TRO powers, and DMMO reclassification and identified where there would be a requirement for primary legislation (paras 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19). Sustainability and suitability are not issues which can currently be considered for DMMO matters.

**ACTION: Gill to forward formal views to John.**

## **4. DCC Repairs and Legal Status Updates**

DCCs draft green lane action plan was circulated.

- Chapel Gate - Henry noted that there was an outstanding issue to determine where the route went and that this was required prior to re-surfacing. It was unclear whether the reason for the fencing is to stop vehicles going off the road. The budgeted and estimated amounts are different.
- BOAT 182 - outside the NP at Eccles Pike.

- Roych - no mention of works and DCC's temporary closure has ceased.
- Long Causeway - not clear whether the works on the top section are being progressed.

Members welcomed the plan and requested updates to future meetings.

**ACTION: DCC to forward the action plan to the sub-group when approved.**

Gill reported that details of applications and status determinations are the responsibility of the HA and shown at:

[http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/leisure/countryside/access/rights\\_of\\_way/register\\_of\\_application/default.asp](http://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/leisure/countryside/access/rights_of_way/register_of_application/default.asp)

Gill advised that she would provide a separate summary for the priority routes.

**ACTION: Gill to provide an update to the sub-group on the classifications for the priority routes.**

Sue Smith and Gill referred to the DCC's RoWIP update to the June LAF at which Aim 2 referred to the requirement to finalise the priority framework for dealing with legal orders and to a draft strategy on this published in November 2005 and considered by the LAF in December 2005 and June 2009. Members confirmed that the PDNP's priority routes should be identified as a priority 1 because of the statutory responsibility on DCC to have regard to the NP.

**ACTION: Members forward any further suggestions on the legal orders priorities strategy to Gill.**

## **5. Sensitive issues**

Sue Smith and Richard Entwistle reported that they had had a meeting to consider how to provide information on sensitive issues on routes. The Trailwise Management Team are considering how this can be done.

## **6. AOB**

All members should have their batch of route information for the remaining priority routes. This is provided for information rather than formal survey.

## **7. DoNM**

To be advised.