

## Washgate – Objections to the TRO submitted under Regulation 12

Representations received under Regulation 12 which object to the imposition of a traffic regulation order on this route are reported below. Individual items of correspondence may be viewed at the National Park offices.

### Amenity

- The proposal would diminish the heritage of the park.
- This will lead to an eventual downgrading of all such historic routes used by motorcycles which is both unfair and unjust in the aims of meeting positive physical, mental and social development of all users of the route in question.
- Often visit the Peak District as a motorcycle tourist and greatly enjoy traversing the green lanes thereabouts, I have travelled along Washgate a couple of times and would like to do so again in the future. Any closure would greatly impact my enjoyment of this outstandingly beautiful area.
- Am a mature man with responsibilities and love to share this environment with my family through walks and bike rides. This is not a pastime that comes cheaply.
- There are limited trails for motor vehicles and every one is important.
- Have regularly ridden this lane as part of a loop we do and have so for years
- Some user groups i.e. Ramblers, have access to all lanes, trail riders however have access to a few.
- Have used the route for years of enjoying trail riding and the fantastic scenery which it offers
- Used this lane for 30 years. Why the change now
- Riding a motorcycle is something on interesting routes I feel gives me opportunities to improve my physical and emotional well being.
- Motorcycling has a cultural heritage as much as any other activity, and this is no reason to apply a TRO.
- In closing the beautiful and iconic route to motorcycles the PDNPA is once again damaging local trail riding businesses and associated support businesses such as B&Bs cafés pubs etc. This TRO will further damaged motorcycle tourism coming to the area and continue to destroy the already very limited access available.
- Am finding it increasingly more and more difficult to enjoy the Peak District due to more and more lane closures/restrictions.
- This will affect my hobby and pastime and in turn my wellbeing. It will also affect my father by the fact that he has two artificial knee implants and a mechanically propelled motorbike is the only way for him to get out on these trails site seeing.
- My disability now means that am no longer able to walk the paths that used to enjoy so much, the only way now have of enjoying these routes and the views they offer is by motorcycle.
- As more routes are banned to motorcyclists it means that more bikes are using fewer lanes thus increasing the chance of conflict with other users
- Washgate is a famous byway in the Green Laning Motorcycle community and closing it to fully will be a significant hit to the motorcycle tourism in the area.
- Washgate has been a main section of my group's runs for the last 3 years connecting a few smaller lanes that would otherwise take a very large detour on the tarmac roads to get to, by removing washgate you are effectively destroying my entire run which in turn is costing local cafes around £150 per run which is usually 1 or 2 runs a week.
- Motorcycles currently have access to less than 2% of the trail network in the countryside whereas Ramblers have 100% access. To simply that, for every 100 miles that a walker has access to, a motorcycle is only permitted to ride up to 2 miles of the same trails
- My late grandfather, my father and myself all used to ride Washgate together on our motorcycles over 20 years ago with the land owner
- Am a responsible trail rider and travel to the Peak District at least 8 times a year, as a group of up to 6 of us
- Stunning and legendary route to motorcycles
- As motorcycles have been using all unclassified roads in the area for over 100 years they are part of the cultural heritage of the area.
- This is one of the most central routes for all Yorkshire green lane events and will have a knock on effect for use of many other lanes . This will in turn push many of riders with no other option when

trying to complete their gps guided routes

- A beautiful and fabulous lane in an area of the Peak that is lovely
- This is a valuable right of way allowing me to travel in the peak district on my relatively slow trail type motorcycle without having to use the busy fast main roads. It allows me to access other lanes in the area for enjoyment. It gives me great pleasure to travel the countryside in this way.

#### Natural Beauty

- It is noted that "Vehicle use has damaged the listed bridge and the historic stone-pitching. Intrusiveness of vehicles has an impact on the setting of features. Evidence of passage, and works and signage to deal with that, have an impact on the heritage asset and the character of the route and area and the setting of features." A public road with permitted vehicle rights may incur signs of use that is inherent with a bit a public right of way, There is reference to signage could impact on the setting - this argument could be applied to most of the Peak District as in essence virtually all of the features of the Peak District are man made and who is to say what is acceptable man made feature and what is not. In 50 years a modern road sign may be considered a heritage item of value to be protected and maintained.
- Your document refers to "Visual impact of vehicle movement in the landscape over a wide area" - at around 3 or 4 motorcycles and no four wheeled vehicles per day recorded since 2010 - the chances of seeing or being aware of any visual impact from a vehicle (and this that presumes that the viewer is actually upset or concerned) actually is extremely rare. So I feel this is not really a justifiable reason to impose a TRO.
- Your document refers "Noise impact on people Disturbance from vehicles on users of the route and nearby properties". The noise impact from 3 or 4 motorcycles and zero four wheeled vehicles per day is really a minimal potential issue - if the noise of a motorcycle actually concerns you at all. Are there real evidence of motorcycles causing significant real problems or is this a comment based on an unreasonable stereotypical view that all motorcycles are noisy (they are not as they have to comply with legislation - any that do not should be dealt with by the appropriate authorities on a case by case basis), and obviously noise from four wheeled vehicles cannot be an issue if none have, as per your records, used the route since 2010. Have owners and residents of "nearby properties" made formal complaint and taken this issue up with the Police or local Authorities? In the near future it is quite likely that most vehicles will be virtually silent electrically propelled so a TRO based on noise (if it actually is an issue at all) would be in place for a short term issue but apply for a long time to a problem which (if it does exist) will probably be a historic point. There is also reference to "Voluntary code of conduct (travel at a quiet and unobtrusive pace in small groups) not always applied" as these codes of conduct are voluntary how can non-compliance be seen as a possible reason to apply a TRO.
- The route has vehicle rights and I believe this is intrinsic to the qualities of the route - to suggest one activity should take precedence over another is purely subjective and unquantifiable - the natural beauty of the Peak District is in essence manmade (before man brought in animals/grazing/ farming etc the Peaks would have looked markedly different and truly natural) so who is to say what is acceptable manmade beauty and what is not.
- Sense of wildness and remoteness / Away from major settlements and roads / Visual – presence and evidence of use Noise – transient but concentrated in the clough or over a wide area. Anyone who is there in whatever form could be subjectively be construed as imposing on someone else's enjoyment of the area - so how can a TRO be imposed for the benefit of some but to the detriment of others
- Where ever man goes in whatever form the risk of disturbance is there - the only way to mitigate this is to ban all access.
- A vehicle using this public route is part of the ongoing human influence – are we trying to preserve the National Park as a museum piece all should we allow the years of human influence to continue in an organic and ongoing process.
- Damage to boundary walls by the 3 or 4 motorcycles a day and zero four wheeled vehicles is likely not to be an insignificant issue.
- Any noise that occurs is transient, based on your vehicle records the worst case is an occurrence on average every 6 to 8 hours, is this truly an issue for any reasonable minded person?
- How many motorcycles have been recorded at night and at the same time caused a light pollution - or is this a historic issue from the last time a four wheeled vehicle used this lane at night. either way is there any real documented cases of this being an issue. Presumably anyone using the route in the

dark would have their own light source that could potentially be a problem for any other users who happen to be there at night.

- The perception of noise as an issue is purely subjective depending on the individual concerned and their acceptance of others - in this case using a public route with vehicle access in a perfectly lawful manner. Any actual unlawful activities should be dealt with by the police not by a blanket ban just in case.
- There is no evidence that the presence of a small number of motorcycle trail bikes briefly present and in transit along the route have a detrimental effect on the scenic quality, relative wildness, natural or cultural heritage of the route. In fact as motorcycles have been using all unclassified roads in the area for over 100 years they are part of the cultural heritage of the area.
- There is no evidence that the presence of motorcycle trail bikes impede on the opportunity to enjoy tranquillity and quiet enjoyment by other users on the route as they are required by law to be properly silenced in accordance with construction and use regulations. As the route is technically challenging it requires great finesse in terms of throttle control and balance and is impossible to traverse above about 5mph. In any case the number of motorcycles using the route a few and far between (5.7 per day in 2015) and as the route is only short any effect is very transitory.
- Due to the technically challenging terrain along the Washgate route and the width restriction in place effectively limiting it to trail bikes it would be impossible to traverse it on one during the night. Motorcycle trail bikes are notorious for their poor headlights and it is our educated opinion that night riding does not take place for those reasons. Attempting it would result in serious injury.

#### Damage

- The only thing that could help this lane is better drainage.
- My bikes weight is about 50 times lighter than a horse and rider and not much more than my mountain bike with back pack and rider. You can't single one out from the other, if you are closing lanes then close them for everyone.
- Know Washgate Lane very well. Over the years I don't think it has changed that much.
- Any roadway will be subject to wear and tear - repairs are the responsibility of the County Council Highway Authority and any damage should be directed to them rather used as an excuse by the National Park to justify a TRO. I believe that wear and tear damage will also occur from permitted vehicles if a TRO is enforced so in practise the route will not benefit. Again the very low numbers of current users is in reality hardly likely to cause noticeable defects.
- Your documents refer to "The use of the river as a ford or turning point results in disturbance and sediment loss affecting its water quality and potentially the internationally designated species downstream" if no four wheeled vehicles use the route then presumably this is a historical point and has no bearing on current use - motorcycles would not use a water way to carry out a turning point as this is almost certainly a way to slip off and damage the motorcycle. There is also reference to Noise and disturbance impact on wildlife from the effects of the river being used by vehicles again this is presumably historic and therefore not relevant in respect of this proposed TRO.
- Your document refers to "Wheel ruts and damage to character of the route" as above based on the very minimal number of motorcycles, 3 or 4 per day, and zero four wheeled vehicles since 2010, then it is fair to presume that the any damage is historic and not of relevance to making a TRO.
- Have used this route for many many years as a Walker and a motorcyclist and it has never changed, water erosion has followed its natural course in this area and it will continue to, motorbikes or not
- We don't do the damage that we get blamed for it is water erosion
- It had already been proven in many studies and various researches that weather plays a big part in erosion and also heavy foot traffic and horses play a big part
- The environmental impact of recreational walking is far greater than trail riding. Levelling and sealing unmade roads into accessible footpaths is a permanent scar on the landscape which can not recover in the way that disturbance of natural surfaces by mechanically propelled vehicles is able.
- As more routes are banned to motorcyclists it means that more bikes are using fewer lanes thus increasing the chance of conflict with other users
- From what I have seen the small amount of use washgate gets from motorcycles has next to no effect on the condition of the lane or the local environment. From what I have seen the small amount of use washgate gets from motorcycles has next to no effect on the condition of the lane or the local environment.
- The claims of environmental damage appear to be using natural erosion as evidence of a negative

impact from trail bikes which is simply inaccurate.

- The route surface over the years has changed but not to any major detriment. The route is not suffering from motorcycle use.
- The surface of the climb is mostly rock. There is very little erosion that can occur to such a surface when soft air filled rubber tyres are used, as fitted to a trail type motorcycle. In contrast a horse uses metal shoes and hard unforgiving hoofs.
- Widening the route is unnecessary, motorcycles aren't getting any wider and have no problems negotiating the lane at it's current width. If there are issues with 4x4 vehicles causing damage due to the width (I've never seen or heard of a 4x4 using Washgate) then motorcycles should not be punished for this.
- Washgates surface is largely made up of stones and rocks. A motorcycle tyre is not capable of causing damage to rock. If you walk down washgate there is very little evidence that a vehicle has ever been down there due to the solid rock surface. A small stretch on the Hollinsclough end shows signs of motorcycle use which can easily be managed and is no excuse for a TRO.
- Damage to watercourse. There is no evidence to prove that motorcycle passing through the ford causes any more disturbance to the sediment than a walker or cyclist. Sediment is constantly moving throughout all watercourses where the water is moving and is laughable to suggest that a few motorcycles a day makes any measurable difference to the ford.
- Never seen or heard of anyone use the bridge on a motorcycle and the general consensus is that the bridge is for foot traffic only.
- The first few meters of Washgate coming from the Hollinsclough end there is a small rut which could be easily maintained. The rest of the route shows little to no sign of motorcycle use.
- Remember being caught out in a storm on that particular lane and the water was pushing rocks down the hillside
- Particularly since the width restriction of 1.5 metres was introduced I can see no evidence of walls being damaged, historic stone pitching or drainage suffering for motorcycle use. Motorcycle trail bikes have little to no impact as they have to be lightweight to control. Any damage to pitching or drainage is due to heavy water downpours that regularly affect the route, along with frost damage and poorly maintained drainage. The adjacent walls are in poor repair to such an extent that they are falling down. Sheep, deer and heavy weather over time are all helping to push over these walls.
- The northern end of the lane is cobbled and well made showing no damage, the western end has the rock steps which are water damaged and need some attention but are still passable.

#### Discrimination

- The proposal is still unfair and unacceptable to motorcyclists, who are equally entitled to responsibly use of Washgate Lane as they have done for over a century. Allowing 4 motorcycle trials a year is not sufficient to properly maintain motorcycling heritage on Washgate. PDNPA are not securing a successful or reasonable compromise.
- Fully support the good work of the Trail Riders Fellowship and would generously donate to a crowdfunding campaign which supported a legal challenge to this unjust, unfair, and unnecessary TRO
- This proposal reflects a biased view against two wheel vehicles which do not cause the levels of concern certain user groups and organisations purport to be the case.
- The TRO is discriminatory towards responsible motorcyclists. Irresponsible motorcyclists will probably ignore the TRO so you are only penalising those riders who do care about riding responsibly by issuing a TRO on the lane.
- You are being biased towards trail riders and blaming damage to the lane on bikers to enforce a TRO.
- The peak park are discriminating against legal and legitimate trail riders who bring money into the park
- My objection is made on the grounds of discrimination, PDNPA has always jumped straight to a TRO, every proposed TRO has gone through local areas. Treat us fairly.
- It's high time that the unelected few that dictate who can do what and where within the Peaks, became accountable for their spurious and totally biased legislation.
- It seems so unfair that another one of my regularly used routes is again under threat of being closed, when restrictions on weight and width have been put in place to stop larger vehicles from accessing this route

- You are happy to spend thousands repairing the likes of the kinder footpath that has been damaged by walkers but the like of wash gate you want to close to motorbikes due to damage! it's a hidden agenda to get motoebike activity out of your precious park
- Peak district national park are not fair in their power over such routes
- Motorcyclists are constantly being discriminated against because of the way in which we choose to explore and appreciate the scenery and views that the Peak District, by taking away every possible route that we can ride there will be nowhere left for us to go and then what will you suggest for us to do as an alternative?
- The environmental justifications for any restriction are overstated and are in fact no more detrimental than use by non mechanically propelled means along unsealed roads. The claims of environmental damage appear to be using natural occurrences as evidence of a negative impact from trail bikes which is simply inaccurate.
- Washgate is a road. It is a vehicular right of way. That certain pressure groups wish to preclude access by vehicles and motorcycles from the park as a whole is no reason to declassify a road to a footpath.
- To ban me and other riders with disabilities from using these routes would be to discriminate against us.
- The effect on people who ride these lanes faced with closure, or subject to a current closure can be sadness, frustration and even depression at the prospect of having their known routes removed for them to enjoy. This in turn can give the feeling of contempt and even anger towards the PDNPA since the actions are seen by many as unjustified and an attack on the trail riding community. If you care to check out social media groups you'll find all these feelings being displayed and more besides. These are law abiding, mostly professional people having their hobby or pass time slowly eroded.
- The local authority should be protecting all of our interests, not just those of groups whom deftly and disingenuously manoeuvre themselves onto the environmental moral high ground
- The PDNPA are not securing a successful or reasonable compromise for the benefit of all users.

#### Displacement

- Banning legal use of lanes like this forces riders to use roads illegally, which could lead to damage on sensitive or fragile trails.
- Puts added pressure on the remaining dwindling and restricted network of trails.
- At the rate people are trying to close these trails we are going to end up with a situation were there isn't anywhere to go and all this do is encourage illegal use which we responsible users are against.
- If you take away all legal lanes you will force some people to give up their love for trail riding and then you will get the other end of the spectrum in which inevitably sure there will be a select few that will continue to ride regardless.
- The continued removal of legal rights of way will not only increase vehicle use on the dwindling number of legal routes, but it will also stimulate illegal use. Adequate provision for legal use must be made.
- As more routes are banned to motorcyclists it means that more bikes are using fewer lanes thus increasing the chance of conflict with other users

#### User Conflict

- Have regularly ridden my motorcycle along Washgate since 1999. I hardly ever see any other users of this road. I rarely see any walkers or cyclists and I have never seen a horse & rider.
- Enjoy riding the trail responsibly and will always take the time to be considerate.
- Have frequently encountered walkers and we have always had a pleasant chat. On several occasions I have stopped to show them exactly where they are on the map.
- Has any real conflict been recorded or is this a perceived issue with no substance?
- Have been using this lane for approximately 12 years on a monthly basis. In this time I have never encountered a horse rider or mountain biker. Only once have I met a family of ramblers on the route. We stopped our motorcycles and allowed them to pass safely. They acknowledged this and their children were pleased and thrilled to see us.
- In 20 years of using it regurly ive honestly seen walkers twice, 2 elderly ladies who we had a charming chat with and loved our bikes and how exciting it seemed and a family comprising of mum dad and daughter who we also chatted to

- Wouldn't imagine you could exceed 5 mph on Washgates as it rather technical.

#### Economic Impact

- Have stayed in local accommodation and spent a considerable amount of money when staying locally of which be reduced if I don't visit again.
- Off road biking creates for many jobs in tourism all year round for pubs and bed and breakfast and hotel. For very minimal damage to the lanes.
- This closure will mean that we won't be able to ride and spend our money in the local community.
- PDNPA should be encouraging the tourism vehicle use brings and the money the local businesses need.
- The vast amount of money that a standard group of 6 spend is such a boost on the local communities using their petrol station, cafes, shops and just local conveniences in general, not to mention actually buying the bikes from dealers and then bike clothing etc.
- Legal recreational driving and riding on unsealed roads makes a huge contribution to both the economy and community, arguably more so than zero cost activities such as walking.
- Have often led small groups of riders using this lane as part of the group and we have supported the local economy by doing so.

#### Alternatives

- The aims put forward in the statement of reasons can be achieved with a lesser restriction. By choosing an overly restrictive option, the proposal will needlessly deprive the National Park of the benefits of motorcycling.
- Failure to satisfy National Park purposes. There is significant scope to meet National Park purposes by educating the public about the traditional pastime of motorcycling on Washgate and other green roads. The public are not confined to those who subscribe to anti - motoring ideologies. Motorcycles and motorcycling are very popular. Focusing on the moderate society has significant potential to increase enjoyment of Washgate and its rich heritage of motorcycling.
- There are plenty of other options for the safe upkeep and conservation of this trail, have a seasonal restriction been considered, day from November to end of March during the wetter weather where exercise use during this time could lead to greater erosion?
- The motor vehicle width restriction that was implemented around five years ago is more than adequate as it prohibits cars.
- There are other ways to protect ancient roads from damage, whether that be by voluntary restraint, weight limits or restrictions on 4- wheel drive use where appropriate. The last sentence provides provision for 'named motorcycle trials' and I assume by this you mean limited competition use as with the Scott Trial in N Yorkshire? My primary interest is in recreational use so would object to a TRO limiting that use.
- Other workable solutions should be explored first. New mountain biking routes are been looked at near Lady Cannings Plantation, why are vehicle routes been closed down and no new ones opened?
- Have been using this route on my motorcycle for around 18 years, and with its present restrictions and possibly a little maintenance it could be left open for many responsible people to enjoy for many years to come
- Please keep it open 365 days a years to motorcycles, plus if you close it will become overgrown and no one will ever see it
- Can't you just put some kind of drain before the down hill section that will solve everything.
- Perhaps it's time you started splitting the lanes, grading one half for walkers and leaving the remaining half as it is in its natural state for other members of the public.

#### Information

- There is no basis for this proposal and I wish it to remain open to motorcycles.
- The actual traffic using this route which is minimal – approx. 3 or 4 motorcycles per day and no four wheeled vehicles at all since 2010 - why impose a ban on the very few users.
- Your documents refer to loss of vegetation alongside the route -The route is narrow and sunken in places with limited opportunities for widening it. Widening would further reduce the amount of vegetation and would result in further impact on the road side verges and the ecology of the area" If the route cannot be widened, either by use or planned, how can widening the route cause damage to

the localised ecology. Surely this contradicts itself and should not be used as a justification. If the route is being widened presumably this is by agricultural use, as by your survey no four wheeled vehicles have used the route for years, and motorcycles by their very nature are narrow and have a low impact. Also if vehicles deviate from the route those responsible should be dealt with rather than blaming all vehicle users - surely this is unreasonable and unjust.

- Your document refers to "Deterrence of use by non-MPV users from presence or anticipation of vehicles" - is there any actual real "Deterrence of use", or put another way are actually there people terrified of using a route, over which there are public vehicles permitted, who would not rather use the 95% or so, of routes which do not have vehicles on them. Have there been any actual cases of harm or crime to justify "Deterrence of use". Perception of something which does actually occur surely cannot be used as a justification for a TRO.
- Is there any actually quantifiable measurement of pollution occurring or is this item a "hearsay" item which therefore should not be used to opinion the imposition of a TRO.
- Are there any actual records of damage to boundary walls actually causing significant impact on agricultural access that could reasonably justify the draconian measure of applying a TRO.
- Is there any actual proven deterrence of other users in any significant quantity that can justify a TRO.
- Not only is the evidence to support any removal of vehicular right of access flawed and distorted, it is also vitally important that the authorities take responsibility for and reverse the trend of the repeated impositions unnecessary TRO's on unsealed roads.