

Derby Lane – Summary of Regulation 7 Representations and Comment

These representations are a summary of the objections to and support for the proposal received. Most respondents made several comments as part of their representation. Individual items of correspondence may be viewed at the National Park offices.

**Objections**

<u>Representation</u>	<u>Comment</u>
<p><b>Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Peak District should be for everyone to enjoy no matter what</li> <li>• Would just like to be able to ride our bikes we have less and less to use and we spend money while we are in the peak district please leave as is and be fair to all who visit the area.</li> <li>• Am a responsible motorcyclist who enjoys the fantastic scenery and trails in the area.</li> <li>• Too many lanes are getting closed nowadays.</li> <li>• A vital BOAT that is part of a network that link together so riders can enjoy the peak district in another form apart from walking hard to get areas.</li> <li>• Do not get pleasure from walking, I'm a motorcycle rider, and over the last 7 years have enjoyed my hobby best I can.</li> <li>• Propelled vehicles should be allowed to ride here they cause little foot print and bring endless enjoyment to a widespread community. It is getting difficult to trial ride legally as it is without closing more.</li> <li>• Am a responsible person who enjoys green laning in Derbyshire. I work in the area but live in South Yorkshire, I travel to Derbyshire to go green laning once a month and on average spend £35-£40 each visit.</li> <li>• It's a place we can all enjoy.</li> <li>• There are millions of miles of footpaths and bridle ways for walkers, horse riders and cyclists to use but a very limited amount for motorcyclists.</li> <li>• We do no harm as motorcyclists visiting the area appreciating its beauty.</li> <li>• Because too many "green lanes" are being lost, we need to fight to keep what remains</li> <li>• Love the countryside like the rest of us but sometime I enjoy it in other ways be it walking camping cycling or motorcycle</li> <li>• Unnecessary closure of an interesting byway</li> </ul>	<p>Derby Lane is an important recreational asset for all users.</p> <p>The Authority is conscious of the limited number of routes available for recreational motor vehicles in the National Park. The historic nature of the route and its setting in the landscape as well as the variety of natural and cultural heritage features and the physical characteristics of this route means that it is valued by many different users yet there is evidence of conflict and damage occurring on this area of conservation and amenity interest.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that motorised vehicle users, in undertaking their chosen form of recreation, also appreciate the special qualities of the area, their continued use of this area by this mode of transport is adversely affecting those special qualities to a more significant extent than other users.</p> <p>In cases where there is a conflict between the NPA's two statutory purposes, greater weight shall be attached to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage.</p>

- Love riding offroad
- Love all types of outdoor pursuits in my leisure time, but the chance to explore off the beaten track on my motorcycle is becoming a dwindling prospect. There are many many routes which are available to be used solely by horse or on foot that I cannot use my vehicle on and I completely respect that. I only ask that respect is given back that I may have the freedom to enjoy the area in a way that I enjoy in an area I love and for the very few (and constancy decreasing) routes that I do have access to, to be able to preserve my hobby.
- Am a responsible rider and i enjoy to use the green roads of the UK , many weekends are spent traveling roads and this closure would incur on my freedom of movement
- As a caver who has used Water Icicle (which is near to the end of the lane) I would want to see access maintained for legitimate caving activities; including digging in particular which can occasionally need the transport of significant amounts of equipment. I would encourage the park authority to work with the Derbyshire Caving Association to see if there is a way of maintaining such access whilst also meeting the objective of reducing traffic on the lane.
- Access to this, and other similar routes is vital for the pastime known as 'greenlaning' . This is a legal pastime enjoyed by a minority or responsible, law abiding people. We actively enjoy, and contribute to local economies, through our use of rural tracks and lanes with motorised vehicles, travelling slowly, and responsibly to both minimise disruption to other law abiding users, and to minimise our impact to the environment. By removing access to this route, our already depleted access is further reduced.
- Can honestly see no actual benefits to exclude propelled motors using this 2km route. The peaks are there to be enjoyed by all and I can't do this on my motorcycle anymore if this goes in favour.
- It brings leisurely enjoyment to many with motorised vehicles and gives countryside access to the disabled
- Have used this route for more than 20 years on both motorcycles and in 4x4s. It is a significant unsurfaced road, which forms part of what is becoming a limited green road network that entices my family and I to holiday in the Peak District each year.
- Having a family member with a disability, driving a MPV is the only way as a family we can enjoy the countryside in the same way as other able bodied persons.
- The road has recently been proven to be a BOAT with vehicular rights, although it is currently illegally blocked preventing its use as a through route it can and is still used as

All recreational users are important to the local economy.

The route will still be available for non-motorised use and the proposed TRO will not prevent those with limited mobility using tramper style vehicles. Reasonable access can also be provided for disabled users.

Consideration of the use of part of this route by cavers will be balanced with the impacts on wider amenity and conservation concerns to assess whether these wider concerns can be adequately addressed to achieve the desired outcome.

The proposed TRO relates to mechanically propelled vehicles and not carriage drivers.

a there and back journey and is a great spot to enjoy a picnic.

- Am a horse rider and carriage driver. I use the gentle network of lanes near Hartington and Newhaven. I was looking forward to using Derby Lane and was very excited to hear that it was declared a BOAT but I am aghast that a permanent tro is being contemplated.
- It isn't possible for us to use a wheelchair or drive an invalid carriage on these lanes because DCC and the Authority allow them to deteriorate without maintenance, so users need to have a motor vehicle to use them safely.
- This saddens me greatly, as someone who grew up in the countryside down south, I have been excited about seeing the famous Peak District via my hobby of green laning. However, having moved to Derbyshire five years ago I have been somewhat disappointed to find most of these impressive by-ways that allowed me to enjoy the countryside have been removed by TROs.
- Myself and the far wider speleological community, both Derbyshire and also nationally and internationally, regularly use Derby Lane to access Water Icicle Close Cavern cave (referred to as WICC from here on) located at grid reference SK161645. This access has been used since at least 1950 and before by speleological groups and is the only access route to and from WICC, by removing vehicle access by motorised vehicles to the parking area used would have a seriously detrimental effect to the access of this cave system. WICC is regularly visited several times a week and throughout every year by many parties including Cave digging teams, scientific research groups, cave tourist groups, adventure businesses, individual guided outdoors customers, Scout/Guide groups and many other people from many other groups. Combined, these people bring valuable revenue into the Park and more specifically the Monyash area which could be lost if access to Derby Lane is removed.
- Proposal to prevent mechanically propelled vehicles from using Derby Lane will have a negative impact on a number of speleological-related user groups, who wish to visit Water Icicle Close Cavern. The primary concern being ease of access. Water Icicle Close Cavern (WICC) is located at SK161645 and is entered via a 30 metre (approx) mine shaft. It is a scientifically important cave-cum-mine system offering a valuable insight into past climatic events and ancient hydrology. It also provides a visual record of recent mining activity (from the 19th century). It gives visitors great opportunity to explore approximately 1km of natural passages, varying from walking-sized passages, crawling, climbing, and squeezes, as well as vertical pitches where ropes are used to

descend and ascend. The system offers an abundance of sights including varying types of passage formations (e.g. phreatic, bedding planes), speleothems (e.g. stalactites), anthodites and fossils (e.g. corals, crinoids). The network is estimated to be in the region of 2 to 4 millions years old; one of the oldest within the Peak District. The prospect for new sections of cave to be discovered remain high. As a result, this a well known and popular cave, ideal for suitably-trained and equipped cavers - beginners or experienced. WICC is visited by a number of caving-related user groups; these include: Experienced cavers participating in a "sport trip" - i.e. exploring the current known system for sport/fun. This provides great exercise, and is a rewarding activity. "Beginners" under instruction, learning caving techniques including SRT (Single Rope Technique) - WICC is ideal. People involved in "digging" - i.e. those wishing to clear blockages to discover new sections of cave. A physically demanding and rewarding activity. There are several on-going projects involving a number of individuals. People interested in cave photography - various sections and formations are regarded as being very photogenic. People interested in mining history. People interested in geology and speleogenesis. People involved in scientific research including past climatic events and dating. Rescue practice by Derbyshire Cave Rescue Organisation or other groups. These may include caving clubs, university caving clubs, outward-bound groups, private instruction, Scouts, etc. In good/dry conditions, visitors can park 100m away from the entrance at SK160646. Under poor/wet conditions, when the lane become difficult to negotiate, visitors can park approximately 500m away at SK156650. Both these sites are ideal for parking, as they can accommodate the usual number of vehicles, and do not obstruct farm traffic. I estimate that a visiting party may include 2 to 5 vehicles, and on occasion may include more than one visiting party. At SK157648 the lane widens and becomes underdefined. At SK160646 the lane appears to (visually) conclude, providing access to a field. The proposal to close Derby Lane would result in visitors parking in the vicinity of Summerhill Farm and/or on Derby Lane prior to this point. This will almost certainly cause difficulty for agricultural vehicles due to the limited width of the lane. The only other parking option would be in Monyash itself. The walk from Summer-hill farm will increase to approximately 1,340m, nearly three times the current distance. From Monyash, it will be 2km. Given the terrain and aspect, caving attire and associated equipment, the walk-in time will increase to approximately 30 minutes. I believe that cavers wishing to visit WICC for recreation will be largely dissuaded by the prospect of much longer walk (there and back again), and lack of suitable parking. With a longer walk-in, exploration time will be significantly reduced, and visitors will be likely

<p>to go elsewhere instead (in search of easier access). The proposal will be detrimental to current and future exploration projects within WICC. I am personally involved in one such project, and this additional walk-in will significantly reduce our active time on the "dig face" (and hamper progress). Furthermore, it will become difficult to transport heavy items such as scaffolding to the cave - usually we are able to park at the top of Derby Lane (within 100m) to unload which is ideal. Considering both these factors, I feel it highly likely that any evening "digging" (after working hours) in WICC would be abandoned - a great shame given the volume of man-hours, dedication, and individuals so far involved. WICC has also been the site of recent scientific study, and this would also make access more difficult for the scientific studies that are being carried out. Some recent work has been carried out by Professor John Gunn of Birmingham University.</p>	
<p><b>Impact on the Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The view that vehicles travelling this lane distract from the visual appeal of this part of the countryside is minimal compared with the permanent monstrosity that is the motorway barriers erected either side of a gateway. Also I have observed on the lane the digging of large holes into the ground into which has been driven large steel posts which have then been concreted in surely this is far worse for the environment than merely passing by in one's vehicle.</li> <li>• Bearing in mind that the farmer and the land owner use the route with their tractors and other vehicles, there can be no question of other motor vehicles affecting natural beauty any more than they do</li> <li>• Vehicles emit co2 but an enduro motorcycle will emit less greenhouse gases than a horse, as ruminants have to be constantly fed and constantly emit gases, their food has to be grown (horses just can't eat grass and are often stabled), processed transported etc. they produce huge amount of emissions. Whereas a motorcycle only burns fuel when in use which in most cases is only once or twice a month. Walkers also have to drive a car to go and walk, they drop litter leave gates open trespass and let their dogs foul which carry diseases, so it is fair to say that all human activity has an environmental impact. Management is needed to minimise impact whilst allowing responsible use of our countryside by all.</li> <li>• The footpath is at some distance away, and then combines with the Limestone way. The distance should be enough to reduce the (by the report info) light vehicle traffic noise.</li> <li>• If it wasn't for vehicular access and usage of these routes, they would be severely</li> </ul>	<p>National Parks were designated on grounds of their scenic value and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>The route is not only a means to access special qualities but also a valued part of those special qualities. The historic nature of the route and its setting in the landscape as well as the variety of natural and cultural heritage features adds to the experience of using the route. The route also gives the opportunity for quiet enjoyment and to experience tranquillity, one of the special qualities that people value most about the Peak District National Park. Noise from motorbikes in particular can carry over large distances.</p> <p>Evidence is available to show that environmental damage is occurring as a result of motor vehicle recreation, both directly and indirectly. The impacts on the natural beauty of the National Park, and on its special qualities, are not just confined to the linear routes, but also affect the wider environment. This impact and the anticipation of the presence of</p>

<p>overgrown and inaccessible to everyone, especially horse riders and ramblers.</p>	<p>motorised users can detract from the experience and enjoyment by other users. The reference in section 5 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 to the purpose of understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of National Parks suggests a focus on quiet outdoor countryside recreation associated with the wide open spaces, wildness and tranquility to be found within the National Park. (Defra 2007)</p> <p>Natural beauty should not be confused with wilderness. The definition of natural beauty recognises that England has a landscape that is formed through the interaction of man-made and natural processes. It includes the wildlife and cultural heritage of an area as well as its natural features.</p> <p>Tranquillity is more than simply noise; it includes the landscape setting, natural sounds and visual intrusion.</p>
<p><b>Damage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main factor of damage is erosion, erosion by water i.e rainfall and insufficient drainage i.e washouts being installed to prevent the lanes becoming streams.</li> <li>• Find a lot of walkers cause more damage than vehicles by leaving empty packets and walking off route to avoid a puddle.</li> <li>• As more and more lanes are closed in Derbyshire peak district to vehicles the amount of money will be less thus the lanes will fall into further disrepair, and you only need one successful case brought against the council for failing to provide adequate lanes and roads this will open the floodgates to countless claims against the peak district national park and councils.</li> <li>• Damage to these routes are mainly caused by 4 wheel drives and farmers using farmers machinery.</li> <li>• Most of damage we get blamed for is weather erosion you only have to look at some</li> </ul>	<p>The order is not being made on the grounds of preventing damage to the route but instead relating to amenity and conservation of the route and area. The NPA is not the Highway Authority with its attendant responsibilities for maintenance.</p> <p>The state of disrepair of the route is a factor for the NPA to take into account when considering the impact on natural beauty and amenity. The natural beauty and amenity of the area and of other users is affected by motorised vehicle use on this route. Vehicle use contributes to the route deterioration and the state of disrepair can detract from the amenity of the route and</p>

Tarmac roads have been damaged due to recent bad weather

- The environmental card is often used and as an environmental scientist I disagree with their arguments. Most path erosion is caused by water, the paths turn into streams and without drainage and proper management quickly erode the surface.
- The unrestricted byways are legal roads, greenlaners pay road tax to go towards maintaining roads. Also the TRF does voluntary work to maintain their rights of way which they are passionate about.
- As a motorcyclist that uses the lane and others in the area I can understand wanting to ban large motor vehicles like 4x4 from using the lanes as some of the surface cannot take repeated wear from such heavy vehicles, especially when the surfaces are wet. This then spoils the lanes for everyone else who wish to enjoy them. Motorcycles on the other hand cause very low impact to the lanes. I have seen worse from horses and high traffic pedestrian routes.
- The bulk of the trail is enclosed by drystone walls, and remainder is roughly level (from the map) so drainage observations appear flawed. If vehicles are leaving the main trail have suitable markers been placed?
- I appreciate that vehicle movement can damage the underlying substrate, but the overall damage is usually on a par with that of the well used footpaths which are not then closed for months for repair.
- Based upon the fact that this route has remained illegally blocked by large boulders for a period of time, there can be no evidence that any damage has been caused by vehicles using the route.
- This field section is well drained and the topsoil is not much more than 6 inches in depth so rutting should not be an issue.
- Regarding ruts it should be recognised that when this road was part of the main road to Derby it would of been travelled by horse and cart and motorised vehicles with solid and much narrower wheels than current vehicles have.
- Comments regarding the damage to Derby Lane I first visited Water Icicle Close Cavern approximately 10 years ago, and have been a very regular visitor over the last 5 years, and have witnessed some of the damage that has happened on Derby Lane. Firstly, I would argue that almost all the damage is the result of 4X4 vehicles and off-road/motocross bikes, particularly when the ground is soft. On several occasions, I have seen these types of vehicle, often 5 or 6 at a time, using the lane during very poor conditions, resulting in rutting, and significant redistribution of material. During this time,

area.

In the event of damage to a highway and which may or may not be caused by a lack of maintenance, TROs will be made if it is necessary to protect the natural beauty or amenities of the area

Evidence is available to show that environmental damage is occurring as a result of motor vehicle recreation, both directly and indirectly. 4-wheeled use has been physically restricted from a section of this route since 2009.

<p>the upper section of Derby Lane (where it widens), has migrated to the right! Secondly, I would argue that cavers vehicles have a very low impact upon the lane. Visitors to WICC are more likely to use “regular” vehicles, such as family car, that are not designed for deeply rutted and/or muddy/wet sections - so these areas are always avoided (hence parking at SK156650). Conversely, they provide an interesting obstacle for motocross bikes and 4x4, and are often sought after. Cavers vehicles are much quieter, and will result in little noise pollution. Since the placement of large boulders at SK160646, I have not seen any more 4x4 vehicles use the lane. The damage from this point onwards towards Long Rake is also quite clear - and has never been used by visitors of WICC, again indicating that 4x4 and motocross bikes have caused the damage. The damage seen on Derby Lane has also occurred on similar lanes across the peak district, and it is widely accepted that the destruction is the result of 4x4 vehicles and off-road bikes. The damage also coincides with the rise in popularity of these types of vehicle for recreational use. It now appears that cavers may lose a long-standing access to Derby Lane due to the activities of other recreational groups. Furthermore, this damage will now make it difficult for members of Derbyshire Cave Rescue to attend WICC in “regular” vehicles, which many will use due to the voluntary nature of the service. Comments on PDNPA Appendix One - Vehicles Use The figures for 2015 “4 wheeled” access records “Nil”. Does this refer purely to 4x4 vehicles? If not, and it includes “regular” vehicles, then this number is not correct, and I question how was the data was logged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the issues in the past has risen from the fact that a section of the lane is not enclosed and Not waymarked leaving travelers to guess at the direction of the lane as it crosses fields.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Discrimination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for the closure are both spurious and concocted and are part of a hidden agenda by Derbyshire county council and the peak national park to ban recreational 4x4 vehicles and trail bikes from the area by closing all the unsurfaced rights of way (boats or ucrs) one by one. The route has already been illegally closed to 4 wheeled vehicles by the placing of large blocks at the entrance.</li> <li>• The use of recreational vehicles and trail bikes on these vehicular rights of way is a valid and enjoyable hobby for many. It is being unfairly restricted by this and similar closures. There are already many alternative routes in the area for walkers, horse rides and cyclists. These dual use routes are few and far between and should be protected not closed.</li> </ul>	<p>The National Park is for everyone and use of recreational motor vehicles on routes with proven rights is a legitimate activity. The Authority does not have a policy of banning use of these green lanes as a matter of principle, and there are opportunities for recreational motor vehicle users to enjoy the area on other routes by their chosen mode of transport.</p> <p>The Authority will promote opportunities for everyone to understand and enjoy the National Parks’ special</p>



- The greatest impact is on those who cannot walk, cycle or ride a horse, due to disability and need to rely of motorised transport to access the countryside. They have the same rights as the rest of us to enjoy travelling though the countryside. A right you are not considering with this closure.
- It is part of a campaign in this area to ban recreational 4x4 vehicles and trail bikes from the area. Most of the unsurfaced rights of way are being closed one by one. The route has already been illegally closed to 4 wheeled vehicles by the placing of large blocks at the entrance. The authorities are quick to react to other law breakers, but support those making life difficult for recreational vehicle users
- Notices have been served to clear and maintain the lane but they are ignored by the organisations that are charged with the care of this access route. It's quite simply discrimination against a section of users and you seem quite happy to go along with it
- The PDNPA is singing the tune of the wealthy land owners by removing the historic rights of vehicular passage.
- My understanding is that this lane has also blocked my boulders which should have been removed. This is discrimination against one group of user. It would seem that you just what to close all this lanes to vehicle use.
- My son is disabled and unable to walk. His only access to the countryside is through vehicular transportation. By imposing TROs and lane closures you are denying him this access. This is a selfish and mean spirited course of action being imposed by nasty, cruel people. It is discriminating against those unable to walk which I thought was against the law and may even be against Human Rights legislation.
- The peak park is for everyone and not just ramblers, you are excluding motor vehicles and offer propelled forms of transport from this lane to pedestrianise it for a few ramblers.
- We have the rights to use these lanes just like horses and walkers.
- After the main objector to keeping lanes open was found to be working and leading the decisions made on closures, you are therefore corrupt and not serving the communities fairly.
- Another unlawful closure of a road used for many years
- As a responsible user of a green lane style motorcycle I do not see why I should not have access to the peak district on set routes to enjoy the countryside in a way that I have been doing for several years. the proposal is another example of my rights being erroded and my liberties being taken away.

qualities in a responsible way but where there is a conflict with the conservation of these special qualities then action will be taken including the use of TROs where appropriate.

It is the Authority's view that recreational motor vehicle use needs to be managed on some 'green lanes', and that this may include restrictions on use using the powers granted to NPAs. This is assessed on a case by case basis. Where there is a need to preserve the amenity and conserve the natural beauty of the route this may outweigh the needs of mechanically propelled vehicular users of the route notwithstanding that such a restriction will affect the expeditious and convenient use of the route by mechanically propelled vehicles.

The route will still be available for non-motorised use and the proposed TRO will not prevent those with limited mobility using tramper style vehicles. Reasonable access can also be provided for disabled users.

There are also users with other kinds of disability such as hearing or visual impairment, or learning difficulties that might be affected by motorised users on the route. The damage and associated loss of amenity also affects users of this route.

The Authority operates a democratic process via the consultation and the consideration at committee. Decisions are made in an open and transparent way and Members consider all relevant arguments and evidence put before them before making a final decision.

- These roads and these are roads should be open for all, not just the few, why would you want to discriminate against a group? If we were an ethnic group you would not dare to discriminate so why us?
- The proportion of footpaths and bridleways compared to byways open to motorized traffic is unreasonably unfair. There is no reason why people who have other hobbies than hiking or riding a horse have to be restricted even more. If anything, more lanes should be open to propelled vehicles, and not closed as per this proposal.
- You have closed Chapel Gate, Stanage, The Roych. You simply do not want us in the Peaks. If you were to close public footpaths there would be outrage and it would not happen.
- We are getting a very rough deal getting blamed for lots of damage etc
- Since when did the rights of one group override the rights of another?
- I use a electric wheelchair this is restricting my access
- Rights of way should be rights of way for all. It is not right that people campaign to keep rights of way open for their own activites (walking horse riding etc) and yet close it for others who also pay taxes and have a right to leisure time without confrontation or being harrassed.
- We live on a small over populated island so unfortunately conflict of interest does occur, this needs to be addressed through management not through harassing greelaners or taking away their legal rights of way.
- It is important not to confuse legal responsible greenlaners with people who are not responsible and ride illegally on non road worthy bikes.
- It is wrong for people to constantly harass greenlaners and to close legal ancient rights of way. Just as it is wrong for me to harass people walking on footpaths on my property.
- By keep closing all the byways your taking away people social life, the country side is for everyone to enjoy, by doing this I feel that you are discriminating motorcyclist, who are complying with the law, the few who don't care and ride illegal are affecting people like myself and other member of the TRF who do everything right.
- You need to make more places of us to ride, so we can also enjoy the country side as well, not reduce place for us to ride.
- It is also extremely wrong to exclude this group of people from the area. The park is for everyone. There is no proof that motorcycles are more harmful than walkers or horse riders. As you have already closed a substantial amount of lanes for no other reason than on say so of the ramblers association. This has caused more traffic on the

The register of members interests are recorded at [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/register-of-members-interests](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/register-of-members-interests). Members may have personal interests which may not be prejudicial to the decisions taken.

remaining lanes which may cause more wear. Which is probably what you want because then you can justify the closure of even more lanes.

- I ride regularly in the Peak District and do not think it is fair that we only have use of 1-2% of trails in the peaks as it is.
- The UCR should retain vehicular rights even the County Council wanted to make it a BOAT. The Highway Authority have been negligent in not removing the obstructions placed illegally on the route. One wonders if the response would have been different had the landowner been other than Chatsworth Estate.
- This is an historic highway that has been blocked in an attempt to restrict certain minorities from using it, there is no reason the Authority can't live up to their obligations and keep this lane open for future generations to enjoy. Buckling to the whim of a few people will exclude the rest of the UK from using this route, this seems massively unfair and is the lazy way to maintain the road network. I trust that the aim of the Peak District is to enhance the area and attract more people into the area and hope issues like this are viewed in the right way to support the area
- The few Byways we have left should be shared by all users, motorised users have access to less than 2% of the national ROW network, more closures will mean increased pressure on the few remaining byways, isn't it about time the crusade to ban minority groups was ended and a fair management scheme implemented as it has been in the Lake District National Park?
- Permanently close the byway would be the easiest option, due to the issues trying to police it and the actions of the local farmer. This does not make it right, if this lane gets closed then all it will mean is other farmers will take matters into their own hands and block other lanes and before you know it there will be an altercation.
- The historic use of this ancient road was as a public carriageway, which was for vehicular traffic of the day, it was certainly not built for recreational walking or riding. The evidence for this has been published by Derbyshire CC in their case for Byway status. For local residents and the Authority to suggest that such use of vehicles is not suitable for the character of the route is to twist history too far towards political correctness. The objects of the National Park include an obligation to provide access for all users. The definition of a Public Byway or BOAT is that it is a vehicular route used mainly by pedestrians, and this is entirely in character for the area and the lane itself.
- I am a blue badge holder and so is my husband. We are unable to walk for any distance and feel that the Authority is systematically depriving us of green lanes which we can

<p>visit with our son in his Land Rover.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel that the Authority makes much of "improving the amenities" for members of the public, whilst reducing the amenities to me and thousands of other users who enjoy driving on our historic byways in the countryside.</li> <li>• The Authority is trying to pre-emptively close a route which the land owner and local residents have illegally blocked and want to keep for themselves, and there is no valid reason in terms of amenity or character</li> <li>• This prevention technique prevents law abiding countryside enthusiasts' access to these areas which have been used in this way for decades. The systematic constriction of people enjoying this hobby means that the few green lanes left see more use and wear, this further compounds the problem. The not-in-my-back-yard protesters who don't care about the countryside as a whole but don't want it near their home because they see the countryside as a chocolate box picture of serenity, don't understand that people live their whole lives here, work here and deserve to practice their pastimes here, not just retire here.</li> <li>• I understand some people are not sensible when using these lanes, but please do not tar us all with the same brush and take away our chance to enjoy the area in a way that I love.</li> <li>• The countryside is for all users, not just for a few exclusive groups like ramblers. Kinder Scout proved pivotal for the Ramblers association to allow them right to roam. Why should other users now object to people who just happen to like a different kind of activity?</li> <li>• Restricting this road to foot traffic only would ignore those other members of the community who wish to enjoy this road. This is against the ethos of the PDNP who are charged with providing access for all.</li> <li>• Derby Lane is a public road and should be given a level of care that would allow all types of usage by all members of the public, not just a narrow sector.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Displacement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal users are getting disgruntled with the corrupt process that invariably leads to a TRO, you might find the legal users either take their money elsewhere out of the local economy or just ride/drive where ever they want.</li> <li>• Closing lanes without organising alternative places. I.e. off road centres or motocross tracks is only going to lead to illegal use which will be blamed on people who use the</li> </ul>	<p>The Authority recognises that the closure to vehicles is likely to place additional pressure on other routes. However the matter required a specific response within the context of the work on other routes. Monitoring to determine the amount of displacement</p>

<p>lanes legally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All you are doing is putting more traffic through fewer and fewer lanes, creating the issues you point out. Green lanes should be open and managed NOT closed.</li> <li>• Closing these routes only leads to increasing illegal use of unauthorized places.</li> <li>• Closing the rights of access via motorcycles may encourage others to go against the councils law and use their own routes so by leaving this particular route open at least it is a better form of control.</li> </ul>	<p>onto other routes will be undertaken.</p> <p>It is accepted that a TRO will affect legitimate recreational motor vehicle users. Monitoring will be undertaken and any illegal use would be addressed with the Highway Authority with regards to the appropriate selection of barriers and the police in relation to enforcement.</p>
<p><b>User conflict</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I ensure that all gates are always closed and stop the engine when approaching horses and dog walkers.</li> <li>• Have spoken to countless walkers and the like on my travels up the green lanes and I have asked them if they object to vehicles the majority are ok with people green laning, they object more when the paths are being used, so you need to reduce the lanes closing and protect the lanes this is heritage that is disappearing.</li> <li>• We ride with respect don't drop rubbish and spend money in Derbyshire</li> <li>• This is a route I use from time to time and I am not aware of any problem</li> <li>• Have upmost respect to fellow people who also use these lanes.</li> <li>• Mechanical traffic does not prevent or restrict any other user</li> <li>• If walkers want to keep away from the unrestricted byways they can use the remaining 98% that are closed to vehicles.</li> <li>• I am a member of the TRF that promotes responsible and legal use of Byways. Better signs are needed to help us to ride legally and closed byways needs to be reopened up so that the remaining lanes are not so heavily used.</li> <li>• Derby Lane has recently been added to the Definitive Map as a Byway Open To All Traffic which proves that there was sufficient evidence to support use by mechanically propelled vehicles. Having used the route over the last 10 years by motorcycle without conflict with other users or causing damage to the lane, I see no justification to prevent future use by vehicles.</li> <li>• There are many other rights of way around Monyash which are footpaths or Bridleways and which pedestrians can use without risk of meeting vehicles, so there is no lack of facilities for walking, riding or keeping fit even if users don't want to walk on a road.</li> <li>• Strangely, the reasons quoted by the Authority for this TRO are very different to those</li> </ul>	<p>Derby Lane is an important recreational asset for all users. All users need to act responsibly in order to reduce the potential for conflict</p> <p>Mechanically propelled vehicles are visually and aurally intrusive and there are difficulties in passing and avoiding other users. Government guidance suggests that 'a level of recreational vehicular use that may be acceptable in other areas will be inappropriate in National Parks and incompatible with their purposes.' (Ref: Guidance for National Park Authorities making Traffic Regulation Orders under section 22BB Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Defra, 2007).</p> <p>The Authority does not accept that it is reasonable to expect non-motorised users to go elsewhere to avoid conflict. There are also alternatives for motorised vehicle users where they do not come into conflict with others to the same extent and, for those seeking to use the affected route as a through-road, there are alternative routes on sealed metalled roads in the area.</p>

<p>quoted by the few people I have spoken to who agree with it. The local residents quote safety of their children as a reason for the TRO, and say they don't like "speeding motor bikes" that apparently use the route. The Authority however is using unrelated "criteria" purely to find subjective reasons why they might close the route. I am sure that the local residents would not allow their children to play on any of the other roads in the area, so why allow them to play on a BOAT? There are other tracks and footpaths which they can use in safety.</p>	
<p><b>Economic Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once again recreational activities are taken away from people who keep local business financially stable, and keeping small business's employing local people. It is a well known fact by local restaurant owners that walkers/ramblers don't contribute anything to the local economy and trail riders are keeping local food outlets in rural areas ie Monyash open. Does the Pdna want a guilty conscience when all these rural businesses have closed, leaving even more local people unemployed. The way things are going this will certainly happen.</li> <li>• Think of all the loss of revenue from visitors.</li> <li>• You are stopping a valuable income stream to the locals by continually closing lanes. Local shops cafes etc will lose in the long term. Ramblers bring their own snacks and contribute little to the local economy. This is short sighted in my view.</li> <li>• It would only cause a reduction to leisure and tourism to the area.</li> <li>• Reducing the boats is leaving the off road users less and less each year and the way it's going there won't be much left meaning we will no longer be spending the tens of thousands each month at local businesses in your area.</li> <li>• This also has an effect on the local community, as when I travel around the country green laning, I stay in bed and breakfast, by not being able to come to the peak district to ride I won't be spending any of my money in your local community</li> <li>• the continual closing of lanes is having a detrimental effect on the area's economy due to the loss of revenue from the excluded parties.</li> <li>• These roads have been in regular use for decades and responsible use will keep them accessible for years to come, closure will result fewer people visiting rural areas that are in financial decline.</li> <li>• This year the UK is hosting Euro-Speleo, a world-wide published caving convention which attracts people from all over the world, the cost to the local economy should</li> </ul>	<p>All recreational users are important to the local economy. Closing routes to motor vehicles can have beneficial as well as negative effects on the local economy.</p>

<p>access restrictions like this become implemented are much larger than you might be aware of; hundreds of people using hotels, cafe's, shopping, purchasing goods etc. all in the local area during an event like this presents a substantial amount of revenue to the which would be seriously affected by moves like this. Myself and the digging team I am part of visit the Bulls Head pub every week after our underground activities, this is one of several active digging groups that regularly visit WICC and should access be removed this would cease as we would be forced to seek to explore caves in other areas. There are regular daytime and evening guided trips into WICC and the universally agreed meeting point is the The Old Smithy Cafe Bistro Tearoom next to the Bulls Head pub, again this revenue would be lost if access was removed as people would choose to visit caves elsewhere. The local caving clubs could suffer income loss as visitors would be less likely to stay at the club huts/facilities is access to caves (in terms of getting a vehicle to within an acceptable distance to the cave) in the area is removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe this would result in a loss of revenue for the local economy: Many visitors will rendezvous at The Old Smithy Cafe in Monyash, before or after their trip. Many visitors will visit The Bulls Head after their visit. Many visitors stay in nearby accommodation, including nearby caving-club accommodation (which relies on visitors for funding).</li> <li>• I spend around £1000 year in peaks an I ride with 20 other riders. So that will be a loss of £20.000 for all ready struggling business.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Alternatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to consider access for motorcycles being powered by electric motors. The Authority has not taken into account the use of electric motorcycles, or electric mopeds or the benefits they bring to national park purposes. Request that an exemption is made from the order for motorcycles being powered by means of an electric motor.</li> <li>• If you want to close roads why not look to close some of the small tarmac surfaced lanes in the area. The minor road past Haddon grove farm or the Rake could be closed with little effect on local traffic flow but would allow similar access to the area for non motorised traffic and allow the removal of hundreds of tonnes of poisons tar from the area plus reduce speeding traffic at up to 60 mph.</li> <li>• Know your budget is stretched thin, you've been offered volunteer groups many times, the rambler and equestrian societies rarely if ever do this. But the offers of help are ignored.</li> </ul>	<p>The management of recreational motorised vehicles within the National Park is a high priority work area for the Authority. Members of vehicle user groups are on the Peak District Local Access Forum and inform and advise the NPA.</p> <p>Members are aware that a variety of measures can be used to resolve issues around recreational vehicular use. The consultations undertaken offer the opportunity to suggest alternatives and for them to be considered by Members. All consultation responses have been given due regard. The decision to pursue a different course of action after having regard to all</p>

- Listen to the whole user base, clear the illegal blockages along the route and also help your local tourism industry all year round.
- The documents outline possible mitigation to the issues, which none have been tried and instead the PDNPA is jumping straight to issue a TRO as per usual.
- Police presence to cut out illegal use would be better.
- I have spoken to numerous walkers and very rarely do they spend more than £5-£10 in the area. so I feel that you are being negative and controlling our heritage when you could promote it more and even hold competitions. the money could be used to ensure the lanes are kept open.
- If you ask for help to manage the situation from people that use the lane, you will get it. Nobody wants to see the lane closed, it just needs managing responsibly. No logical Land Rover or dirtbike owner would ever object to that and most would offer help and support.
- It is unnecessary for the closure to be permanent
- If you do not like the vehicle tracks then you close the road temporarily during the wettest periods of the year to allow the ground to recover and then open it again. This should be for no longer than three months.
- The council only considers a restrictive TRO or a voluntary restraint as the only options besides closure. The Lake District National Park implements a successful permit scheme for very sensitive byways, this alternative should be investigated prior to closing this byway for all time at the expense of a minority group.
- Maintenance volunteers and funding is provided by motorised user groups to maintain the byways in LDNP and many other areas with similar inclusive management plans. If the PDNP were not so short sighted the same funding and volunteer network could be a positive aid in an inclusive management plan. The council should be forced to consider all options, clearly they have not considered successful permit schemes used in other National Parks.
- There is no reason why with a small amount of money (which could be donations from user groups/bodies) that this and others in the area could not remain for the enjoyment of all.
- Alternative methods of vehicular management have not been tried on this route and I would expect any democratic process to at least try alternatives before banning a user group from enjoying this part of the countryside.
- A potential compromise could be temporary winter closures.

relevant considerations doesn't negate this.

Where a least restrictive option achieves the desired outcome then this may be considered to be the recommended approach.

Priority routes remain priority routes even where a restriction may be in place. The monitoring, management and review of measures adopted will continue to take place.

4-wheeled vehicles have an impact on the route surface and adjacent land by virtue of their width and weight. At certain times on certain sections of the route there may be less impact by motorcycles used in a responsible manner.

The NPA is not the Highway Authority and does not have responsibility for maintenance. The NPA adopts a range of measures in reducing the impact of motorised use. This includes the use of volunteers where the works are of a nature suitable for volunteering.

The Authority is not aware of any evidence of any users using electric motorcycles within the Peak District National Park on unmetalled roads.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If use of the green lane is going against good practice set out by groups such as GLASS and GLA then communication needs to be made to the tiny minority to use the lanes in an appropriate, considerate way. Not force them further into a world where they are targeted, seen to be insubordinate and essentially criminalised</li> <li>• I fail to understand the logic behind this proposal as Derby Lane currently ends at SK161645 due to very large crash barriers that are in place to prevent 4X4 vehicles etc. progressing, these barriers have been in place to some years now and are absolutely effective.</li> <li>• Alternative Proposal Leave the lane open from Summerhill farm to SK160646, where the lane appears to naturally conclude. "Close" the lane at SK160646 by removing the existing gate, and constructing a stone built wall, with a stile for pedestrian access. This again will re-enforce that the lane ends at this point, and deter motocross bikes from using the lane. Resurface the sections of lane in poor condition, and make it more clearly defined at the upper reaches. This will help make it less attractive to 4x4/motocross vehicles looking for recreational use. This will also improve access for cave rescue, as well as recreational visits, and scientific undertakings. With a more clearly defined track in the upper section, the grassed area could be sporadically planted with trees to prevent vehicles from driving over it but leave parking available for people visiting WICC. Retain access for people wishing to visit WICC.</li> <li>• This road has been woefully neglected, with no signs indicating its course, its surface unprotected and a blockage left unquestioned. A better solution would be not closure to motor traffic, but providing a suitable surface so that all users can benefit from a safe and secure route. This approach has been successfully applied in other parts of the country with the advantage of increased tourism.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report does not highlight the effect of recreational vehicles over farm traffic.</li> <li>• Does light vehicle traffic (moving through an area) make more noise than a group outing who may also be wandering off the path? Please can the authority provide proof to the documented observations, rather than (in some cases) supposition.</li> <li>• The reasons given by the Authority to close this lane are subjective and not based on any objective evidence.</li> </ul>	<p>The statement of reasons and the route management reports set out the different components of natural beauty and impacts and are there to provide relevant factual information; they do not seek to make a judgment on the final decision to be made.</p> <p>The legislation allows for TROs to be made on grounds of natural beauty and amenity and the NPA is the appropriate authority to make the decision on</p>

	<p>whether this outcome would be met by a restriction.</p> <p>TROs will be considered where appropriate having regard to all relevant considerations at the time including comments provided in response to the consultation undertaken and by undertaking the balancing exercise provided by s122 of the RTRA 1984. If a TRO is made on a route it does not change the status of the route.</p> <p>Members of vehicle user groups are on the Peak District Local Access Forum and together with the Green Lanes Forum contributed to the code of conduct at <a href="http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/greenlanecode">www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/greenlanecode</a>.</p>
--	--

**Support**

<u>Representation</u>	<u>Comment</u>
<p><b>Importance of the Route and Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the park regularly, as keen walkers and horseriders. Can see and feel the devastation that transport such as this causes. ruining recreational and a beautiful area for the many in order satisfy a need of the few is to the detriment of many and of course a worsening environment.</li> <li>• This is a beautiful route offering the chance for walkers to enjoy the peace and serenity of a beautiful area in a national park. Sharing the track with motorised vehicles spoils this quiet enjoyment as well as posing safety risks for other users, who have to share a track in close proximity with motorised users.</li> <li>• This is a wonderful proposal aimed at enhancing safe access to some beautiful countryside for walkers and riders.</li> <li>• Horse riders have increasingly less options for riding off road and protecting green lanes from motorised vehicles is a good step in the right direction to preserving what little routes we have.</li> <li>• It is imperative that we keep these little green havens as they are for the use of those that love them and the plants and animals that live in them.</li> <li>• Derbyshire is a stunning county for everyone to enjoy. It would be such a shame is we allow motor vehicles to ruin it, as there do seem to be more about nowadays. People come to the countryside at weekends to get away from the hustle and bustle of towns, and to meet up with a noisy vehicle on a country lane when walking out to hear the birds etc, would spoil the very thing you have come out to enjoy.</li> <li>• The majority of lanes in this area are surfaced and carry heavy traffic and there is no need for vehicles to be allowed on this quiet route.</li> <li>• We no longer enjoy walks up the lane and my children now stay in our fields which run alongside it. They have a right to wander the country lanes around where they live but they cannot.</li> <li>• Derby Lane is used by our family, and several other families in the area. Our field, which is accessed from Derby Lane, is a regular spot for the local school to use as field trip days and sporting activities. The school children have the right to walk up this lane without fear</li> </ul>	<p>National Park designation offers opportunities for understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the area for all users. National Park designation does not preclude use of such routes by recreational motor vehicles as a matter of principle. The natural beauty of this area and its amenity value is recognised.</p> <p>There is no duty on NPA's to promote quiet enjoyment. The NPA will however promote activities in keeping with the special qualities of the Peak District. The NPA will also have regard to whether there is a conflict between recreational use and the conservation of the area in order to meet its statutory purposes.</p>

of being struck by a motorbike.

- This quiet unspoilt area below Arbor Low a special place for reflection needs to be protected from the noise and surface damage which would be caused by motorcycles and vehicles.
- Safeguarding a historic route which is a wonderful way to appreciate some of the peace and quiet which is more and more missing from our modern lives.
- Having stayed in Monyash I applaud the National Park's proposed prohibition on motor vehicles using Derby lane. This inappropriate and often unsustainable use of our green lanes by scramble bikes and 4x4s has over recent years become a major problem discouraging the lawful use by other people as the noise and disturbance can be most unpleasant for those wishing to enjoy the peace and quiet of the countryside, especially in a national park.
- Beautiful old ways like this need to be respected and not trashed.
- This is so obviously the right thing to do for this area. It will preserve the peace and tranquility that the vast majority of visitors to the peak park desire when they come here. It will also protect the natural beauty of the area. The sight, sounds and damage vehicles cause off road is so incongruous with beauty of the Peak Park that there can be no doubt that the proposal should be carried out and the action replicated wherever such vandalism is being wreaked.
- I have walked this ORPA route several times over the last ten years, using it as way to Arbor Low. It is a delightful track and continued use by vehicles other than for access damages the surface of the lane. In addition, off-road vehicles are a threat to life and limb, and the peace and quiet is disturbed.
- A couple of years ago, at the point where the ORPA comes to an end on my 2004 OS Explorer OL24 GR 160 646, there is a gate and if I remember, large welcome boulders, stopping further vehicle access. To the side ie NE there is a gap to a field. At the time I noted that the wooden five bar gate had been badly damaged, indeed shattered and was lying on its side. I hazarded a guess that this was deliberate and may possibly have been done by off-road vehicles searching for a way to circumnavigate the blocked gate and boulders.
- The northern part of this route, from Summerhill Farm to SK 1601 6460, should be a quiet green lane used only by walkers, horse riders, cyclists, carriage drivers and for access by farmers to their fields and by cavers. The Green Lanes Association and the Association of Peak Trail Riders claim in their responses to your regulation 4 consultation that Derby

<p>Lane has a long history of motor vehicle use and that recreational motor vehicle users should therefore be allowed to continue to drive it. However local people recall Derby Lane as a quiet cul-de-sac, along which animals could be driven to and from pasture without disturbance, and where village children could learn to ride their bicycles without danger. These recollections are supported by a photo of c1960 which shows a “No through road” sign at the Monyash end of Derby Lane. This sign indicates that Derby Lane was not a through route for motor vehicles in the 1960s. Nor is it shown as a through other route with public access on Ordnance Survey mapping, so only those drivers who knew it was on DCC’s list of streets would have used it until 2007, when it was designated as a priority route by DCC and PDNPA. Think that it was designated as a priority route because of the damage which recreational motor vehicles were starting to cause to the northern part and to the fields over which the southern part runs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have walked all the way along Derby Lane between 2-5 times per year for the last 6 years and can say from personal experience that this route will benefit from having a TRO. It is a route of historical significance and that very special character can be sensed as you walk along it, it is a really unique lane amongst green lanes in Derbyshire and it should be protected.</li> <li>• Retain the natural beautiful, the tranquil environment of the lane for the walkers and horse riding activities within the Peak District Park</li> <li>• This is a lovely lane which at present is being ruined by motor vehicles.</li> <li>• I am a resident of Sheffield and greatly value the Peak district as a walker and a lover of the natural world. I am sometimes dismayed to find my walk in the country ruined by motor vehicles of different sorts - one vehicle's noise can shatter the peace and quiet for many other people.</li> <li>• Preserve the route for people to walk and livestock to graze, and all things to be just as nature and traditional agriculture intended</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Route Condition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The unsealed track was never designed to take heavy motorised vehicles and suffers damage as a result and I am pleased that PDNPA is proposing action to protect it.</li> <li>• The lane will be less rutted making access to these groups safer.</li> <li>• There is evidence that the increase in weekend traffic is having an adverse effect not only on the road surface but the tracks further up the lane. We can no longer walk towards the end of the lane because trenches have been carved up by the motorbike wheels and that</li> </ul>	<p>The legislation dealing with the clarification of status and vehicle use does not have regard to suitability for such use. Where use is considered inappropriate or excessive, powers to make TROs are available to Highway Authorities and also to NPAs for unsurfaced routes.</p>

means the fields are increasingly water-logged.

- Green lanes such as Derby Lane are vulnerable to damage by vehicular use.
- It is subject to a BOAT claim and has started to be used by motor vehicles. Use at by motor vehicles on most of the route is at present currently light, partly because 4x4s do not have access to the whole route and partly because the route is not yet widely known in the offroading community. Assuming Derby Lane becomes a BOAT, use by motor vehicles will increase rapidly and the surface will be quickly get badly damaged. It will end up in the same terrible state as the routes at Minninglow and Wetton - two other routes which have soft grassy surfaces and which the Peak Park should be taking urgent action to protect from further damage by 4x4s and motor bikes. Am very pleased to see that one of the grounds which PDNA intends to use for a TRO on Derby Lane is to 'prevent damage to the road' and that action is being taken before damage occurs, rather than waiting for damage to be done by. Congratulations on this approach. Please use it elsewhere.
- Derby Lane seems relatively undamaged at this point and it would be fantastic if the landscape could be protected from the inevitable damage from 4x4s and trail bikes.
- It is to the Peak Park's credit that they are imposing this TRO before irreversible damage is done to this beautiful area.
- Badly rutted ground and the environmental damage which is done can make walking difficult and also unpleasant,
- The effect they have on the ground is terrible and long lasting making it difficult for other users such as walkers and cyclists to enjoy using the lane.
- Derby Lane near Monyash is a 2km long grassy byway of considerable rustic charm, but terribly vulnerable to the deprivations of unthinking recreational off-roaders which could reduce the lane to a waste of mud and ruts - the sad fate which has befallen too many green lanes throughout the land. Fortunately there is a saviour at hand
- Support PDNPA's proposed pre-emptive TRO to protect this vulnerable route.
- Similar Orders relating to most of The Ridgeway Long Distance Path have resulted with a dramatic improvement to the many sections of the path that are now prohibited to motorised vehicles. Hope the Order is approved and that a dramatic improvement, similar to that seen in The Ridgeway Path, is achieved.
- Particularly concerned that the recent determination of the status of Derby Lane as a Byway Open to All Traffic will result in the removal of the current barriers, protecting the unfenced section of the lane from use by 4x4 vehicles. This will increase the vulnerability

The order is not being made on the grounds of preventing damage to the route but instead relating to amenity and conservation of the route and area.

The NPA is not making the TRO to obviate the duty by the Highway Authority to maintain the route.

<p>of the unsurfaced section and I believe will result in rapid degradation of the surface. By implementing a Traffic Regulation Order now, PDNPA will prevent the type of damage the Highway Authority has had to repair at considerable expense on other routes in the National Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The route is one of the few lanes in the Peak District that is still in reasonable condition and I believe vehicle use end to end (ie. as a through-route) would cause significant damage to both the route and the amenity value for other users. This includes the physical difficulty of other users using the route at the same time as vehicles, or having to avoid massive ruts/mud and puddles. It also includes the negative impact of pollution and the destruction of verge habitat and wildlife.</li> <li>• Restrict all off road vehicles from the lane to retain this unique ancient and natural structure of the lanes surface from further denuded and severe erosion caused by off road vehicles.</li> <li>• With current restrictions on money, my question is, who will be responsible for the up keep of the lane when it's damaged beyond accessibility, will Derbyshire County Council, Peak Park or Parish Council put it right. The answer is no, they do not have the finance to repair the Lane and certainly the Green Lane group won't and they are the ones who will have destroyed it. Likewise as the track widens through the surface being damage, the walls and grass verges boarding the lane would be undermined causing wall damage, which would be expensive to repair causing severe hardship to the land owners.</li> <li>• Over the years the condition of Derby Lane, particularly past Summerhill Farm, has deteriorated, largely due to the use by motorcycles and 4x4s. This has had a negative impact for users on foot, bicycle or horse, with large areas of mud and ruts which never used to exist. Historically the route would have been used by nothing more damaging than horse drawn vehicles.</li> <li>• This proposal to protect Derby Lane before the damage has occurred is a most welcome initiative</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Effect on Farming</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lane runs through my fields. I strongly object to motorised vehicles using the lane. My reasons are: These vehicles drive all over the field and do not stay on track. They often come during wet weather and seem to enjoy getting bogged down, and making as much mud and mess as possible. They then proceed to tow and drag each other out causing even more damage. When spoken to about staying on track, and the mess they are</li> </ul>	<p>Minimising impact is a key concern. Some impacts may only be temporary but when taken cumulatively are of more significance.</p>

causing they use abuse and become aggressive. Gates are often left open and our farm animals stray down into Monyash village. We care about the countryside and try to look after it, why should these people be allowed to come and make this sort of mess? It may be enjoyment for them, but when they return to their homes we are left with the damage. These lanes were never intended to be used for this sport and I would like to see the lane closed for that purpose.

- Own the barn and fields on the northern side of the lane and conduct my main business activities in this area. I have noticed an increase in the usage of Derby Lane by the off road motorbikes within the last 12 months or so, to the detriment of my business. I've been at the barn on a number of occasions, when the sudden and excessive noise from these off road machines have disturbed my cattle, and in more than one incident, spooked the cattle within the pens to a degree that they have tried to jump the pens. Farming is going through a tough time and expensive vet bills to attend injured animals, or even having them put down would and could put me out of business. At worse, I could have been in the pens and been seriously injured. This is pleasure sport for the off road bikers not a business. My business is my livelihood, they are seriously disrupting my business activities, they have no concern over farm hygiene (TB & foot and mouth along with cross farm contamination regulations), they are damaging the lanes surface and verges and at times I'm having to move equipment standing in the lane to let them past so they don't do any damage to the verges and undermine the walls. I have also noticed the noise is putting additional pressure on the eco balance of the wildlife of the countryside surrounding the lane.
- The need to apply a TRO is now more pressing than ever following the decision of Derbyshire County Council (DCC) to award Derby Lane BOAT Status with effect from 2nd March 2015. This will inevitably lead to a request to remove the boulders had placed adjacent to the gate, entering onto the holding from Derby Lane, to allow vehicular access to commence. Support the Park's proposal to enforce a TRO now in order to prevent increased levels of damage being caused and greater costs being incurred further down the line. According to the records on file it was generally accepted by DCC that the status of this right of way was agreed in the 1960's to be that of a bridleway, however for whatever reason this never made its way onto the definitive maps. There is no evidence of the alleged lane as it enters onto the property and where the purported highway passes over the land there is no defined route as it passes through three grassland fields. The fact there is no surfaced track supports the previous agreement with DCC that the only sensible status of the route is that of a bridleway. Any greater intensity of use would



<p>require reinforcement of the surface to prevent the inevitable damage caused by motorised vehicles. The potential damage/rutting which could be caused by use of the alleged highway would inevitably lead to the farming tenant receiving financial penalties from the Rural Payments Agency. The farming tenant has already suffered incidences of the gateway between his holding and Derby Lane being left open by unpermitted users of trial bikers and 4x4 users allowing stock to escape in the direction of Monyash village. The inevitable increase in use that will occur following announcement of BOAT status can only serve to increase the frequency of such occurrences. The Peak District vehicular access sub-forum have also provided their views upon the status of this track and its current condition, which accords with our views upon its use not being sustainable. See Appendix 3 of the route summary report. As part of investigations to provide evidence to the BOAT determination sought confirmation from three previous tenants of the farm and the current tenant, who has farmed in the locality since the mid 1980's, as to their recollection of the use of the track during the periods of their tenure (in one case of their father's tenure). All of these parties testament supported the position that the status of the Lane is only that of a bridleway, or at least that part of it which crosses the Trustees' ownership.</p>	
<p><b>Conflict &amp; Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the bikers have been standing up in the stirrups whilst throttle the machine at speed. I have seen them on the public tarmac part of the Derby Lane and village people have also seen them close to the Square and the school in Rakes End Road doing the same thing, which is putting the general public at risk.</li> <li>• Motorised vehicles clearly have no place on such a track through such a peaceful area. The damage and disturbance would have a detrimental effect on the path and deter others from coming to the area.</li> <li>• Support PDNPA's efforts to protect this route from the damage which it is likely to incur over time and to protect the local environment against damage to the landscape character, important geological and archaeological features, biodiversity and scenic and auditory amenity.</li> <li>• Need to protect these routes from motorised vehicles to prevent an accident. Horse riders and pedestrians do not expect to encounter cars on a Green Lane so the risks of an accident are higher.</li> <li>• Motorised traffic does not need to use this strip of green for access but they will destroy it.</li> </ul>	<p>National Park designation does not preclude use of such routes by recreational motor vehicles as a matter of principle.</p> <p>Not all vehicle users are irresponsible, however, the type and level of use and nature of the route and the in parts limited opportunities to avoid vehicles can exacerbate conflict and safety concerns leading to deterrence of use by non-vehicle users.</p> <p>Where issues of safety exist, these will normally be dealt with by the Highway Authority acting in co-operation with the police, with the National Park Authority providing any support we reasonably can. However fears for safety may be a contributory factor impacting on the amenity of users. Where the NPA</p>

keep our countryside, keep our countryside sports,

- This is a beautiful lane, and allowing motorised vehicles along it would ruin the natural landscape of this lane, apart from the obvious dangers if motor vehicles met with cyclists, walkers and especially horses.
- The majority of lanes in this area are surfaced and carry heavy traffic and there is no need for vehicles to be allowed on this quiet route.
- Since the BOAT was granted there has been a very obvious increase in recreational traffic. This has mainly been in the form of motorbikes or "scramblers" although have seen some off road vehicles use the Lane.
- Am not against the National Park being enjoyed by all. We are keen walkers, I cycle hundreds of miles around the Park each year and it is good for the local economy for people to feel that this is a welcoming and friendly area. But my initial reservations upon learning of the BOAT application have, in my opinion, proved to be well-founded. I was prepared to observe the motorbike users for six months in order to form a fair opinion. Traffic is worst on Saturdays and Sunday's. Groups of up to 12 have been counted. Speeds vary between what could be considered slow and cautious and fast - in excess of 40 miles per hour. On several occasions I witnessed a rider accelerating and pulling a wheelie down the lane. Unfortunately, the majority of bikers have in my view failed to exercise the necessary care when riding up and down this lane. Some, not all, drive too fast with blatant disregard for who else might be using it. I am scared that one day an accident will occur. Therefore, my first concern is one of safety. Prior to the order being granted, I was happy to walk up the lane with my children, aged six and two, without the fear of being confronted by several fast moving motorbikes. I was happy for them to stop and look in the hedges for wildlife and flowers and I was happy for them to be distracted by the cows and the lambs. I was happy for them to walk ahead and enjoy the countryside. But I can no longer do that. Whilst it is impossible to eradicate all risk on a country lane (the tractors use the road very responsibly) the unpredictability and speed of the scrambler bikes means we no longer walk up the lane. You only need to view videos posted online by motorbike users themselves to appreciate the speed and sometimes erratic driving exhibited by the riders.
- Whilst recreational activities like scramblers have a right and a place to be in the National Park, not all Lanes are suited to it.
- Vehicle users who wish to travel between the points connected by either end of Derby Lane can do so by way of existing metalled highways. Most if not all of the drivers of

are considering making a TRO on amenity grounds, safety reasons may be an additional consideration in support of this ground.

Minimising impact is a key concern. Some impacts may only be temporary but when taken cumulatively are of more significance.

mainly two wheeled vehicles recorded as using Derby Lane are doing so not because they have legitimate destinations served by this lane, but simply to use it as a 'free' venue for dirt track/trail biking. They have no regard for the detrimental effects on other National Park users/the environment/wildlife/ historic landscape as detailed in the submission.

- Those who just want the thrill & challenge of driving across open ground have no place in the countryside. They spoil it for everyone else.
- There is a wider issue of environmental damage caused by vehicles in the quiet countryside of the Peak Park.
- As a walker with children I've experienced dangerous encounters with bikes coming at speed round blind bends; since 2010 I've seen the increasing deterioration of the track from Brushfield to the Monsal Trail to the point where the rocks are so exposed horses are no longer safe to ride along it according to a group of local riders I spoke to; the local shepherd has had pregnant ewes scared to miscarriage by speeding bikes as well as gates left open so that livestock escape. We have 4x4s passing our hamlet well after 11pm regularly and on a busy day we will see lines of up to 8-10 4x4s queuing to get through through our farm yard area. Would like to support the proposal to permanently exclude vehicles from Derby Lane to protect that area from the damage and distress caused by many of the drivers of vehicles on green lanes throughout the Peaks.
- Used to walk regularly in the Peak District but over recent years I have found other places to walk because the intrusion of off-road motor vehicles was making it almost impossible to enjoy a peaceful day out. It is not just the damage that off-road vehicles do that I find offensive but also their aggression and noise. Every activity causes some measure of damage but off-road vehicles can do in one wet season what it would take others to do in 20 years. There is no place for off-road vehicles in our National Parks. The people who undertook the Kinder Trespass did not do so to clear the way for vehicles.
- Apart from the diminution of the lane's amenity for walking or mountain biking, the ruination of this lane becomes a blot on the landscape. Too many of the tracks in the Peak District have been trashed in this way, and apart from any scenic consequences it also has commercial ones as walkers and cyclists are increasingly turning their backs on the area because of this - and these are the people who tend to use the local cafes rather than the 4WD brigade
- Support the proposed traffic regulation order so that the natural beauty of this walking route can be preserved for future generations. The intrusion of vehicles along this route would be severely detrimental to that natural beauty.

- There is no place for off-road motor vehicles in the Peak District National Park. The beauty and peace of the Park should be protected for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to enjoy in peace and without the awful damage the vehicles make to the ancient rights of way.
- I am a horse rider who rides regularly in the North York Moors National Park and I have experienced the damage and often obstructions caused to these vulnerable ancient highways which, in many cases makes them hazardous and difficult to use by other legal Users e.g. walkers and horses.
- This proposal to protect Derby Lane before the damage has occurred is a most welcome initiative.
- In 2009 we began to realise the enormous damage being caused to green lanes in the National Park by motor bike riders and drivers of 4x4 vehicles, who consider it a sport to drive along those green lanes. Realising the need for evidence we commissioned an experimental TRO which proved the effect of those vehicles, in that natural places and plants recovered after the experimental period. The lanes are used by walkers and horse riders, when motor vehicles of any type present a danger to such users, and in fact accidents have occurred, including injury, especially with horse riders. Significant damage is being caused by the use of these vehicles to ancient Roman roads, SSSI sites, native species etc. When the concept of the National Parks was implemented am sure those responsible never envisaged that the mass of people who wanted to walk these lovely and peaceful lanes, would be compromised by fast moving vehicles, in the name of sport
- There is also the noise and other pollution from these vehicles as well as their safety in proximity to motor vehicles.
- The noise from motorbikes in particular can be particularly annoying in what is a peaceful village.
- A couple of years ago, at the point where the ORPA comes to an end on my 2004 OS Explorer OL24 GR 160 646, there is a gate and if I remember, large welcome boulders, stopping further vehicle access. To the side ie NE there is a gap to a field. At the time I noted that the wooden five bar gate had been badly damaged, indeed shattered and was lying on its side. I hazarded a guess that this was deliberate and may possibly have been done by off-road vehicles searching for a way to circumnavigate the blocked gate and boulders.
- Similar Orders relating to most of The Ridgeway Long Distance Path have resulted with a dramatic improvement to the many sections of the path that are now prohibited to

motorised vehicles. I hope the Order is approved and that a dramatic improvement, similar to that seen in The Ridgeway Path, is achieved.

- Due to their speed, can result in safety issues for other users of the path such as walkers. In my experience these vehicles can also cause excessive noise which spoils the tranquility of the area.
- The presence of vehicles reduces my enjoyment of the lane by destroying the peace and quiet of this part of the countryside. Even the anticipation of vehicles raises my anxiety level.
- It is very questionable that trail riders actually enjoy the Peak District scenery when they have to concentrate on negotiating the uneven and grassy terrain such as that found on Derby Lane. Their recreational activity is one that affects the enjoyment of other types of users of the countryside for walking, cycling and equestrian users.
- Use of green lanes with unsealed surfaces should be reserved for posterity for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders to be able to use without the concern of meeting motorised traffic. In addition, green lanes with their unsealed surfaces are more often than not susceptible to damage by motorised vehicles to the extent where the enjoyment of other users are severely affected.
- Stop this off road recreational pursuit that cause excessive noise and pollution to a quiet area, endangering farm animals and disturbing wild animals and causing resident's untold distress with their noise, pollution and attitude, riding their bikes at speed stood up in the stirrups and up on one wheel not only on the lane but also through the village on their way to the lane usually at speed to create noise.
- I have also grave doubt about the off Road Vehicles insurance cover, both on and off road usage, until an accident occurs with a walker/ horse riders the person/ or persons involved may not be covered by their insurance company on this byway. I also believe that none members of an organized club may not be tax for on road usage.
- Monyash has almost become a playground for this recreational sport, with other tracks being used to the North of the village, disturbing the village life with the noise they generate, revving up their bike's/ vehicles with little concern to the amount of noise they produce, or the general safety of the normal road users, and clearly from what I have said previously they ride their bike through a built up area passing school facilities which is in constant use by children without concern for their safety. Furthermore most people live in the villages of Derbyshire for the quietness and tranquility of the Derbyshire Dales that it provides, all we want is some quality time in our own village and gardens.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road users will not be inconvenienced as the road network is extensive enough for their needs.</li> <li>• Motorcyclists and 4x4 drivers do not need to use Derby Lane to enjoy the lovely scenery. If that is their real intention, they can do so just as well from the road Long Rake.</li> <li>• those in support of recreational motorised use of green lanes should consider having dedicated and challenging sites of their own, in locations around the country if none are in existence.</li> <li>• This sport should be confined to a purpose arena like the one off M5, North of Worcester/ disused quarry or gravel pit. Not on a byway or public roads.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Any sites proposed for motor vehicle use would require planning permission.</p>
<p><b>Others</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why wait until something is ruined? The right time for this TRO is now.</li> <li>• Would also like to add my praise of the Peak District National Park Authority for taking this stance against needless selfish vandalism and for unspoiled green rural countryside - very well done PDNP, you fully deserve the praise of all country lovers for this decisive action.</li> <li>• The National Parks and other Highway Authorities should work together to make the procedures to do traffic regulation orders easier and to learn from each other</li> <li>• Preference should be given for the promotion of healthy recreation along green lanes in the National Park, not unhealthy recreation as practised by drivers or riders of mechanically propelled vehicles.</li> <li>• The imposition of a traffic regulation order prohibiting the recreational use of motorised vehicles would properly concur with the Peak District National Park Authority's 'Landscape Strategy and European Landscape Convention Action Plan' published in 2009, which has an approved policy that will not be reviewed before 2019, that is to:- Manage the Network of Tracks and Footpaths to Maximise Opportunities to Enjoy the Landscape - The network of tracks and footpaths should be managed to maximise opportunities for healthy recreation and to enjoy the landscape. This can be achieved easily by landscape management measures such as surfacing, and by controlling inappropriate use to retain the character, cultural heritage and biodiversity interests. This definitely precludes recreational motorists from using such tracks.</li> <li>• If succeed in objection to DCC's DMMO, the result would be to make the southern section</li> </ul>	<p>The NPA has proposed this action at this time on Derby Lane after careful consideration of the evidence available and alternative options. This has included preparing route information in consultation with the Peak District Local Access Forum - an advisory body to the NPA and its constituent Highway Authorities.</p> <p>Determination of status of a route is based on fact not suitability and is undertaken by the Surveying (Highway) Authority.</p>

<p>a bridleway or a restricted byway, leaving the northern section as a BOAT. The whole route would still be vulnerable to recreational motor vehicle use, albeit illegal on the southern section the proposed TRO, will protect the whole route from motor vehicle use which is unsuitable on a quiet country lane and over grassland, preserve the amenities of the route for non-motorised users and enhance the natural beauty of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Photograph evidence is documented in the well known Francis Fifth photographic collections of bygone years, which shows a road sign that clearly indicates a restriction had been placed on the tarmac lane part of the Byway in the early 1960. Although this sign outside of Manor House indicates the restrictions probably is for vehicle access only to Summerhill Farm, this restriction may not have been formally removed.</li><li>• The Peak Park authority have spent many months closing down similar routes within the Park, because of the destruction to the infrastructure and the subsequent damage to the surface of similar old roads and bridle paths. The granting of this a byway will go against the Peak Park Authorities philosophy on such routes throughout the Peak Park area, therefore I believe vehicle restrictions should be enforced.</li></ul>	
---	--