

Notice of Proposal: Forest of Dean Prohibition of Driving

22nd February 2023 to 17th March 2023

5227-40-001 Redbrook

XXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>1. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROHIBITION OF DRIVING RESTRICTIONS ON COXBURY LANE, REDBROOK</p> <p>2. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES RESTRICTION ON A SECTION OF THE 500034 TRACK FROM NEWLAND TOWARDS BIRCHAM WOOD, NEWLAND, GLOUCESTERSHIRE</p> <p>The Parish Council has been in discussions with representatives of the Green Lane Association, the Forest of Dean Land Rover Group and the Motor Enthusiasts Groups expressing our concern over the damage being done to 'Green Lanes' in the parish, whilst accepting that the two cases under consideration above relate to Class 5 highways. Coxbury Lane is road number 50029 and is hard surfaced over the length indicated in the draft Order. The road in case 2 is numbered 50034 and is unsurfaced and subject to serious damage.</p> <p>Representations from residents affected by the use of the roads by motor vehicles were made at our Parish Council meeting last evening and can be summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When was it designated as a road?• Could / should it be downgraded to a footpath?• High pressure water main under the surface - could be damaged causing flooding in Newland and loss of water supply. (Highway 50034)• Access by aged / disabled is impossible and therefore discriminatory, motor vehicle activity is the only sport which curtails other activities• Use will increase by other groups as word spreads among clubs• Promises by clubs to repair and maintain are "fanciful"• Vehicles are leaving the roads in question and travelling over private land, in some cases preventing the landowner access, and opening the landowner to possible action for accidents on the land
--------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles will be damaged with a real risk of oil and other liquids leaking and entering the watercourse • Non road legal motor cycles being used on recognised roads and green lane (which are technically highways) • Horse riding impossible for last 3 years due to surface damage, speed and noise of vehicles spooking animals • High risk of accidents from vehicles not slowing down • If there was an accident who would be liable? • There are around 10 activity groups seriously affected by motor vehicle activity and only 2 or 3 which benefit • These 'green lanes' would never be designated as highways today. <p>The question of who had been consulted was raised, and although we note your claim that an "extensive resident's consultation has been carried out", the effects of the use of these roads by motor vehicles go far wider; there are those from outside the immediate area who use them (or once used them, when the surfaces were acceptable) for recreation. Bear in mind also this is a tourist area (encouragement and promotion of which is a key objective of the District Council Local plan), and the continued use of these roads goes against that plan.</p> <p>The offer to repair the roads surfaces by motor enthusiasts' groups was considered, but the general feeling of the residents at the meeting was that these offers were 'fanciful' and would not be practically effective.</p> <p>Newland Parish Council, on behalf of its residents and visitors strongly SUPPORTS the making of the proposed Order and would seek to have it extended to other such highways in the parish.</p> <p>Yours very truly</p>
--	--

5227-40-002 Newland

XXXXXXXXXX	I live in the XXXXXXXXXXXX. I would like to support the proposal to prohibit the use of motor vehicles along the burial path.
------------	---

	<p>Having tried to use the path it is in a very poor state and as such poses a danger to animals and people. I agree with all of the statements below. I would also add the noise generated by motorbikes racing up and down the area disturbs the tranquility of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising. • For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property. • For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot. • To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders. • To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway.
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>In relation to the public consultation, Prohibition of Driving and Prohibition of Motor Vehicles in the Parishes of. Newland 2023 ref 5227/40, I reiterate my representation below in support of a prohibition order.</p> <p>Yours</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>Subject: Potential TRO to implement prohibition of motor vehicles restriction on section of 500034 (informally known as Burial Path) Newland, Glos</p> <p>Your ref: 5227-40</p> <p>Dear XXXXXX</p>

	<p>Thank you for your letter regarding the above. I am sending this representation on behalf of my household.</p> <p>The Burial Path is a very old holloway, the earliest mention of which appears to be 1369 (Victoria History of the Counties of England - Gloucestershire Vol V (page 199)). At that time, it was the main route between Coleford and Newland and would have been used by pedestrians, those on foot and the occasional horse and cart. There were no burial grounds in Coleford and so bodies were transported to Newland to All Saints Church (circa (1200s)</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX, and XXXXXXXXX. The XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. When XXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. It was leafy with vegetation and wildflowers along the banks, and it was used frequently by locals and visitors for recreation; it was truly charming. Over the past 10 years, it has been "discovered" by recreational trial bikes and 4x4 off road vehicles. Some of these may be part of organised groups, and indeed, we have seen convoys of 10 vehicles regrouping outside our house with the leader in logo-ed jumper, getting out of the vehicles to talk to the others. Many are not members of such groups and battle up and down XXXXXXXX of the day and night (memorably one Christmas Day at midnight), with much revving of engines. This did not even cease during the first lock down of the pandemic. If a tree is in the way, a chainsaw will be deployed; obstacles are relished as a challenge.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX, the state of this lovely way has deteriorated considerably. Stones have been pulled out of the ancient walls to fill holes, ruts from wheels have gouged the surface and most of the time the ground underfoot is like a quagmire. The flora has all but disappeared making it less attractive to wildlife and nesting birds. Walkers are often shunning the way because of the state of it and instead using a nearby footpath over the fields, which is not dog friendly because of a number of stiles, and difficult to navigate with young children. Also, there is apprehension as to whether you will meet a 4x4 or indeed a convoy, as the way is too narrow to accommodate the passing of a vehicle and a person, and the banks for the most part are too steep to climb. Many of the vehicles (both 4x4 and motor bikes), come at some speed, and as the lane is shady, visibility and therefore safety is an issue.</p> <p>In addition, mud is often brought down onto the metalled area of the lower part of the XXXXX, and onto the main highway which runs past The Ostrich Inn, causing a nuisance and a hazard, and a burden to the local Highway Authority.</p> <p>I was at the Parish Council meeting earlier this year, where XXXXXX addressed the meeting. He stated that his group has rules of behaviour, including as to speed, and to numbers in a convey. I have no doubt that this is the case. However, the organised groups are only a small part of the users. When we reported a couple of 4x4s who used a nearby green lane to the police as they had caused criminal damage on our land, one</p>
--	---

	<p>vehicle was carrying a false number plate, and the other was "out of county" and so the police would not pursue them. News of these green ways spread through the various communities and those who use them are not necessarily accountable or sensitive to public approbation. XXXXXX suggested that a seasonal closure might assist. However, particularly with climate change, it is impossible to predict when the weather will be fair and the ground dry. I am enclosing a number of photos which were taken at various times of the year. I found XXXXXX very personable and I have no doubt that XXXX wishes to be cooperative. However, if the way is open for one it is open for all, including the less scrupulous.</p> <p>Regarding the trial bikes, they, of course, contribute to the poor state of the way, and there is potential for conflict with horse riders and pedestrians because of visibility and the speed that they travel. Also, when they reached the metalled lower stretch, they appear to relish revving their engines and speeding down to the main road, which is an inappropriate intrusion in this quiet area.</p> <p>We would all support a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on the XXXXXXXXX for the reasons stated.</p> <p>Yours</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I wish to register my support for a restriction on the Track from Newland towards Birchamp Wood (500034)</p> <p>I have XXXXXXXXXX and have used the path for walking, cycling and horse riding. I have noticed a severe deterioration in the condition of the path both in appearance and in the flora and fauna.</p> <p>When I first move to the village there was a small working party who used to clear broken branches and the odd fallen stone from the lower end of the path ensuring that others could use the path. Having travelled down the path on horseback yesterday taking particular interest in the ground that I was riding on there are significant areas with ruts up to two foot deep, fallen trees due to erosion of the sides of the path and numerous fallen stones.</p> <p>The deterioration of the path means that I am no longer able to cycle up or down the path and I guess only very experienced mountain bikers are able to travel along now.</p> <p>I rarely use the path during the winter months due to the extensive mud which appears in the ruts after continuous rain. These ruts which have been made by the motorised vehicles which have been driving down</p>

	<p>the path in recent years and you can clearly see where the cars have been stuck and damage due to wheel spin. I have had the unpleasant fortune to meet 4 wheel drives in convoy when walking on foot and had to retrace my steps for fear of getting crushed on the side of the narrow path. Not only that I felt as if I was being pushed down the path at pace in order for the cars to continue their travel.</p> <p>I have also been on horseback when motorbikes have been using the path and whilst the motorcyclists were polite and on this occasion switched off their cycles it was still intimidating to hear the engines making their way up on a track which would have been difficult to change direction due to the condition of the path underneath.</p> <p>During Covid my Partner and I would use the path to walk to Coleford and get provisions for some of the elderly relatives who were unable to go out – this was very positive for our mental health and due to the dry weather at the time and no motorised vehicles a very pleasant experience. The path also has an historic use by All Saints Church where there are pilgrimages from Coleford to All Saints Church on occasion accompanied by the Bishop of Gloucester.</p> <p>Whilst the above objections refer to recreational use of the path I have also noticed a total change to the footpath with regard to the vegetation which grew up the sides including wild flowers and on occasion mushrooms. These areas are now bare and stony</p> <p>I would hope that if motor vehicles were excluded for recreational use on this path that over time the damage that has been caused may be repaired by nature. I cannot see how this path could be restored any other way.</p>
XXXXXXX	<p>Dear XXXXXXXXX,</p> <p>TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES RESTRICTION ON A SECTION OF THE 500034 TRACK FROM NEWLAND TOWARDS BIRCHAM WOOD, NEWLAND, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.</p> <p>I am writing in support of this scheme. As someone who regularly XXXXXX track, it has become hazardous to ride or walk dogs along, particularly over the last 10 years. The erosion of the banks and the ruts made by such large groups of off road vehicles is hugely damaging to the flora and sides and walls of this ancient path. It was, after all, never intended for anything other than people, horses and carts.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>

XXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I would like to give my strongest support to the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting motor vehicles on the XXXXXX in Newland and the other country pathways in the area.</p> <p>Whether these lanes are described as roads or pathways, they certainly should not be a playground for 4-wheel drive vehicles and scrambler motorcycles. The use by motor vehicles is increasing as news of the uneven surfaces, narrow, winding and muddy lanes spreads to the wider off-roading zealots. This type of use is dangerous and unsuitable for such narrow lanes and precludes use by walkers, horse riders and cyclists. When walking along the path, there is nowhere to stand to get out of the way from these often fast moving vehicles. Someone will get injured if the lanes continue to be used as an off-roading playground.</p> <p>It is interesting that these vehicles often have no registration plates, surely a requirement on a road.</p> <p>The damage caused to the pathways means that walking along them, even once the off-roaders have gone, becomes difficult and dangerous.</p> <p>It seems that Newland and the surrounding areas is becoming attractive for off-roading use and a trail is being established linking the various ancient pathways by trespassing on private land in order to link the pathways.</p> <p>At the Newland Parish Council meeting last night (7 March 2023), it was suggested that there was a single organised group of off-roaders who would make any necessary repairs if damage was caused. This is surely madness! Would the council allow any other road user to damage a road, leaving it in a dangerous state for other users until those causing the damage eventually got round to repairing it? As I am sure you are aware, the more difficult the terrain, the more of a thrill it is for off-roaders, so there would be very little incentive for them to mend it!</p> <p>I urge you to impose this TRO as soon as you are able, before someone gets hurt.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
XXXXXXX	Dear XXXXX,

	<p>I wanted to give our full support for the closure to traffic of the road from Bircham wood down to Newland. I know from talking to people using the track the relief this will bring.</p> <p>When my XXXXXXXX just down from the XXXXXX, we often walked the track down to Newland and to our local pub the Ostrich in Newland. It was a beautiful grassy track that was easy to walk. Just after our children were born a few years later we still walked the path regularly and it was still the same around ten years ago. Since then the use of the track for 4X4's and enduro motorcycles has made the path virtually unwalkable and dangerous. The width of the path is so narrow that there is no room for a vehicle without causing damage to the sides of the track and pulling the supporting dry stone walls down. The undercutting of the walls has destroyed many parts this historic path that was created over the centuries, to carry coffins by foot to Newland Church. The path has become so deeply rutted as well as unpleasantly slushy/muddy, it has made it difficult to walk and if you meet the vehicles that now use it, you have to retreat a long distance quickly to avoid injury, to let them pass. Not nice with children and dogs. If the vehicles have to stop it is often difficult for them to start again so they resist stopping, especially when in wet muddy conditions which they are now, making them dangerous to encounter and frightening not just for humans but for dogs and horses walking the path.</p> <p>What was a delightful visually stunning short cut for pedestrians to Newland is now so bad we mainly go by road to Newland even though it was previously a lovely walk with children and dogs.</p> <p>We are but one XXXXXX the path even now and I know they miss the country pathway it was. We will all be very grateful if it is left to grass over again and not have the hazard of vehicles using it. The route is just unnecessarily used because it has become a muddy difficult challenge for 4X4's and motorbike. There is a perfectly good and short road bypassing it on both sides, for vehicles to use, it serves no purpose for road vehicles other than self gratification of 4X4 drivers and enduro motorcyclists. There are plenty of areas they can practice their activities on private land without offending and endangering the public.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, XXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXX XXXXXXX	<p>Hello.</p> <p>We live XXXXXXXXXX and the XXXXXXXXXXXX the historical burial path.</p>

	<p>We are increasingly worried about the fleets of old 4x4 vehicles in convoy ruining this path. The noise, the mud and the damage are completely unacceptable.</p> <p>We used to walk here regularly but it is now impassable</p> <p>We urge you to put a stop to it without further delay</p>
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROHIBITION OF DRIVING RESTRICTIONS ON COXBURY LANE, REDBROOK</p> <p>TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES RESTRICTION ON A SECTION OF THE 500034 TRACK FROM NEWLAND TOWARDS BIRCHAM WOOD, NEWLAND, GLOUCESTERSHIRE</p> <p>The Parish Council has been in discussions with representatives of the Green Lane Association, the Forest of Dean Land Rover Group and the Motor Enthusiasts Groups expressing our concern over the damage being done to 'Green Lanes' in the parish, whilst accepting that the two cases under consideration above relate to Class 5 highways. Coxbury Lane is road number 50029 and is hard surfaced over the length indicated in the draft Order. The road in case 2 is numbered 50034 and is unsurfaced and subject to serious damage.</p> <p>Representations from residents affected by the use of the roads by motor vehicles were made at our Parish Council meeting last evening and can be summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When was it designated as a road? • Could / should it be downgraded to a footpath? • High pressure water main under the surface - could be damaged causing flooding in Newland and loss of water supply. (Highway 50034) • Access by aged / disabled is impossible and therefore discriminatory, motor vehicle activity is the only sport which curtails other activities • Use will increase by other groups as word spreads among clubs • Promises by clubs to repair and maintain are "fanciful" • Vehicles are leaving the roads in question and travelling over private land, in some cases preventing the landowner access, and opening the landowner to possible action for accidents on the land

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles will be damaged with a real risk of oil and other liquids leaking and entering the watercourse • Non road legal motor cycles being used on recognised roads and green lane (which are technically highways) • Horse riding impossible for last 3 years due to surface damage, speed and noise of vehicles spooking animals • High risk of accidents from vehicles not slowing down • If there was an accident who would be liable? • There are around 10 activity groups seriously affected by motor vehicle activity and only 2 or 3 which benefit • These 'green lanes' would never be designated as highways today. <p>The question of who had been consulted was raised, and although we note your claim that an "extensive resident's consultation has been carried out", the effects of the use of these roads by motor vehicles go far wider; there are those from outside the immediate area who use them (or once used them, when the surfaces were acceptable) for recreation. Bear in mind also this is a tourist area (encouragement and promotion of which is a key objective of the District Council Local plan), and the continued use of these roads goes against that plan.</p> <p>The offer to repair the roads surfaces by motor enthusiasts' groups was considered, but the general feeling of the residents at the meeting was that these offers were 'fanciful' and would not be practically effective.</p> <p>Newland Parish Council, on behalf of its residents and visitors strongly SUPPORTS the making of the proposed Order and would seek to have it extended to other such highways in the parish.</p> <p>Yours very truly</p>
XXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Scheme Ref: 5227-40 Newland</p> <p>I live in XXXXXX. I would like to support the proposal to prohibit the use of motor vehicles along the burial path.</p> <p>Having tried to use the path it is in a very poor state and as such poses a danger to animals and people. I agree with all of the statements below.</p>

- For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.
 - Motorcycles have no registration plates, and as such should not be on the paths/roads.
 - As they are not registered it is difficult to see how they are legally monitored for safety and suitability.
 - The riders do not take into account other users of the land and put them at risk. High Gage Farm XXXXXXX from 4x4 trying to extend their off-road adventures by going on to their land, XXXXXXX.
 - Although it is described as a recognised sport, there are no indications that all of these individuals belong to regulated sporting bodies who set down safety restrictions or show consideration to the public.
- For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular
 - Although the Burial Path (French Lane and Rockfield road which should also be covered by this order as they are used in the same way by these vehicles), was in the mists of time registered as a highway, the fact that the GCC does not maintain it, and that it is no longer suitable to sustain the amount of rough use it is getting, means it's classification should be reviewed.
 - There are 2 signs positioned at each end of the Burial path, clearly stating that the burial path is unsuitable for vehicles. This should indicate to the drivers of these vehicles that they should not be using it at all. I find it interesting that council can not identify where these signs came from, as no independent person would pay for them and get them erected without permission. If they had the council would have had them removed.
- Traffic in a manner which is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.
 - The off roaders have been known to pick up large stones and chuck them over the fence of the burial path to allow their vehicles to pass. This results in damage to the landowner's property and additional costs to have these boulders removed, so they do not interfere with any machinery used in the field.
- For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Horse riders can no longer use the Burial Path (Rockfield road or French Lane) because the surface is now covered with exposed moving stones which could result in a horse breaking its leg, and tipping its rider. ○ There is very little in the way of flora remaining down the path as the regular tracking of vehicles has removed existing plants, and the regular agitation of the soil precludes seedling recolonisation. ○ The vehicular damage to these routes have lost their surface sufficiently that when it rains water gushes down moving stones and more mud to the entrance. ○ The vehicles are mounting the sides of the track, which dislodges the sides resulting in further damage. ● To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway. ○ The riders are not local, but travel down in larger vehicles transporting their motorcycles to the forest, so they leave the damage they cause without any detriment to their own habitats.. ○ The motorcycle riders show little concern for the walkers who are showered with stones kicked up by their wheels as they race past. This is intimidating. ○ There are very few places of safety to move out of their way, and they do not show any concern by slowing down to allow you to reach a place of safety. ● Intrusive noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I would also add the engine noise generated by these fast moving vehicles grinding up and down Newland pathways disturbs the tranquillity of the area; ○ The noise generally lasts for hours not minutes so it can not be ignored; It is not like white noise which blends into the background. ○ These events tend to be held at the weekends and holidays, which in the summer, means we rarely have days without this invasive noise, which travels. ○ Most people moved to the village for peace, riding, walking cycling, bird song, mindfulness, a slower pace of life and to get closer to the natural order of things, this is blasted out of the park by these people and their vehicles.
--	--

	XXXXXX
XXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I have already put in a letter of support in relation to this scheme. It may not be relevant, but at a meeting of Newland Parish Council, a Mark Holder of the Motor Enthusiasts Group claimed that the County Council was derogating in its duty not to maintain the Burial Path to a standard suitable for the use of 4x4s. Bearing in mind the damage that the 4x4s occasion on any trip, we found this to be an odd claim. However, I thought that you might be interested in a document which seems to confirm what we had always believed to be the position.</p> <p>In XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXX through Newland on one side and the Burial Path on the other. As a XXXXXX, he XXXXXX. XXXXXXXXX is a local search dated 1965 a copy of which I enclosed, in which the Registrar confirms that the Burial Path is only maintainable as a bridleway. I have seen nothing to establish that GCC decided to up their maintenance obligations at any time after that. I am aware that this doesn't go to the heart of the issue. However, I do not think that locals would be enthusiastic about GCC spending large sums of their money on making this way more commodious for 4 x 4 vehicles.</p> <p>Yours XXXXXX</p>
XXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir Madam,</p> <p>Re: 5227/40 Burial Path Newland and Coxbury Lane Redbrook Gloucestershire.</p> <p>I am XXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX in the Newland / Redbrook area and all over the country for forty years, so I strongly object to any vehicle restrictions on the above roads.</p> <p>My experience has shown that the vast majority of users of these legal rights of way get along very well and enjoy a social chat whenever we meet on these lanes. Horse riders in particular thank us for stopping and killing our engines. I don't see the need to close these lanes for motorcycles. I have two important points; the first I would like to mention, is when lanes have been closed in the past, it causes more traffic in the local villages than before. A typical example of this is in Brockweir. XXXXXX, cross Brockweir bridge then just up the hill, XXXXXX up Mill Hill, which used to be legal for motorcycles. XXXXXXXX on the road right through the whole village for several miles before reaching the top of the lane which used to bypass Brockweir. My</p>

	<p>second point is I have tried to ride green lanes that have been closed in the past on my mountain bike, only to find that since closing them for motor vehicles, no one uses them or keeps them clear from fallen trees etc., so they are no longer passable even for walkers. Surely there is enough room in the countryside for us all to enjoy our hobbies, without the need to cut them out for the unfortunate few. At the end of the day this country has many footpaths and bridleways that we are unable to use on XXXXXXXX, so is it so wrong for the tiny percentage of lanes that are still legal XXXXXX open?</p> <p>If, as I'm guessing, illegal riding is happening on these roads, an order to restrict them will have no impact on these riders, XXXXXXXXXXXX people using and living by them, will cease to be able to enjoy them.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I wish to express my support to prohibit motor vehicles from using the <i>track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034) from a point approximately 147 metres east of its junction with Road from Swanpool Wood to junction with Almhouse Road (C357) for a distance of approximately 728 metres in a north-easterly direction.</i></p> <p>The reasons for my support are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX the route known as the 'Burial Path' which is a historic path used for centuries by residents of Coleford who transported their dead along the path for burial in Newland until 1867. The use by motorised vehicles (mostly 4x4 cars in convoys) has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. eroded the structure of the path by creating deep ruts which fill with water making it difficult to walk along it. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX a safe route along the path but in a few years time, these ruts will make it impossible for XXXXXXXX along the path – as such I believe the deep ruts create an age-discriminatory environment. b. created a danger to walkers and horse-riders as its narrowness prevents safe passing points c. adversely impacted the peace and tranquility of this historic route 2. The proposed plan, indeed, refers to the 'Path' also known as the 'Burial Path' and the dictionary definition of a path is a route for walkers. 3. I know of no other recreational activity where users can adversely impact the use and enjoyment of others without even clearing up the mess they've made to the environment (land, noise and fumes) and impacts other users' safety!

	<p>4. If nothing is done to prevent motor vehicles (particularly 4x4s and trail-bikes) destroying the Burial Path, a route which has been used by local residents for centuries, it will be <u>unusable by anyone</u> within just a few years. Indeed, as word spreads about its use, 4x4 users will become more prevalent and the path will be destroyed at an even faster rate.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my submission in support of the proposed prohibition.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX have asked me to forward this to you in support of the above.</p> <p>Please would you acknowledge receipt.</p> <p>Yours</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>

	<p style="text-align: right;">[REDACTED]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">05.03.2023</p> <p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>[REDACTED] A footpath crosses this route between The Village Room and High Meadow and The Scowles.</p> <p>Both of these areas have campsites which produce a fair number of walkers – visitors [REDACTED]. These are either aiming to visit the Church and/or The Ostrich, or making the longer trek to Redbrook. Unfortunately a frequent grumble is the disgusting state of the Burial Path stating that it is not fit for use by pedestrians or cyclists due to the muddy surface and the depth of the ruts. Some have been confronted with 4-wheeled vehicles and found there was no safe place for them to pass.</p> <p>[REDACTED] to look at the area. We were dressed in summer clothing including open toed sandals and our only complaint was that the fallen holly leaves were very uncomfortable on bare toes! The surface was by no means smooth but not impassable as it is today.</p> <p>Apart from the mess for walkers the mud washes into the drains, blocking them both in the lower end of the Burial Path and into the through route between Clearwell and Redbrook. This road is narrow enough without the frequency of drain cleaning vehicles to be needed time and again.</p> <p>It would be nice to see the Burial Path returned to a usable state, but as long as motor cycles and 4-wheeled vehicles belt up and down it that will not be possible.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I wish to register my support for a restriction on the Track from Newland towards Birchamp Wood (500034)</p> <p>I XXXXXXXXXX and have used the path for walking, cycling XXXXXX. I have noticed a severe deterioration in the condition of the path both in appearance and in the flora and fauna.</p> <p>When I first move to the village there was a small working party who used to clear broken branches and the odd fallen stone from the lower end of the path ensuring that others could use the path. Having travelled down the path on horseback yesterday taking particular interest in the</p>

ground that XXXXXXXXX are significant areas with ruts up to two foot deep, fallen trees due to erosion of the sides of the path and numerous fallen stones.

The deterioration of the path means that XXXXXXXXXXXXX and I guess only very experienced mountain bikers are able to travel along now.

I rarely use the path during the winter months due to the extensive mud which appears in the ruts after continuous rain. These ruts which have been made by the motorised vehicles which have been driving down the path in recent years and you can clearly see where the cars have been stuck and damage due to wheel spin. I have had the unpleasant fortune to meet 4 wheel drives in convoy when walking on foot and had to retrace my steps for fear of getting crushed on the side of the narrow path. Not only that I felt as if I was being pushed down the path at pace in order for the cars to continue their travel.

I have also XXXXXXXXX have been using the path and whilst the motorcyclists were polite and on this occasion switched off their cycles it was still intimidating to hear the engines making their way up on a track which would have been difficult to change direction due to the condition of the path underneath.

During Covid XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX to Coleford and get provisions for some of the XXXXXX who XXXXXX – this was very positive for our mental health and due to the dry weather at the time and no motorised vehicles a very pleasant experience. The path also has an historic use by All Saints Church where there are pilgrimages from Coleford to All Saints Church on occasion XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX.

Whilst the above objections refer to recreational use of the path I have also noticed a total change to the footpath with regard to the vegetation which grew up the sides including wild flowers and on occasion mushrooms. These areas are now bare and stony

	<p>I would hope that if motor vehicles were excluded for recreational use on this path that over time the damage that has been caused may be repaired by nature. I cannot see how this path could be restored any other way.</p> <p>XXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Hello, I refer to your drawing 5227-40-002.</p> <p>Have or will TRO Ltd be doing a site visit to this Road please? And do you travel along the Road and report on the condition, etc?</p> <p>When XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX visited the site we found that the circumstances were completely different to what was written in the TRO Application.</p> <p>Thus, we are anxious to see your Report to see if there is any concurrence.</p> <p>Please let me know.</p> <p>XXXXXXX</p> <p>Dear Sir &/or Madam, Please find my objection Response document and 6 accompanying referred attachments.</p> <p>I must please ask for acknowledgement of due submission, because i am assured that i am on the list to receive TRO notices, etc and have received nothing.</p> <p>Best regards, XXXXXXX.</p> <p>Please take this as our objection</p> <p>Ongoing neglect by Gloucestershire County Council comes to a head in Newland Parish</p>

Why Newland?

This Parish includes the large villages of Clearwell, Newland, and Redbrook; and several hamlets. Newland is the exception here – historically, although assarted from the forest, it was settled mostly by nobility who made large houses and estates, some as large as 800 acres. There were artisans settled prior to that, but mostly in the ‘rougher’ lower part of the village. Its church, although not the oldest in the Forest of Dean, is possibly after modification over the centuries the largest in the district. Locally, it is known as: “The Cathedral of the Forest”. The houses clustered around the church are the heart of the village, and it is said to be one of the prettiest in England.

Today, that pattern of settlement continues, except nowadays the ‘nobility’ is instead people often from the south-east of England who can afford to buy in. It is ‘gentrified’.

Newland is special, and the people deserve special treatment.

How have matters become so dire in Newland Parish?

It's a combination of many factors.

The whole Forest of Dean district is seen as ‘here fear ye dragons’ by many. I was on a fore-runner of the Local Access Forum for many years, and the PRoW Manager spoke of

‘The Forest’ as a distant place, where his staff and jurisdiction rarely ventured. It was portrayed as a run-down area, and did not justify much effort.

Consider, too, that the Definitive Map of PRoW for ‘The Forest’ was not completed until the mid-1980s. The process nationally and county-wide was set off by the 1949 Act, and started in earnest in the early 1950s. I used OS maps in the 1980s, and in the ‘key’ for PRoW was “Extent of available information” with a c. 1” square representation of the whole map with an area shaded in pink. Where it was white (un-shaded) the Definitive Map of PRoW was not available. No Footpaths, no bridleways, no road used as public paths, and no byway open to

all traffic. So PRoW were very, very late coming to the Forest. Some 30 years late.

Further, in the Forest of Dean in general, there is a huge tract of Crown land where few PRoW were either not allowed to be established in the first place, or were chopped out at Draft map stages.

Looking at today's maps for PRoW around Newland village shows very few.

However, the village does have a relatively high concentration of 'Green Roads'. There are three radiating from Newland village, with one of these leading to Redbrook, and a fourth leading from Redbrook to elsewhere.

Newland parish, as well as being beyond the 'forbidden' (or even foreboding) Forest of Dean, is at the absolute far-flung corner of Gloucestershire. Thus it is at the bottom of the list for everything. I have experienced similar in other counties: e.g. in Herefordshire, in the southern-most extent there is wide-spread flouting and lack of enforcement of Planning laws; and problems with PRoW never seem to get sorted – a footpath undermined by a building site is still closed after 22 years.

There are, let's just call them 'influential people' in the village, and there are: let's call them people who want to make their way and fit in (peer group admiration) in the village. The former largely remain behind the scenes, letting others do their risky work, and leave it to the aspirants to stick their necks out in the political arena.

The XXXXXXX is the first layer of Government, and seemingly one XXXXXXXX have taken up the project to get the Roads closed to motor vehicles. Note that XXXXXXXXX is the only XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. This project is in the Newland Parish Plan, which includes inflammatory (wind-up) terms.

Goings-on concerning issues with the Green Roads, and possible bans were not known to general motor (probably not others too) user groups until mid-2022, and then only by chance of some keen person reading NPC minutes online. I was invited at short notice after another person was called to work to attend a regular NPC meeting.

Before that I went on a trip to examine all four of the Green Roads mentioned in the NPC Minutes, so I knew the current condition. I reviewed information about Traffic Regulation Orders

– GCC website, Statutes, and Guidance Documents.

I attended the ordinary XXXXX, and it was dominated by the XXXXXXXXXXXX (who said many incorrect and unhelpful things), no-one else dared speak even when asked a question by me, and I had a rough reception. Attachment is a write-up of the meeting XXXXXXXXXXXX, including significant offers:

A colleague attended a later meeting and by now the ice was starting to thaw.

Soon after I organised a site visit to Road 50034, and it was made by representatives from motor enthusiasts' groups, the XXXXXXXXXXXX, and XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX on behalf of everyone (XXXXXXXXXXXX and anyone else interested or from the village).

I have composed a much more comprehensive Report: involving many more visits by me to the Road, a day in GCC Record Office (County Archives), several days in Coleford library, several contacts with GCC Highways, discussions with the XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX, discussion with the XXXXXXXX, going through 55 documents in a Planning Application next to this Road, and much other investigation. However, that Report is not completed, mainly because the research on 'The Burial Path' notion is not fully written up.

We also made FOI requests on many other issues around these TROs, and attach one of the responses, a 97-page pdf mainly with correspondence between the two XXXXXXXXXXXX, **the then** XXXXXXXXXXXX). NPC Minutes call him XXXXXXXXXXXX, **but that is wrong**. There are four XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.

Then, after nearly a year in the queue, it was announced that GCC were to release a consultation on the Newland TROs. Naturally, XXXXXXXX would not tell me what was in the application, and we had to make a FOI request.

After that the attached Report was issued to most XXXXXXXXXXXX:

We XXXXXXXXXXXX and with good notice invited all of those on the Report's circulation, plus

the XXXXXXXX, to a meeting. The XXXXXXX came, but only one XXXXXXXXXX not invited had written a comment XXXXXXXXXX, and after that most dropped out on the afternoon of the evening meeting.

Peer pressure in a small community can be very strong.

At the XXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX the whole issue including that Report, and for some the Report was a bit too 'near to the bone'. New Reports were written, and these were sent out in reasonable time for the next tabled monthly Parish Council meeting. They were (see attached):

The list of Conservation Solutions was essentially a review of the list in the first-released Report. XXXXXXXXXX vote on the acceptance (or not) of the Report(s) to be put on the agenda for the up-coming NPC meeting. No acknowledgement.

I attended the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX as public, and the item was on the agenda – as it and many other unresolved general tarmac road issues have been on the agenda as a permanent fixture for years.

I XXXXXXXXXX. It was briefly discussed. Some Parish Councillors had the odd negative point. XXXXXXXXXX was not content. Full Council at the beginning of the meeting, but before this item one had walked out in disgust at an earlier item – **vote 6 in favour**. This was to be sent, with some sort of covering letter, as NPC's response to [their own application] the TRO consultation.

Following the meeting, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX probably **lobbied using the various email lists and Facebook groups in the village** to drum up support for his view – his email, my response, and several other emails below:

At the end of that thread XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX would be discussed at the NPC extra meeting a week after the meeting on the 28 Feb 2023.

No response – so effectively a **SECRET ITEM** on the agenda.

XXXXXXXXXX meeting on 7 March 2023 in case it was discussed. XXXXXX before the meeting, and XXXXXXXXX complained that XXXXXXXXXXXX.

Around 35 (the Clerk reports 29) people turned up, as had been herded. There was nearly an hour for the item, when mostly public spoke. Only about 10 people spoke, but some several times. After that the NPC had to suspend Standing Orders and re-voted.

As would be expected, under the eyes of such a huge crowd, the previous vote was overturned unanimously. **For Parish Councillors to vote otherwise would have been political and community suicide.**

The comment was made that all of the people at the meeting could have got involved before, as the item (and its lead up) had been on the Agendas for a very long time.

After this meeting, XXXXXXXXXX put the following (shown in serif font):

1. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROHIBITION OF DRIVING RESTRICTIONS ON COXBURY LANE, REDBROOK**
2. **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SCHEME: IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES RESTRICTION ON A SECTION OF THE 500034 TRACK FROM NEWLAND TOWARDS BIRCHAM WOOD, NEWLAND, GLOUCESTERSHIRE**

The Parish Council has been in discussions with representatives of the XXXXXXXXXXXX, the XXXXXXXXXXXX and the XXXXXXXXXXXX expressing our concern over the damage being done to 'Green Lanes' in the parish, whilst accepting that the two cases under consideration above

relate to Class 5 highways. Coxbury Lane is road number 50029 and is hard surfaced over the length indicated in the draft Order. The road in case 2 is numbered 50034 and is unsurfaced and subject to serious damage.

Representations from residents affected by the use of the roads by motor vehicles were made at our Parish Council meeting last evening and can be summarised thus:

- When was it designated as a road?

My comment: they still don't know after years of correspondence with GCC. **None of the public at the meeting knew it was a Road**, mainly because GCC PRoW (Road is not a PRoW) had erected 'Path' signs, and also a 'Public Footpath' sign at one end. Answer — certainly in 1761 (see end of file "Report to Newland Parish Councillors ...").

- Could / should it be downgraded to a footpath?

My comment: they still don't know after years of correspondence with GCC. **What about bridlepath users?**

- High pressure water main under the surface - could be damaged causing flooding in Newland and loss of water supply. (Highway 50034)

My comment: **is this true?** We see this common tactic in TRO applications, and no-one checks if it is true.

- Access by aged / disabled is impossible and therefore discriminatory, motor vehicle activity is the only sport which curtails other activities

	<p>My comment: they have not looked at what is causing the problems. It was said in the meeting by the XXXXXX that motor use was a “sport”, and that led to lots of public anguish. Prejudice too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use will increase by other groups as word spreads among clubs <p>My comment: a common fallacy, but does not happen in reality. It is a Road, and has been shown very clearly as ‘ORPA’ (red spots on OS LR maps) since mid-1980s, and has been on GCC’s ‘List of Streets’ since early 1930s.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promises by clubs to repair and maintain are “fanciful” <p>My comment: the people seem to blinded by prejudice and can’t see what is ‘spoiling’ the condition of the Road. So the repair solutions mean nothing to them – especially when their Messianic leader XXXXXXXXXX says they are lies and says that all the poor state of the road is due to motor vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles are leaving the roads in question and travelling over private land, in some cases preventing the landowner access, and opening the landowner to possible action for accidents on the land <p>My comment: irrelevant to this TRO. This is French Lane, land owned by retired lawyers. The use is illegal, so must be sorted by Police before even considering a TRO. Also likely that usual landowner obligations have not been met. Also total lack of GCC signage for this Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles will be damaged with a real risk of oil and other liquids leaking and entering the watercourse <p>My comment: let’s TRO all Roads for this reason?</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Non road legal motor cycles being used on recognised roads and green lane (which are technically highways) <p>My comment: This use is illegal, so must be sorted by Police before even considering a TRO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Horse riding impossible for last 3 years due to surface damage, speed and noise of vehicles spooking animals <p>My comment: horse riders do not seem to have this problem elsewhere. Comment from one horse rider only. Prejudice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• High risk of accidents from vehicles not slowing down <p>My comment: based on prejudice rather than any actual incidents. No-one said that they had actually met vehicles on the Green Roads, but many claimed to have seen huge groups. Prejudice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If there was an accident who would be liable? <p>My comment: surely someone should find out? Not put it in a TRO consultation. Same as any other road. No reports of accidents. Prejudice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are around 10 activity groups seriously affected by motor vehicle activity and only 2 or 3 which benefit
--	---

My comment: gross exaggeration! Prejudice again. The public impression was that vehicles and foot users (their interest) and others were in great danger. Yet no-one claimed to have met a vehicle!

- These 'green lanes' would never be designated as highways today.

My comment: an arcane argument. Would they? Would we even get more footpaths or bridleways today? Not according to the CLA and NFU! **Vehicles on unsealed Public Roads is a recognised sustainable activity (by Defra, etc), with economic and health benefits.**

The question of who had been consulted was raised, and although we note your claim that an "extensive resident's consultation has been carried out", the effects of the use of these roads by motor vehicles go far wider; there are those from outside the immediate area who use them (or once used them, when the surfaces were acceptable) for recreation. Bear in mind also this is a tourist area (encouragement and promotion of which is a key objective of the District Council Local plan), and the continued use of these roads goes against that plan.

My comment: **it is unlikely that 'amenity groups', etc have been consulted. I am on the list and I heard nothing!** Use of Green Roads by vehicles is good for tourism!

The offer to repair the roads surfaces by motor enthusiasts' groups was considered, but the general feeling of the residents at the meeting was that these offers were 'fanciful' and would not be practically effective.

My comment: **we doubt if many had read them** — XXXXXXXX dismissed them as lies and just a sign. **Plus no-one seemed to understand the causes and then the remedies — they are lay people anyway.**

XXXXXXXXXX residents and visitors strongly **SUPPORTS** the making of the proposed Order and would seek to have it extended to other such highways in the parish.

My comment: after all that they have been told by GCC, motor users, etc – they are still saying that an order can be put out for consultation but changed during the process!

At the NPC meeting, there was a lot more said by the public, but my over-riding impression is that much of what was said was based on a few incidents of off-piste driving from French Lane, i.e. illegal use.

No-one knew it was a Road, so they think all vehicle use is illegal.

The GCC ‘path’ signs also say it is a ‘path’ – and **everyone knows that you don’t drive on a path.**

What was concerning was that a Parish Councillor expressed grave concern about, and he exaggerated every aspect (for effect – as people do to make a convincing story): **electric bicycles** now, silent, as dangerous as motorbikes, they have modified them to go fast. Looks like they will just whittle down until there are no users.

Another concerning item was the public statement that the Police had been told about XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, who had provided reg plates and descriptions. It was claimed that the Police said they could do nothing about the one vehicle because it had a cloned reg plate, and **nothing about the second because it was from Oxfordshire and that is outside their [Glos Police] area. That leaves everyone in the room believing that the Police can do nothing about any illegal use, especially if the drivers are from outside the county.**

Overall, it seemed that most concerns were based on fear of what could happen. This is the same that the XXXXXX at the XXXXXX into a PoD TRO (not made) on the Ridgeway put in his summing-up Report.

GCC, and it seems with the help of others such as the XXXXXXX, need to work to solve all of the little things that are leading to such fears on these Green Roads. A PoD TRO is not the answer.

CONCLUSIONS

The problem starts a long way back. Signposting of RUPPs from early 1950s with the misleading (and therefore illegal under two Acts) "Public Path" (they are carriageways, which is completely different to a path in law) — and **everyone knows that you don't drive on a path.**

GCC duty FAILED

Only a handful of the c. 400 RUPPs were re-classified (a duty starting in 1968, then again in 1981), and that was mostly to resolve landowners' access disputes.

GCC duty FAILED

GCC leaflets, staff training, and **general information is poor - especially concerning recreational MPV (mechanically propelled vehicle) use.** They even had policies against it.

GCC duty FAILED

The fore-runner of the LAF was ineffective on carriageways. GCC refused to accept that higher-rights routes should have more priority to keep in good order as they can be used by the whole diversity of users. Conversely, the policy seemed to be: '**don't do any maintenance - let them get in a mess, then we or someone else will get them shut (for various reasons)**'. Very often, the 'mess' is little if anything to do with MPV use – as in this case, where the problem is a falling roadside wall.

GCC duty FAILED

There are only 4 miles of Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) in Glos (figures from current ROW&CAIP). GCC refused to accept Government Guidance in 'Making the Best of Byways', and a good longish BOAT that once had 'Public Byway' signs was changed to 'Restricted Byway'

signs – **two years later after constant reports, they still have not been corrected.**

GCC duty FAILED

All along there was a network of some 200 qty totalling around 98 miles of unsealed Public Roads on GCC'S 'List of Streets'. In around 1995, they were put as Other Route with Public Access (ORPA) on OS maps – which would lead to other (non-motor) users enjoying them much more. A bit more multi-user pressure. Of course, the MPV users had to be specialists in the 'hidden maps', and were quite familiar with these Roads all along. GCC Highways seemed to have the policy to neglect this network – certainly not to see it as a recreational and tourism asset. It was kept secret – nothing on GCC's website. Also a policy to not indicate status 'on the ground' by such as signage – in the 97-page FOI response is an email from **Kath Haworth saying not to sign these routes. Why?**

GCC duty FAILED

Then along came the CROW Act in 2000 and the NERC Act in 2006. Firstly, with the 'inverting' of the Definitive Map of PRoW, all the Roads that had been dual-recorded at a lower status (e.g. recoding a footpath on a Road) meant that all of those routes were lost to MPVs. Distance lost not known. Secondly, because of the failure to re-classify the vast majority of RUPPs (as had happened properly in nearly all other counties in England and Wales) meant that they overnight became 'Restricted Byways' – not open to MPVs. That meant that 134 miles was lost from the MPV network. So a network of Green Roads of c. 600 routes totalling c. 232 miles + others uncalculated was reduced overnight to c. 200 routes totalling c. 98 miles + 4 miles of BOAT (some later mis-signed). This 'spread' is important – it sets out the kind of tour that a MPV user might make. (Note that there are 2840 miles of footpaths). On the ground it means that **MPV users are now 'funnelled' into around 1/3 of the previous network, and this will lead to more use on each Green Road, which might need more management.**

GCC duty FAILED

From other FOI requests we found out that **GCC have abandoned roads** (we don't know which). A request revealed a 'Site History Report' for this Road (after trying the same

request many times – Highways were really obstructive), and no activity since 2005. We don't know what happened before that. No inspections; and any public reports are effectively ignored. Even my email about the danger of falling stones on this Road did not appear (it normally would).

GCC duty FAILED

From FOI responses and our discussions with the Local and Area Highways Managers, we discover that **inspections were stopped on many Green Roads years ago** - possibly going against Government Guidelines and certainly against basic duties. See box just below:

Just a reminder:

Any Highway Authority knows that it has has a duty to both maintain highways and 'assert and protect' the rights of the public to 'use and enjoy' them. Also, from the Highways Act: the process for keeping the highways network properly used, well maintained, and well managed is:

- (1) **enforcement** (with other Authorities such as the Police, but signage would need to be correct) *only if needed*, then
- (2) **highway management, maintenance and repair** - and *only then if all that fails*
- (3) **traffic management** (such as bans and restrictions done under the Road Traffic Regulation Act – using Traffic Regulation Orders – TROs).

The HA knows that these should be done in that order, so, for example, they should not use traffic management when the two earlier measures have not at least been tried.

Nowadays, measures such as '**education**' might also be tried as an initial, cost-effective step.

GCC duty FAILED

Then, if that were not bad enough (the users can instead report issues if GCC won't be finding them) GCC have a '**fake' system for handling any reports made by the public on certain Roads** (not sure how they are chosen). They either don't respond or they go through the motions of acknowledging the phone call (emergencies only), email, or ReportIt system. Then some time later on another thread the public might get an email saying that the issue (often vaguely and worryingly reproduced) will be investigated. Then later (hopefully) on another thread the public will get a 'fake' report stating that the Inspector has looked, that there was nothing wrong, and here's a link to pdf of some huge GCC policy.

GCC duty FAILED

Another issue is that GCC make it difficult to report certain issues, because since launching ReportIt in 2016, there are **still some 34 Roads (GCC says) missing from it**. This causes all sorts of problems, because public and worryingly also GCC staff use it as 'gospel' to see if a route is 'publicly maintainable' by GCC. This Road is one of the 'missing' Roads, and was only put on after my insistence in 2022.

GCC duty FAILED

This Road has been signed '... Path ...' and even for a period 'Public Footpath' for many years. All the locals believe that it a path — and **everyone knows that you don't drive on a path.**

GCC duty FAILED

The **base map for ReportIt is also sometimes misleading**. On this Road we got OS to change "path (um)" to something else, but it could take years for the change to come in on ReportIt.

GCC duty FAILED

Another flaw in ReportIt is highlighted on Green Roads. There simply are not the standard 'drop-downs' to cover typical issues (e.g. a misleading sign). The PRoW option does offer most of what is needed, but not the Highways option. Although there is a box for additional information, that does not work because a low-trained person at GCC has to get

through hundreds of reports a day, and has to allocate a 'Code'. If there isn't a suitable code, then it founders. Either it won't happen or it just degenerates into non-sense.

GCC duty FAILED

Then there is the **problem of reports made to Highways**, and an utterly off-topic response coming back. Then the public emails back pointing this out, and referring back to the original report, and still the GCC response is utterly unrelated. Most of the time it is impossible to find out what, if anything, has been done – because the completion / closed email does not cover that.

GCC duty FAILED

I expressed concerns about the efficiency and fairness of the TRO process a while back. **I have an email from the Manager stating that I will be put on the consultees list for all TRO in Glos. I have had nothing since.**

GCC duty FAILED

Even a County Councillor asking for me to be sent the notification of this TRO came to nothing. Is it like Monmouthshire CC, where **they avoided consulting outside the usual list (Road Haulage Assoc, utilities, etc) because they wanted to avoid objections?**

GCC duty FAILED

Even the usual XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX on XXXXXX have not been notified. **Who has been 'cherry picked'?**

GCC duty FAILED

We have asked questions about **site surveys**, and have got no plain answer. I would have thought it sensible for someone skilled in Highways Inspections to go and have a look before a TRO went to consultation. It appears that this has not been done. This is so silly, because all the Road needs is some attention to the stones pushed out of the wall by expanding tree roots, and a general tidy-up / bit of care.

GCC duty FAILED

There it includes:

Consultation is key to achieve community buy-in and for local input to the design process. It can lead us to modify, redesign or even abandon our proposals. Consultees will normally include, but are not limited to:

- Police, Fire and Ambulance Services
- District, Town and Parish Councils
- Road Haulage Association, Freight Transport Association
- Residents or Resident Groups
- Chambers of Commerce
- Action Groups (Mobility, Cycling, Bus Operators, Taxi, CPRE)

This limited list (already possibly going beyond the legal requirement) is utterly inadequate for unsealed Roads, PRoW, etc – routes used mainly for recreation. At least the LAF reps should be a start point, thereafter the organisations listed in Annex A of Defra 'Rights of Way Circular' 1/09 – Guidance for Local Authorities, released 2009. **Do GCC even use this? Regardless of the list, if the basic duties of the Highways Act are going to be broken, then it makes good sense to involve users who have some input and useful knowledge of the overall recreation network. Failure to do something that is so obvious must be seen as a failure of basic duty.**

GCC duty FAILED

The GCC [LAF's] ROW&CAIP does vaguely mention CA (countryside access, i.e. other than PRoW), and vaguely alludes to unsealed Public Roads, but without actual mention. Also the whole document (I have searched on the pdf) **only mentions the word 'path', and never the word 'carriageway'**, so at present is greatly deficient. Plans to improve the document for next release do not address these routes. Should we wonder why?

GCC duty FAILED

There seems to be an **institutional bias against using any other word than 'path'** for unsealed routes. This might be a lack of training, but even when the 'error' is explained, the staff just carry on the same. **Are they under pressure from some unwritten policy?**

GCC duty FAILED

This problem even gets into consultations, such as Claims for BOATs, where **all the paperwork insists on calling everything a 'path'**.

GCC duty FAILED

The then XXXXXXXXXX, spent an incredible amount of time emailing (and we know not what other liaison) with his XXXXX in XXXXX and the XXXXXXXX. XXXXX contacted every Council department you could think of (and the Police – who just 'rubber-stamp' stuff on his say-so). All of this is clear to in the FOI Response document attached. **He should have done his duty and said: "This road is clearly suffering from stones being pushed by tree roots out of the sidewalls – let's see what GCC can do to get it sorted". Instead he did all the SECRET dealing with his few contacts, and told them that they needed a PoD TRO.**

GCC duty FAILED

On the site visit with the two Highways Managers, they explained that they only knew the basics of TROs, and there is a specialist GCC department to deal with the proper implementation and process. So why did XXXXXXX advise his contacts from NPC that a TRO was the way to go, and then help with all that is in the FOI response? **How many roads were not being fixed while he was messing about trying to put through a TRO for three people?**

GCC duty FAILED

It also appears that **GCC is quite content to put up 'fake' TRO signs**. A PoD TRO sign at Rock Lane, Coleford (at the meeting of the class 4 and class 6 stretches) was put up

(presumably by workers from Cannop depot), and many weeks after being reported to XXXXXXX and an admission that it does not have an Order, it is still there.

GCC duty FAILED

There may well be **another TRO sign that is 'fake'** at Wyegate Green. I queried this sign months ago in a clear report. I got one of GCC's special utterly off-topic responses back, and despite 're- submitting' in an email reply I got no-where. Now I suspect that since the Rock Lane is admitted fake, that this one is too.

GCC duty FAILED

XXXXXXXXXX email report to Highways about the situation that will be created by the proposed PoD TRO on the steps at **Coxbury Lane**. Again, I got one of GCC's special utterly off- topic responses back, and despite emailing back asking for the original email to be re-read I got no sense. XXXXXX unofficially that two potholes had been mended, but doubt if even this really happened.

GCC duty FAILED

I am sending again in two parts because it is over GCC limit, and i can't find out if TRO Ltd have the same situation.

PART ONE of TWO.

Again, please email receipt. We can't have you rejecting it because it is deemed late.

Best regards,
XXXXXXXXXXXX

I am sending again in two parts because it is over GCC limit, and i can't find out if TRO Ltd have the same situation.

	<p>PART TWO of TWO.</p> <p>This is the sixth attachment to the Response itself.</p> <p>Again, please email receipt. We can't have you rejecting it because it is deemed late.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>I am a XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX following roads:</p> <p>Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212</p> <p>Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear sir/madam</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX following roads:</p> <p>Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212</p> <p>Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have used these roads over the last XXXXXXXX experienced no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p>

	<p>Your sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>My name XXXXXXXXXX. I am writing to you regarding the Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting vehicles using the green lanes XXX XXXXXX.</p> <p>I have many reasons why these fantastic and beautiful lanes should remain open to vehicles.</p> <p>I have been XXXX XXXXXXXXXX and have spent a lot of time in the off-road environment and it has XXXXXXXXXX and a hobby which I love.</p> <p>I use these lanes among others to maintain my XXXXXXXXXX and practice certain techniques, so I can pass that on when I am teaching for work.</p> <p>When I leave XXXXXX, my goal and future career will be to remain XXXXXX.</p> <p>I have XXXXXXXXXX about the countryside and the outdoors in general and absolutely loves going XXXXXXXXXX. Which brings me on to my last point.</p> <p>I use these lanes because they are some of the best lanes in the southwest. They are amazing, and linked together can last a couple of hours when driving appropriately. This takes my XXXXXXXXXX reset and refocus.</p> <p>I really hope that the lanes remain open, and we can come up with some compromises within the community to help with both our needs and the needs of the local residents.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>

XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear sir/Madame</p> <p>I am a XXXXXXXXXXXX the following roads: Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212</p> <p>Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have used these roads over the last XXXXXX experienced no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I am a XXXXXXXXXX the following roads: Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212</p> <p>Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have used these roads for many years and experienced no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear info</p> <p>I am a XXXXXXXXXXXX of the following roads: Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212</p>

	<p>Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have used these roads over the XXXXXXXXXX and experienced no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>So excuse any weird typos, as replying while out and about .</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>We strongly object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order to prohibit vehicles using the above mentioned Green Lanes and the closure or partial closure of any Green Lanes in the Forest of Dean, especially the much loved Coxbury Land and the historic Burial Path.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX and have enjoyed driving these beautiful Lanes for XXXXXXXXX. Over the years they have become increasingly important to XXXXXXXX more restricted by how far we can walk.</p> <p>These Lanes offer the unique experience of going deep in the Forest to places of outstanding natural beauty steeped in peace and tranquility. We always greatly appreciate the overwhelming sense of well being and mental harmony, which appears to be in short supply in the modern day world.</p> <p>The Lanes are becoming increasingly popular with locals and visitors alike but there is enough room for all respectful users to enjoy. These range from family walkers with their dogs, cyclists, motor cyclists, horse riders and suitable vehicles.</p> <p>We all acknowledge each other's presence and frequently stop for a brief chat. Many of the users, especially equestrians, are grateful to see us in our vehicles as we keep the lanes clear and user friendly.</p> <p>We also retain a balance to the lane floors. If it was only used by two wheelers, the middle section would soon become deeply rutted to form a stream in very wet weather which would significantly erode the sides.</p> <p>We greatly enjoy using the Forest Lanes, usually with a few others making up a small group. The ages frequently range XXXXXXXXXX.</p>

	<p>Along the way we are able to describe or show many points of interest especially places like the Burial Path, which was first mentioned in 1282 and St. Briavels Castle originally built in 1075. These historical jewels add so much to our day out, easily changing a lovely leafy lane into a place of privilege to visit. There are so many along these unique lanes.</p> <p>Coxbury Lane is outstanding, with breathtaking views and ever changing colours as the seasons progress. It would devastate so many people - XXXXXXXXXXXX - if these incredible lanes were closed to us. Many of us deeply need the peace and mindspace to appreciate the ever changing magnificent flora & fauna. Many Green Lanes have already been closed and are now completely overgrown, impassable and of little use to anyone. We implore you to debate very caringly about the long term effect that a restriction/closure to vehicles would bring before it's too late. So very many people, of all ages, experience great pleasure accessing these wonderful lanes.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I am a XXXXXXXXXXXX:-</p> <p>Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212</p> <p>Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have used these roads over the XXXXXXXXXXXX no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interact with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads for the reasons given. I am also aware that alternative proposals have been put forward and ignored by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Your sincerely</p> <p>Regards</p>

	XXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Hi,</p> <p>We are users by road XXXXXXXXX of the following roads:</p> <p>Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212 Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>We have used these roads XXXXXXXXX experienced problems with the surface conditions and had no reason to back track or had any unpleasant interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore we strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads as it is completely unnecessary.</p> <p>Your sincerely XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I am a user XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX following roads:</p> <p>Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212 Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p> <p>I have used these roads XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn around or interact with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear info</p> <p>I am a XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX the following roads:</p> <p>Redbrook to Newland: Coxbury lane 500029 to Tinmans Green 403212 Newland: Bircham wood 500034 to Almhouse road C357</p>

	<p>I have used these roads XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX no problems with the surface conditions and not had any reason to turn round or interaction with other road users.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly protest to any TRO applied to these roads.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I have lived in XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>I am a XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.</p> <p>I do not support your proposal or the Parish Council. Councillors have not consulted the parish. They believe election/co-option means they represent the electorate & they can vote according to their conscience/vested interest.</p> <p>The upcoming election means many may be out of office.</p> <p>I have walked the path a lot. I do not agree with the reasons for supporting the application. The bikers are slow, respectful & local. They have XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX walking.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Please see my email below. Your ref 5227/40</p> <p>Begin forwarded message:</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>On Fri, 3 Mar 2023 at 17:54, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX:</p> <p>Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Burial Path Newland</p> <p>I would like to express my concern at the decision by Newland Parish Council not to support the Prohibition of Driving Order in respect of the Burial Path.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and enjoyed the walk from XXXXXX down to XXXXX along this ancient path.</p>

	<p>Unfortunately, over the last few years, with its constant usage by motorbikes and 4x4 vehicles, this path has now deteriorated to such an extent, that it can be dangerous to walk.,</p> <p>This ancient track has been badly damaged with deep ruts and collapse of stone walls in places. It becomes a mud bath and impossible to walk safely in wet weather.</p> <p>If permission is given, it will be an attraction to many more 'off road' groups from near and far, adding to fuel and noise pollution already being suffered by those living close by.</p> <p>How will the safe use of the path be managed to allow pedestrians and vehicles to pass safely when some parts are so narrow? Will pedestrians be cautioned not to use it?</p> <p>Has thought been given to the fact that the Burial Path passes through farmland, currently in use by livestock?</p> <p>There is a perfectly good 'off road' corse in the disused quarry (Whitecliff) on Newland Street where 4x4 and motorcycles are most welcome and can drive around till their hearts content.</p> <p>I cannot comment on whether the correct procedure has been followed by the Parish Council, but the decision does appear to have been rushed and without taking into account the interests of other stakeholders.</p> <p>My position is that the Council should support the Prohibition Of Driving order,</p> <p>The ancient Burial Path is an amenity that was available to ALL and has now been wrecked by the FEW.</p> <p>Regards XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Sir.</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the above proposed TRO for the following.</p> <p>I am not aware of any incidents on the highway that have endangered other users. Being concerned is not evidence enough to close a road.</p> <p>Either end of this road culminates at other roads. If one is walking or riding a horse or bicycle the same concerns apply on these roads so what's the difference.</p> <p>I have used the said road by XXXXXXXXXXXX for many years without incident and rarely happen across other users.</p>

	<p>One of the statements of reason points out to provide a safe area. I would refer to my first point about the lack of supporting evidence of people in danger.</p> <p>All of the points raised in the statement of reasons are purely dreamt up by NIMBYism.</p> <p>From feedback of local residents I believe the main concern comes from 4x4 use. If this is the case then a simple width restriction would suffice rather than the Draconian action of closing a road for no other reason than a concern.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Re: The Burial Path, Newland, Coleford Ref: 5227-40</p> <p>I am writing to support the proposal to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting motor vehicles on the stretch of the Burial Path from Birchamp House to the elbow at High Meadow.</p> <p>I XXXXXXXXXX and have used the Burial Path on occasion XXXXXXXX. Unfortunately, what should be a picturesque and tranquil setting has essentially become a 'no go' area for walkers for a number of reasons and I find myself avoiding it. The ground is completely churned up and rutted as a result of the path being used by motor vehicles. This can make it an unsafe and unpleasant environment to take a walk just as a result of the nature of the terrain. In addition, there is always the fear that a vehicle will appear on the track causing a danger to walkers, cyclists, and those on horseback. There is the additional problem of mud on the made up road that leads into the village which is transferred from the track by the vehicles. This causes a potential hazard as well as making the area (a conservation area) very unsightly at times.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>XXXXXXX.</p>

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XX

We the undersigned are one or more of: residents

[REDACTED] We support the proposed Traffic Restriction Order for one or more of the following reasons: damage to route 500034 as a result of use by motorised vehicles resulting in it becoming difficult and at times dangerous to navigate for anyone on foot, horseback or cycle; conflict of use for any users coming up against a convoy of 4 x 4s as the banks are too steep to take evasive action; nuisance caused by mud carried onto the metalled part of route 500034 and down through the village of Newland; nuisance caused by revving of engines and grinding of gears due to the terrain, particularly intrusive during the night; damage to the sides of route 500034 by vehicles mounting the verges causing an adverse ecological effect. We ask the Newland Parish Council to represent the interests of its constituents by supporting this prohibition.

Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034)

We the undersigned are one or more of: residents

[REDACTED] We support the proposed Traffic Restriction Order for one or more of the following reasons:

- Damage to route 500034 as a result of use by motorised vehicles resulting in it becoming difficult and at times dangerous to navigate for anyone on foot, horseback or cycle;
- Conflict of use for any users coming up against a convoy of 4 x 4s as the banks are too steep to take evasive action;
- Nuisance caused by mud carried onto the metalled part of route 500034 and down through the village of Newland;
- Nuisance caused by revving of engines and grinding of gears due to the terrain, particularly intrusive during the night;
- Damage to the sides of route 500034 by vehicles mounting the verges causing an adverse ecological effect.

We ask the Newland Parish Council to represent the interests of its constituents by supporting this prohibition.

XXXXXXX

Dear Sirs

[REDACTED] A footpath crosses this route between The Village Room and High Meadow and The Scowles.

Both of these areas have campsites which produce a fair number of walkers - visitors [REDACTED] These are either aiming to visit the Church and/or The Ostrich, or making the longer trek to Redbrook. Unfortunately a frequent grumble is the disgusting state of the Burial Path stating that it is not fit for use by pedestrians or cyclists due to the muddy surface and the depth of the ruts. Some have been confronted with 4-wheeled vehicles and found there was no safe place for them to pass.

[REDACTED] to look at the area. We were dressed in summer clothing including open toed sandals and our only complaint was that the fallen holly leaves were very uncomfortable on bare toes! The surface was by no means smooth but not impassable as it is today.

Apart from the mess for walkers the mud washes into the drains, blocking them both in the lower end of the Burial Path and into the through route between Clearwell and Redbrook. This road is narrow enough without the frequency of drain cleaning vehicles to be needed time and again.

It would be nice to see the Burial Path returned to a usable state, but as long as motor cycles and 4-wheeled vehicles belt up and down it that will not be possible.

XXXXXXX	<p>In relation to Paragraph 3 of the notice. The reference is made to a track from Newland to Bircham Wood (500034) described by position and Commonly known as part of the Burial Path.</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>The track detailed on the attendant map is the subject of this notice being an extension of the Upper Burial Path. This section is described as a 'hollow way' and has the provenance of use by locals over possibly hundreds of years. An alternative name for a path that is worn down by foot fall and animals is a sunken lane. The last drovers in the late 19 century would have been responsible for keeping these tracks viable as a means of taking stock to market. The advent of the railways and later the use of vehicles on metalled roads saw their use decline.</p> <p>Status of the track:</p> <p>In 2009 the track was noted as having lost a substantial amount of cut blockwork from the retaining walls on both sides. There was no evidence of robbing out, however arboreal growth had doubtless moved against the retaining walls.</p> <p>An inspection in the recent past noted that the retaining walls had suffered further degradation with lost block work being deposited into deep tyre tracks. The passage of 4 X 4 vehicles now presents a problem for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. It was noted that the deep tracks had compressed the subsoil and that tyre tracks now channelled excess surface water freely down the lane into Newland.</p> <p>A french drain has been constructed to intercept surface water running down and direct the flow into a conduit on the North side of the lane. This conduit empties into a chamber/gully pot at the South West Corner of Birchamp Cottage. This is often overloaded when there is even moderate rain. This chamber requires attention and when unattended, throws debris over the road blocking the linked gully pots towards the Village Room. The road below Spout Farm is then known to flood.</p> <p>Mains water supply to Newland.</p> <p>A mains water supply to Newland traverses the Burial path as described above and marked in red. The service pipe has various stop valves in transit. This service was subject to failure some time ago. This resulted in the flooding of Birchamp Cottage in Newland and also for overrunning of the chamber previously mentioned.</p> <p>The lower section of the Burial Path was inspected today.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There has been a recent failure recorded at a point downline of the "T" section at the crest of the hill towards High Meadow on this service pipe. 2) The lower apron interface section with an in line Stop Valve shows evidence of remedial works having been carried out. 3) The embedded mains water pipe serving Newland traverses the section marked in red on the North or nearside edge of the lane (elevating and going towards Coleford).
---------	--

	<p>4) The nature of the embedded service pipework protection is not known; the nature of the visible Stop Valve heads do not indicate whether the service pipe is synthetic. The service could be black iron.</p> <p>5) The inspecting engineers observations made on site on 4th March indicate that this matter warrants the due diligence of the Parish council and other responsible authorities.</p> <p>Reason: possible loss of an essential service to the Newland community.</p> <p>WARNING</p> <p>The Parish Council or other responsible party should be aware that the water supply to Newland may be disabled or seriously damaged by vehicular movement in a zone that does not have the benefit of protection afforded by a traditional metalled surface. This observation is made because it is evident upon inspection that this singular water supply remains for nearly all of its transit directly beneath the deepening wheel tracks. The engineers inspection carried out on the 4th of March 2023 found evidence of square edged stone debris released from the walls within and submerged in the tyre tracks directly above the pipeline. Pressurised pipeline services depend on stability of support to maintain their integrity. The compaction of material so described by singular or vehicular convoys in an unprotected zone should be prohibited.</p> <p>Should this pipework be damaged and have to be replaced this section would cost a substantial amount of money to repair along with the inconvenience of a supply interruption.</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Traffic Regulations Orders Limited</p> <p>Date: 14th March 2023</p> <p>Re: Traffic Regulation Order Scheme: Implementation of a prohibition of motor vehicles restriction on a section of the 500034 track from Newland towards Bircham Wood, Newland, Gloucestershire</p> <p>Background</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX and I XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX, in respect of which a Traffic Regulation Order ("TRO") is proposed ("Relevant Highways*"). I urge Gloucestershire County Council ("GCC") in the strongest terms to promulgate the TRO. I submit that in all the circumstances of the case, they are lawfully compelled to do so.</p> <p>Newland Parish Council</p> <p>On Tuesday 7th March 2023, I attended a meeting of Newland Parish Council ("NPC"), within which the proposed TRO was discussed. That meeting was convened with the aim of concluding the NPC meeting which had been adjourned seven days earlier. Representatives of an organisation called the Motor</p>

Enthusiast Group ("MEG" had attended that earlier meeting, with the aim of securing the support of residents to the attached proposal.

The reconvened meeting was attended by approximately 50 local residents, whose interests are served by PC. One representative of either MEG or another similar group which seeks to use the Relevant Highways for recreational purposes, also attended.

Those who attended came from a number of stakeholder groups, including:

local residents like me who live close to, or whose properties are accessed via the Relevant Highways;

1. landowners upon whose land, third parties driving motorcycles and 4x4 vehicles routinely trespass, and cause damage to property and intimidation to persons;
2. horse riders who have historically used the Relevant Highways for recreational purposes, to exercise their horses and to teach others to ride;
3. other local residents (including young children and the elderly) who have historically used the Relevant Highways for both access to and from Newland and other villages within Newland parish, and for leisure purposes.

The alleged responsibility of GCC to main and repair the Relevant Highways

I mention MEG; their written proposal and the presence of their representative at last week's meeting because of a hugely significant assertion which was made by him during the course of the meeting. First, it is trite that the Relevant Highways are in substantial disrepair. I understand that it is accepted by MEG that this disrepair has been caused exclusively by the 4x4 drivers and motorcycle riders whose interests the MEG represent, and it is accepted that, at present, the Relevant Highways cannot safely be used by those stakeholder groups to which this letter refers.

During the meeting, the MEG representative rounded on GCC. He asserted that it was GCC which was in dereliction of its statutory function, in not maintaining the Relevant Highways to a standard which would enable use by each of the stakeholders who attended the meeting and that, if GCC discharged its statutory function, the problem could be overcome. (I am not sure how GCC feels about having to use public money to repair and re-instate damage caused to unadopted highways, in circumstances where the identities of the individuals who not only caused that damage, but are pressing GCC to maintain the right for them to continue doing so, have made themselves known, but I object to that suggestion, in the strongest terms. I feel that scarce public resources should be used on a more utilitarian basis. I hope I am not alone in that sentiment.)

The status of the Relevant Highways

I understand the Relevant Highways are in fact "highways", though they are unadopted. If that is the case, in the context of repair, maintenance and legal liability, GOC may have a more limited function and exposure to liability, than it would, had the roads been adopted. The latter scenario would involve the expenditure of substantial sums of money by GCC in bringing the roads up to, and then maintaining those roads, to an adoptable standard.

The motivation of MEG in visiting the Relevant Highways

Despite what MEG says, in reality, the last thing MEG, and others with like minds actually want, is for GCC, or anyone for that matter, to maintain, repair or improve the Relevant Highways. They have no interest in driving on properly maintained roads. If they wished to spend their leisure time driving up and down roads of that type, they could do that in their own street, rather than having to drive miles and miles, to the Forest of Dean.

They are "off-road enthusiasts" and they are looking for opportunities to test their driving skills over rugged and uneven terrain. The Relevant Highways are manna from heaven to them, in that they present an opportunity to drive over their favoured type of terrain in circumstances where, generally, they would have to seek consent of a landowner. If the roads were brought up to an adoptable standard, MEG and others would simply stop using them.

Perhaps that is the answer

Competing interests and the issue of health and safety

What this highlights, is that the interests of MEG and those whom they represent, are diametrically opposed to the interests and rights of every other potential user of the Relevant Highways. Ramblers, pedestrians of all ages, horse riders etc, all demand, and are entitled to access and use a highway which can be traversed with reasonable safety, and for this purpose safety must be considered in various ways including:

1. a right of safe passage when using roads with no verges or pavements, which they may use to the exclusion of motorists; and
2. a right (subject to the exercise of reasonable caution) to a road relatively free of uneven surfaces under foot, rutting, fuel and oil spills, noise pollution and other environmental damage.

Having listened to several anecdotes in the NPC meeting. I am certain you will receive numerous representations from interested parties, reporting the extensive damage to their properties; the abusive language used towards them and of the various "close shaves" they have had with motorists driving at speed. I understand there are examples on you tube.

XXXXXXXXXXXX at the meeting explained that he had XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, close to a Relevant Highway, only for the creation of ruts over a foot deep by trespassers within just a few weeks. The necessity for a permanent TRO

It is the creation of this environment which, unless the TRO is promulgated, will lead to these Relevant Highways becoming the exclusive domain of motor enthusiasts. All other potential users (to whose rights you MUST have regard when considering the promulgation of the TRO) will not feel safe in using them. If they choose to use the Relevant Highways, they run the risk of harm both from vehicle and motorcycle users, and by reason of the state of the Relevant Highways.

If harm is caused, as a result of the poor state of repair of the Relevant Highway, fairly obviously GCC will be liable for that harm, but even if harm is caused by a vehicle or motorcycle owner, GCC may be jointly and severally liable, given it will have given permission for MEG and others to use a highway which it knows is also used by pedestrians.

What is a Highway?

The definition in the Highways Act 1980 doesn't really help but, at common law, a highway is described as a "way" over which exists a public right of "passage" enabling all persons at all times to "pass and repass"

I have emphasised certain words and expressions, because inherent in the principle of a highway (or a right of way or a bridleway for example), is the idea that one may move along the highway from point A to point B. Put slightly differently, it is a means and not an end.

To be clear, I understand that the matter being considered by GCC concerns whether or not a TRO should be promulgated. There is no request for GCC to submit an application for the removal of highway status, but, nevertheless, MEGs are not using the Relevant Highways for their intended purpose. They do not use them as a means to access point B via point A, they use them as a destination. They access the highway and stay there. In using them as they do, the highways inevitably deteriorate, which improves their attractiveness as a destination.

The commission of criminal offences

That highways must be used to enable people to pass and repass, is underpinned by the imposition of a statutory penalty, if the ability to pass and repass, is interrupted. Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 provides that if a person without lawful authority or excuse, in any way, wilfully obstructs free passage along the highway, he/she is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding £50.00. It is an arrestable

offence. I submit that in using the Relevant Highways as a destination, MEGs inevitably commit an offence under the Highways Act 1980.

In my view, obstruction involves any impediment to use, and includes the creation of damage to the highway, thus preventing its' use by others. If the Highways Authority refuses to impose a TRO, it commits an inchoate offence, in the sense that it aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of arrestable offences. (See my comment on this issue in a moment.)

It became clear in the meeting of NPC to which I referred earlier, that, in addition to 4x4 vehicles, the Relevant Highways are used routinely by individuals with motorcycles and electric bikes, with the former bearing no vehicle registration plates.

It is an offence to drive a vehicle on a public road within the United Kingdom without a vehicle registration and, it is also an offence to drive a vehicle on a public road without road tax. If these motorcycles do not have a vehicle registration, they will not have paid vehicle excise duty. The drivers/riders will not be insured for damage to property, or injury to persons. If

GOC refuses to promulgate a TRO, again it commits an inchoate offence. Any person who is injured or suffers property damage, will have no recourse or remedy against an uninsured rider (or driver for that matter) but by virtue of the commission by GCC of the inchoate offences to which I have referred, GCC will be liable to the same extent. As a result, in my view, no reasonably informed public body would or should act, or leave itself open to liability in that manner.

The relevant legislation

The relevant legislation relating to Traffic Regulation Orders is contained in parts I, II and IV of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) ("the 1984 Act"). Section 1(i) of the 1984 Act states that a Highways Authority may make a permanent Traffic Regulation Order having regard to the following considerations:

- to avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road... or to prevent the likelihood of any such danger arising;
- to prevent damage to the road or to any building on or near the road;
- to facilitate the passage on the road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians);
- to prevent the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property;
- to preserve the character of the road in the case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot;

to preserve or improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs; or
• to preserve or improve the local air quality.

I have emphasised the word "may", but I do not say that the use of that word gives a discretion as to whether a TRO should be imposed. On the contrary, I submit that if any one of the considerations listed in section 1 of the 1984 Act is engaged, GCC must promulgate a TRO.

Having made that point, I submit that all of the considerations to which GCC must have regard, are engaged in this case, and that compels GCC to promulgate a TRO. To fail to do so would be a gross dereliction of statutory duty.

Either way, GCC has been informed that pedestrians and horse riders feel they are in danger when using the highway both by reason of its poor state of repair and because of the off vehicles and motor cycles which are using it. Having received representations to that effect,

GCC must decide whether a danger actually exists and their decision on whether to promulgate or not, inevitably involves a finding of fact on the issue of danger and damage.

That is a matter for GCC of course but it necessarily creates significant potential liability for GCC were injury to be caused.

Considerations for GCC

I believe it is unnecessary to address each of the criteria to which section 1 refers, in support of my proposition but for the avoidance of doubt:

1. The question of danger

Members of the public and horse riders have no choice but to share a deteriorating highway with high-powered 4x4 motor vehicles and motorcycles, some of which are untaxed and uninsured.

I have already made the point that, having drawn your attention to this, a duty of care arises in relation to all pedestrians and horse riders etc who use these highways and, in circumstances where any harm is caused to those individuals, and particularly in circumstances where GCC has condoned and supported the commission of regulatory and arrestable offences, it will be liable. I do not say it should promulgate the TRO for its own protection however, it should do so to prevent dear and obvious danger of harm to others.

The question of damage

GCC has undertaken a site inspection and extensive damage to the highway is self-evident. Of course, it is not just the visible damage. The nature of the activities currently being carried on are such that significant damage is often caused to vehicles, resulting in fuel and oil spills and other environmental damage. I mentioned earlier that you will receive representations from a property owner of damage to property totalling tens of thousands of pounds.

To facilitate the passage on the road... of.

*... pedestrians

It was clear from the NPC meeting that, as a direct result of the use of the Relevant Highways by motor vehicles and motorcycles, the danger which results directly from that use, coupled with the danger which results from the deterioration of the Relevant Highways, is such that it is now unsafe for pedestrians and horse riders to use the Relevant Highways

4. To prevent the use of the road by vehicular traffic which, by its very nature is unsuitable

There is a comparable anachronism with the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which enables the right to bear arms.

The point is often made that when this Amendment was introduced, "arms" were limited to single shot muskets. It is argued that it was not envisaged, when that Amendment was introduced, that it would be used as justification for citizens to keep and use high velocity, automatic assault weapons.

I am unable to ascertain when the Relevant Highways were designated as such, but it can never have been envisaged that they would be used by the type of vehicles which are currently using them. If the Relevant Highways, were not highways, and an application was made today to designate them as such, in order that they may be used by MEG and others, in my view that application would fail.

1. Preservation of the character of the road for use by persons on horseback and on
2. foot

I have made this point already To preserve or Improve Amenity

3. I have made this point already. To Preserve Air Quality
4. Clearly the extensive use of the Relevant Highways by large groups of motorcycle riders and 4x4 drivers on a regular basis, necessarily diminishes both air quality and increases noise pollution.
5. The Proposals by MEG
6. MEG's proposal is essentially limited to an undertaking to repair, though how will their proposal be enforced? How will anyone know whether those who use the Relevant Highways are in fact part of a recognised group which will take responsibility? It will always be open for any group to deny responsibility, insisting that we prove damage was caused by one of their members.

	<p>7. How would their proposal be policed? Is it intended to have enforcement cameras? If so, who would pay for them? Even if they were installed, how would that help in respect of those motorcyces which do not have numberplates or, in respect of 4x4 vehicles, whose numberplates are covered in mud?</p> <p>Not only are the proposals unworkable, they address only one of the issues to which you must have regard, and there are of course, numerous others in respect of which MEG can offer no reassurance.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In my view, the requirement for a permanent TRO is compelling. So much so, I do not believe any properly informed Highway Authority could refuse to promulgate such an order.</p> <p>Data Protection</p> <p>To the extent my letter is published please ensure my name and address are both redacted.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear XXXXXX,</p> <p>I am a XXXXXX and would like to record my support of the TRO as referenced above.</p> <p>The pathways referenced in the order are subject to highly inappropriate levels of traffic on a weekly basis with large groups of 4x4s traversing down narrow tracks.</p> <p>This makes it dangerous for us as pedestrians to walk as a family. Due to the steep banks there is nowhere to retreat to when faced with cars that take up the entirety of the paths.</p> <p>The pathways themselves are also badly damaged by the motor vehicles and are churned up to such an extent that they can become impassable to those on foot. This is having a detrimental effect on the wildlife and the vehicles are also causing pollution in what could (and should) be a wildlife haven.</p> <p>The noise, pollution and physical damage to the pathways prevents walkers, joggers, horse rider and cyclists from enjoyment of the pathways for the benefit of a few motor vehicle enthusiasts.</p> <p>My understanding is that there are many other areas where the motor enthusiasts can enjoy their hobby including an off road driving centre in Whitecliff quarry less than a mile away so I wholeheartedly support the TRO for the benefit of the wider community.</p>

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I'm writing with reference to the above proposed TRO's in the Coleford and Newland Parish area for the purpose of lodging a formal objection.</p> <p>It's with great sadness that I saw the proposed closures for these lanes, despite offers to voluntarily fix and maintain them. XXXXXXXXXX, have been XXXXXXXXXX. Not only have they been a key source of pleasure and enjoyment, they have also been a solid part of improving off road skills, not to mention the positivity they enable from a mental and physical health perspective. XXXXXXXXXX to Monmouth for work purposes occasionally - traffic free and in nature for a short time, beats the main roads in my opinion!</p> <p>As a XXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXX, whilst always remaining respectful for other users. I find it very sad that we cannot successfully share these ancient roads with others, especially considering the high number of alternative vehicle free, walking routes in the area, of which I too am hugely grateful for. It would be a great shame for many people who enjoy these lanes and use them to enable their passion and hobbies, because we couldn't come to a mutually beneficial agreement on sharing our spaces.</p> <p>Thanks and regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the Burial Path, Newland to stop all motor vehicles. XXXXXXXXXX and have never encountered any other users on it or had any problems while riding it. However, talking to residents in the area I accept there are occasions when there are apparently illegal motorcycles/motorcyclists using it and large groups of 4x4s.</p> <p>With illegal riding, putting a TRO on this road will not stop them or even deter them. By their very name they are illegal, breaking the laws either with motorcycles that aren't registered or taxed or fit for road use, or riders without insurance or even driving licenses. As they are already breaking the law, one more law isn't going to stop them. Even if they get caught and their motorcycles taken and crushed it won't stop them. They will just steal another motorcycle causing mystery to a law abiding motorcyclist.</p> <p>Legal motorcyclists hate illegal motorcyclists .</p> <p>The main issue does appear to be with the 4x4s, who arrive in large numbers and take great delight in getting stuck on these roads and then winching along the road regardless of any damage they cause.</p>

	<p>I would therefore propose a compromise: a width restriction TRO , that has been used successfully in others areas, to allow walkers, horses , cyclists and legal motorcycles but would stop 4x4s.</p> <p>XXXXXXX</p>
<p>XXXXXXXXXX <u>XXXXXXXXXX</u></p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to object to TRO 5227/40; specifically, the TRO on the track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034).</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. I XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX of way in the Wye valley and Forest of Dean. I find that this recreational activity greatly helps with my state of mind; indeed, this had never been more apparent than during the COVID social distancing period. I cannot believe that anybody needs to be told of the health benefits of just getting outside and enjoying the outdoors.</p> <p>As a responsible rider, it goes without saying that my motorbikes are fully legal for road use and I am a member of the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX that promote the sustainable and responsible use of public rights of way.</p> <p>The lane that TRO 5227/40 (track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034)) refer to is one of the very few lanes that still have vehicular access and, as such, represent a significant proportion of the available green lanes in the Forest of Dean and Wye Valley area.</p> <p>The proposal is based on “concerns raised by local representatives about unsuitable motor vehicle use”; however, the reasons given below do not contain any relevant facts and could be applied to any road in the country. Please see my comments in italics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising. <i>This could apply to any road in the country.</i> • For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property. <i>This track has been a public right of way for many years as its inclusion on the list of streets shows, therefore the existing “character” of the road must include all means of transport.</i> • For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot. <i>See above, I find it a particular threat to inclusivity when single user groups</i>

	<p><i>seeks to remove another user group's rights. Why are persons on horseback or on foot different to other users?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders. <i>Why should the perceived needs of some user groups ride roughshod over others?</i> • To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway. <i>Having ridden many thousands of miles on green lanes I find it difficult to categorise what causes the most erosion is it horse riders ploughing up soft mud, is it water erosion washing out the track base, is it local farm traffic using modern monster tractors? Each case is different, in this case I would suggest that weather erosion is the main issue.</i> <p>It appears to me that reason behind the TRO is a local desire to remove existing access for motorised recreational use with no real evidence given. Green laning is a legitimate and legal pastime, discrimination against anyone who chooses to partake in it, irrespective of ability, is incongruous with the law and the spirit of recreation. Access to the countryside should not influenced by "Not In My Back Yard" individuals with vested interests to the detriment, or even the risk, of the rest.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I would like to object to the above orders for 2 green lanes in the parish of Newland, neither of which are supported by any accurate or substantial evidence.</p> <p>These proposals have not been thought through by the council or GCC Highways. They should not be considered for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The statement of reasons is not fit for purpose. 2. Concerns raised by locals is not an adequate reason. 3. Lack of supporting justification. 4. No credible basis to proceed in line with the RTA 1984. 5. No reports or records of ANY accidents on these 2 lanes has been identified. 6. There are no current or historic dangers to drivers, pedestrians or horses. 7. It is the Highways dept legal duty to ensure least restrictive options for public use.

	<p>8. No consideration given to those with mental health issues and disabled MPV users all of whom use the routes.</p> <p>9. The closures appear biast against MPV users and motorcyclists.</p> <p>10. The character of these routes has not changed in XXXXXXXX (personally and as XXXXXXXX)</p> <p>11. The average use on these lanes is very low and has no or minimal local impact to residents.</p> <p>12. There are proven detailed reports showing biodiversity is improved with the use of green lanes.</p> <p>13. Motorised groups and clubs were not involved in any original road safety surveys.</p> <p>14. Highways and NPC should be working with local user groups and volunteers for solutions not closures.</p> <p>15. The GLAF do not appear to have approved or be fully aware of these proposals.</p> <p>There are many more points surrounding these proposals, these are just a few. I have been driving these lanes for years without issues, and also advise many others.</p> <p>They have always proved sustainable and are suited to suitable equipped vehicles.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>We strongly support the traffic regulation scheme, implementation of a prohibition of motor vehicle restriction as listed above.</p> <p>When XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX were able to walk these rights of way with ease, unfortunately the deterioration caused by increased use of motorised vehicles and the subsequent difficulties encountered means that we are unable to continue with the legitimate use of these facilities and I am sure that this must also apply to other previous users such as landowners, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>We now have no direct safe walkway to reach XXXXXXXX. The extra distance, lack of pavements and increasing traffic mean that walking in the area has now become extremely hazardous.</p> <p>The area has either conservation status or is an AONB. We need action taken to preserve the principles of these designations which are to ensure that the distinctive character and natural beauty are protected and enhanced.</p>

	<p>We need to protect these ancient paths to encourage their environmentally friendly use in the future. They do not meet the current standards for use by motor vehicles and this has resulted to the unacceptable situation that we are in today and without this scheme everyone will suffer the subsequent consequences.</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Scheme Ref: 5227-40 Newland</p> <p>We XXXX a XXXXXXXX at the XXXXXX of XXXXXX. We fully support the proposal to prohibit the use of motor vehicles along the burial path.</p> <p>However, we respectfully ask that XXXXXXXXX to be included in the prohibition of motor vehicles. The path is in a poor state and as such poses a danger to animals and people.</p> <p>In addition, rain/surface water and silt washes down to the highways road leading to our and other properties, which, remains there during the winter months. This causes hardship whilst moving the animals to our fields specifically on frosty days when the road becomes a dangerous ice rink, therefore, unable to turn our horses out in our fields. Even though it is a highways road the salt bins at the bottom of Savage Hill have not been refilled, despite messages being left with Council/Highways.</p> <p>We would also request that Rockfield Road is included.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>We agree with the notes below'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Motorcycles have no registration plates, and as such should not be on the paths/roads. ◦ As they are not registered it is difficult to see how they are legally monitored for safety and suitability.

- The riders do not take into account other users of the land and put them at risk. XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXX out at risk from 4x4 trying to extend their off-road adventures by going on to XXXXXXXXXXXX.
 - Although it is described as a recognised sport, there are no indications that all of these individuals belong to regulated sporting bodies who set down safety restrictions or show consideration to the public.
- For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular
 - Although the Burial Path (French Lane and Rockfield road which should also be covered by this order as they are used in the same way by these vehicles), was in the mists of time registered as a highway, the fact that the GCC does not maintain it, and that it is no longer suitable to sustain the amount of rough use it is getting, means it's classification should be reviewed.
 - There are 2 signs positioned at each end of the Burial path, clearly stating that the burial path is unsuitable for vehicles. This should indicate to the drivers of these vehicles that they should not be using it at all. I find it interesting that council can not identify where these signs came from, as no independent person would pay for them and get them erected without permission. If they had the council would have had them removed.
- Traffic in a manner which is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.
 - The off roaders have been known to pick up large stones and chuck them over the fence of the burial path to allow their vehicles to pass. This results in damage to the landowner's property and additional costs to have these boulders removed, so they do not interfere with any machinery used in the field.
- For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot.
 - Horse riders can no longer use the Burial Path (Rockfield road or French Lane) because the surface is now covered with exposed moving stones which could result in a horse breaking its leg, and tipping its rider.
 - There is very little in the way of flora remaining down the path as the regular tracking of vehicles has removed existing plants, and the regular agitation of the soil precludes seedling recolonisation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The vehicular damage to these routes have lost their surface sufficiently that when it rains water gushes down moving stones and more mud to the entrance. ○ The vehicles are mounting the sides of the track, which dislodges the sides resulting in further damage. ● To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway. ○ The riders are not local, but travel down in larger vehicles transporting their motorcycles to the forest, so they leave the damage they cause without any detriment to their own habitats. ○ The motorcycle riders show little concern for the walkers who are showered with stones kicked up by their wheels as they race past. This is intimidating. ○ There are very few places of safety to move out of their way, and they do not show any concern by slowing down to allow you to reach a place of safety. ● Intrusive noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I would also add the engine noise generated by these fast moving vehicles grinding up and down Newland pathways disturbs the tranquillity of the area; ○ The noise generally lasts for hours not minutes so it can not be ignored; It is not like white noise which blends into the background. ○ These events tend to be held at the weekends and holidays, which in the summer, means we rarely have days without this invasive noise, which travels. ○ Most people moved to the village for peace, riding, walking, cycling, bird song, mindfulness, a slower pace of life and to get closer to the natural order of things, this is blasted out of the park by these people and their vehicles.
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear XXXXXXXXXX,</p> <p>I write - XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX strongest possible support for the TRO and its implementation.</p>

	<p>1. Background</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and is XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and is almost opposite the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.</p> <p>As you know, at Newland, the final 150 metres of this historic Path (having emerged from its sunken section) are tarmac, ending at the road that runs through the village. The last few metres XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. I XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX of users of the path and their frequency.</p> <p>Again as you will know, records in the Forest of Dean Heritage Centre relate to an ancient path that ran down to Coleford, passing High Meadow, to Newland, and that constituted a simple route for pedestrian and equine traffic. Since it was also used by pallbearers for carrying the coffins of the deceased from Coleford for burial at Newland, over time it became locally known as the "Burial Path".</p> <p>The <i>key point</i> is that this Path was established over time <i>essentially as a broad footpath/bridlepath and was not designed for wheeled vehicles</i>.</p> <p>2. Users of the Path and their <i>average</i> frequency - XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (lower figure = winter ; higher figure = summer)</p> <p>Walkers - 10 to 20 daily weekdays; 15 to 30 daily at weekends ; 20 to 50 daily Bank Holiday weekends. Occasional large organised groups, particularly in summer, ie. Macmillan Nurses Charity walkers up to 300, Duke of Edinburgh Award teenage walkers up to 150</p> <p>Horse Riders - 1 or 2 horses daily, weekends a little more</p> <p>Cyclists - 2 to 5 daily weekdays; 5 to 20 daily at weekends; 10 to 40 daily Bank Holiday weekends (frequently in groups of 6 to 10). Also 2 or 3 organised rallies over the summer, each from 20 to 60 riders</p> <p>Motorcyclists - 1 or 2 daily weekdays; 5 to 10 daily weekends; 10 to 20 daily Bank Holiday weekends</p> <p>4 x 4 vehicles and similar - 1 or less daily weekdays (but groups often on weekday summer evenings); 2 to 6 daily weekends; 4 to 8 daily Bank Holiday weekends. Normally come in groups</p>
--	--

	<p>Thus overall use is constant and in summer quite heavy.</p> <p>3. What has happened to the Path over the XXXXXXXX</p> <p>In the XXXXX, it was a pleasure to walk along the path. Its surface was relatively even. Of course, there was the odd bump, but not the dangerous bits of stone sticking up, loose rocks on the ground, and 10-inch deep ruts as there are now. At that time, there were almost no motorised users.</p> <p>I assess that increased use of the Path over the years by walkers and horse riders has caused minimal damage to the path. Single or pairs of bicycle riders similarly cause minimal damage; there may be some light damage caused by large bicycle rallies.</p> <p>Without question, as scores of local people will tell you, the current grievous state of the Path is very largely due to damage caused by motorbikes and 4 x 4 vehicles. Motorbikes have caused the deep rutting, so that rain runoff rushes down the channels of the ruts, causing much more erosion of soil than before. 4 x 4 vehicles in particular have worn away more of the path near its the side walls. These stone walls, built in the 19th century or perhaps even earlier, have now been undermined at the base in many places. As a result, collapses have occurred, leaving piles of rock and rubble in the pathway.</p> <p><i>In short, between them - over the years - 4 x 4s and motorbikes have ravaged this once-beautiful country path, to the extent where it has become unsafe to walk down, on account of :-</i></p> <p class="list-item-l1"><i>a. its very uneven surface, now with a potential trip or slip at every step</i></p> <p class="list-item-l1"><i>b. the courtesy of motorised users who usually roar up or down it at the maximum speed that they can achieve, frequently utterly regardless of other users.</i></p> <p>4. ACTION - What needs to be done - and soon</p> <p>This Path was never intended for motorised use, as is indeed implicitly acknowledged by the Council with the wording of their caution on their sign outside my house, reading "Burial Path - Unsuitable for Motor Vehicles". This sign</p>
--	---

	<p>appears to have no deterrent effect whatsoever on intending motor-vehicle users; I have never seen anyone turn back.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that walkers, horse riders, and cyclists should continue to be permitted to enjoy sensible use of the Path.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that all motorised users be banned from using it.</p> <p>Legal Status of the Path :</p> <p>I understand that the current technical status of the Burial Path allows it to be legally treated as a road, and that - whilst it technically remains a road - the Council has no powers to ban motorised users.</p> <p>Clearly the legal status of the Path must be changed to a category that permits a full ban to be implemented.</p> <p>Enforcement of the Ban :</p> <p>Enforcement of the ban will be difficult. A notice threatening a fine of £1000 for law-breaking motor users might have some limited effect, especially if combined with the use of visible video cameras. More effective still would be the construction of some sort of over-lapping metal barriers that would permit the passage of pedestrians, horses, and bicycles, but that would definitely prevent 4x4 vehicles getting onto the Path and hopefully also the larger motorbikes. Such barriers would need to be placed at both ends of the Path. I refer to the over-lapping type of metal barriers frequently used by Councils in urban areas to prevent motor users entering pedestrian alleyways.</p> <p>I should be delighted to discuss any of my points above with yourself or any other official involved in the matter, either by telephone or email.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Dear XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

	<p>As residents of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, we are writing in support of the above proposed TRO to prohibit motor vehicles from using the track known as The Burial Path.</p> <p>The Burial Path running from Newland to High Meadow was clearly only ever intended for use by pedestrians and horses and its ever increasing use by “off-roaders” is entirely inappropriate. Convoys of 4x4 vehicles and motor cycles frequently access the route and effectively prevent its use by those for whom it was intended. In fact, they create a potentially dangerous situation for any legitimate users encountering these aggressively driven motor vehicles.</p> <p>As this increased use of The Burial Path by motor vehicles has been encouraged through organised groups of off-road enthusiasts, it has become so treacherous that we certainly feel, for example, that we can no longer walk with our dog along the route.</p> <p>Additionally, the increased use by motor vehicles over recent years has caused potentially irreparable environmental damage to flora and fauna along the entire length of the route and is causing structural damage to the steep banks at either side of this historically significant track.</p> <p>We hope the Gloucester CC will act in the interests of the majority and prohibit future use of the Burial Path by any motor vehicles.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear XXXXXXXXXXX,</p> <p>I'm writing to add my support for the TRO on the Burial Path. It needs protecting against ruin from inappropriate vehicle traffic, especially the 4x4 leisure vehicles which regularly drive through in a dangerous and destructive manner.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Traffic Regulation Orders Ltd.</p> <p>Re: 5227/40 GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (PROHIBITION OF DRIVING & PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES) (VARIOUS ROADS IN THE PARISHES OF NEWLAND AND LITTLEDEAN) (FOREST OF DEAN DISTRICT) ORDER 2023</p> <p>Please find attached representation and objection in response to the above named proposed traffic regulation order.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt and acceptance of our objection. I would prefer to receive correspondence via email to XXXXXXXXXXX</p>

Sincerely,
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear Sirs,

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX writes in response to a Notice of Proposal dated 22nd February 2023 to make the above-named traffic regulation order ("TRO").

We welcome the review of the Gloucestershire County Council (Littledean) (Various Roads) (Prohibition Of Driving) Order 1978. We support the relaxation of restrictions to facilitate use by non-motorised vehicles.

We do not object to the proposed prohibition in respect of Coxbury Lane insofar as this is confined to a flight of steps. We recommend amending the draft order to a consistent prohibition of riding/driving rather than prohibiting vehicles "...to proceed..." as per clause 3 in the draft order. Doing so would allow for e.g., bicycles to be wheeled and prams/wheelchairs to be pushed along the flight of steps.

We object to the proposals insofar as they prohibit motorcycle and quadricycle use of "Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood" (hereafter referred to as "The Road").

Grounds of objection.

1. Inadequate Consultation

The statement of reasons recites four statutory purposes for making a TRO:

- *For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.*
- *For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.*
- *For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot.*
- *To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders.*

A further non-statutory purpose is also provided:

- *To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway.*

Neither the notice of proposals, draft order, or statement of reasons provide any information as to the factors identified by Gloucester County Council as unsuitable, dangerous, damaging, or that transform the character of The Road, in respect of motor vehicles, let alone specific classes of motor vehicles.

The information is confined to conveying that local representatives have raised concerns about unsuitable use by motor vehicles. Information as to whom the local representatives are representing, the detail of the concerns, and the classes of motor vehicle and types of use considered unsuitable, have not been made available within the consultation process.

We have been unable to locate the decision record and background papers on Gloucester County Council website for the decision to commence the statutory TRO process.

The Statement of Reasons is inadequate and is insufficient to discharge the traffic authorities' obligation to enable meaningful consultation.

2. Road out of repair and obstructed / use of TRO power to avoid duties/ use of TRO to compound nuisance to highway and detriment to biodiversity.

The proposed prohibition affects sections of The Road that require maintenance and repair. The road is also obstructed by large stones in the carriageway that have fallen from retaining walls.

Gloucester County Council, as highway authority, is subject of a duty to maintain and repair the carriageway and collapsing walls, and to remove obstructions caused by the stones that have fallen from the walls, fallen trees, and overgrown vegetation.

The carriageway suffers from exclusion of sun and wind, as a result of overgrown vegetation.

Gloucester County Council has failed to satisfy statutory duties to maintain and repair and remove obstructions. In consequence of failure to satisfy statutory duties, The Road is obstructed and in disrepair. The presence of obstruction and disrepair creates an increased likelihood of danger. The exclusion of sun and wind (by overgrown vegetation) has damaged the carriageway surface and made it vulnerable to damage by all classes of traffic.

Were Gloucester County Council, as highway authority, to satisfy its statutory duties to maintain and repair, and remove obstructions, the carriageway would not be vulnerable to damage, nor be likely dangerous to use.

The Road was designated as a Class V highway by Gloucester County Council and was included as public carriageway in the calculation of statutory mileage returns for the purposes of obtaining central funds (only a proportion of Class VI highways being excluded from the calculation of mileage).

The statement of reasons records Gloucester County Council's apparent intention to compound the mischief of disrepair, obstruction, and failure to maintain:

- *To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway*

The highway is a public right of passage. That public right of passage is suffering accelerated damage in consequence of Gloucester County Council failure, as highway authority, to remove obstructions, clear vegetation on the carriageway and verges, prevent continuing damage to the road by exclusion of sun and wind, repair and maintain retaining walls, and repair and maintain the road surface so damaged by non-traffic causes.

Airflow and sunlight are beneficial to biodiversity, as are the air currents created by the passage of motorcycle traffic. Motorcycles also act as vectors for seed distribution. The biodiversity of the road is product of the benefit of motorcycle traffic. The entire green road network is an ecosystem of which motorcycle traffic is an essential component to maintain, conserve and enhance biodiversity.

The carriageway is not a nature reserve, lawn, or pasture. TRO powers are not available to convert carriageways into lawn, pasture, or nature reserve by prohibiting traffic so as to protect vegetation growing out of the

carriageway – especially where that vegetation grows in consequence of a failure to maintain, repair, remove obstruction.

The statement of reasons records Gloucester County Councils intention to use TRO powers to promote the growth of vegetation that is both damaging The Road and obstructing the highway. The TRO itself would accelerate damage arising from Gloucester County Councils failings as highway authority.

3. Road not especially suitable for use by persons on horseback and foot.

We repeat our observation that the Statement of Reasons is inadequate. No factors are identified within the TRO process to demonstrate that The Road is especially suitable for persons on horseback and foot.

The Road comfortably meets the definition of a “made up carriageway” as provided by s.329 Highways Act 1980: *“made-up carriageway” means a carriageway, or a part thereof, which has been metalled or in any other way provided with a surface suitable for the passage of vehicles.*

The statutory definition uses the term “metalled” and that is synonymous with “suitable for the passage of vehicles”. “Metalled” does not mean tarmacked or otherwise sealed but improved by the application of road metal – stone, gravel, cinders, road plainings, or other hard mineral material used in the construction of roads.

The Road was designated as a “Class V” County Road by Gloucester County Council from 1939 at the latest. As a “County Road”, The Road is a highway maintainable at public expense. Class V designation criteria is recorded as follows:

“Metalled carriageway roads for wheeled traffic, consisting of unimportant accommodation roads or cul-de-sacs serving a few properties only.”

The Road was not recorded on the definitive map and statement as a public path or road used as public path. In the absence of proof of mistake or failure to satisfy statutory duties to record public path or road used as public path, there is no presumption that Gloucester County Council acted improperly in choosing to manage The Road as part of the ordinary road network outwith the scope of definitive map legislation – that is to say The Road was considered to be a carriageway mainly used by the public for the purposes of carriageway, where no reasonable allegation could be sustained to record it as road used as public path, bridlepath, or footpath.

The administration of the road as part of the ordinary road network, outwith the scope of definitive map legislation, forms part of the character of The Road as a carriageway mainly used by the public for the purposes of carriageway.

The Road comprises an engineered carriageway that has been constructed with a levelled surface, with gradients cut down, retaining walls built, road metal applied, and sufficient width provided to be suitable for vehicular traffic. The road surface is suitable for the passage of vehicles, and this is contemplated in the proposed TRO which does not restrict pedal cycles, horse drawn vehicles, nor motor vehicles used for access to premises.

Made up carriageways are not especially suitable for use by persons on horseback. We refer to “Advice on Surfaces for Horses”² published by the British Horse Society:

² “The greatest risks for horses are:

- *Slippery tarmac or other sealed surface*
- *Hard surfaces which cause concussion through joints*
- *Sharp stones which may bruise or puncture the soles of hooves”*

The Road has all of the aforementioned risks.

Made up carriageways are not especially suitable for pedestrians – for they are constructed to be primarily suitable for vehicles. The middle of a carriageway is not an especially suitable place for pedestrian traffic, and this is reflected in the Highway Code rule #2 to keep to the right side of the road, walk in single file on narrow roads, and keep close to the side of the road.

The Road, as a made-up carriageway, is not especially suitable for pedestrians or persons on horseback. The Road is especially suitable for persons riding pedal cycles, Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles (EAPC), and motor cycles. The Road is suitable for motorised agricultural vehicles, Heavy goods Vehicles (“HGV’s”), and cars, as accepted by Gloucester County Council in its proposing a TRO which provides for the aforementioned classes of motor vehicle to be exempt from prohibition and to continue to use The Road.

The statutory purpose for making a TRO speaks of the road and is concerned only with the especial suitability of the road for persons on horseback and foot. The statutory purpose is not concerned with ideological views as to who the countryside is for, nor whether the environment surrounding the road is pretty.

4. Road suitable for motorcycle use / use by motorcycle traffic is safe, suitable, sustainable, not damaging, conducive to preservation of road character / road sufficiently robust to accommodate motor vehicle traffic with much greater impact than motorcycles/ prohibiting motor cycles irrational where other motor vehicle traffic not prohibited.

In respect of responsible motorcycle use, XXXXXXXX no evidence within the TRO process to demonstrate that motorcycle use is dangerous, unsuitable, damaging, or transforming the character of The Road.

Motorcycles used XXXXXXXX will usually be those classed in accordance with type approval regulations as XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, where the type-approval is for on-road use and the requirements contemplate “special use” as being especially suitable for use on roads that do not have a sealed surface – such as The Road.

It follows that road-legal XXXXXXXX XXXXXX are suitable for use on all-roads, including The Road, as a fact of their being type approved in accordance with statutory requirements. Moreover, those motorcycles classified as “enduro” are also especially suitable for use on The Road having regard to its character as a made-up carriageway with an unsealed surface.

The Road, comprising of a made-up carriageway that is suitable for vehicles, and which has long formed part of the ordinary road network, can comfortably and safely accommodate motorcycle traffic with non-motorised traffic. The Road can also comfortably and safely accommodate classes of non-motorcycle vehicular traffic that are wider, heavier, inherently more dangerous, with non-motorised traffic (and motorcycle traffic) where those classes of vehicle (horse drawn vehicles and EAPC) are not prohibited by the TRO.

By Gloucester County Council choosing to exempt motor vehicles being used for access to premises, the proposed TRO accepts that agricultural traffic, HGVs, and cars will continue to use The Road despite TRO powers being available to prohibit such use. Such powers are available where the traffic authority is satisfied that for reasons of danger, damage, facilitating passage of vehicular traffic, or restricting HGV for amenity purposes, it is requisite to prohibit such use for more than 8 in 24 hours in respect of access to premises. It follows that Gloucester County Council, as traffic authority, is satisfied that use of The Road by tractors, HGV, cars is not so damaging, dangerous, incompatible with vehicular traffic (including bicycles and horse and cart), or detrimental to amenity, so as to warrant restriction.

We refer to the findings of independent research commissioned by Government:

"Damage to byway surfaces in general increases exponentially with the increase in axle loading. Motorcycles are likely to have the lowest axle loading of any vehicle but their ability to accelerate quickly can produce rutting on soft surfaces. However, the main concern is with vehicles with heavier gross vehicle weights. The effects of land management vehicles, which are generally heavy, are likely to be much greater than dwelling access and recreational traffic although their impact may be mitigated by the low speeds at which such vehicles operate."⁴

Motor cycles account for c.1% of traffic on the ordinary road network and around 21% of motorised traffic on Byways Open to All Traffics. Motor vehicles used for land management and access purposes comprise some 62% of traffic on byways and recreational 4x4 some 17%. The main (somewhere between 99% and 79%) motor vehicle impact on The Road does not arise from motor cycle use and most likely arises from motor traffic that is not restricted by the proposed TRO.

It is a nonsense to maintain that it is practicable for The Road to sustain and safely accommodate agricultural traffic, HGVs, and cars, yet not practicable to sustain and safely accommodate any degree XXXXXX responsible use of lightweight motorcycles.

We make the further observation that motorcycles will generally cause no more damage to the road surface than equestrian traffic. We refer to the findings XXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Motorcycling on unsealed roads, such as The Road, started in the Victorian era and was established prior to WW1. Motorcycling on such minor roads is a proper use of the countryside that forms the traditional fabric of British rural heritage.

The Road has a primary purpose. That primary purpose is to accommodate traffic. The Road's accommodation of motorcycle traffic is an intrinsic element of the character of The Road. Loss of motorcycle traffic would dilute the character of The Road rather than preserve its character. The proposed TRO would be detrimental to the character of the road by altering it to a more path-like character from its long-established character as a made-up carriageway forming part of the ordinary road network.

We see that the proposed TRO would transform The Road from its valued character as a made-up carriageway to an under-used, under-valued, weed-infested dog toilet, frequented by little more traffic than a minority of local residents, devoid of traditional traffic (including motorcycles), and at best a pale imitation of a carriageway.

The primary detriment to the character of The Road arises from failures to maintain, repair, and remove obstructions. The proposed use of TRO powers will not preserve the character of The Road and will not satisfy or

circumvent statutory duties to put The Road in repair, remove obstructions, and maintain. Neither will the proposed TRO protect The Road from the most damaging classes of motor traffic continuing to be used for access, where those classes of traffic continue to have far greater impact on The Road than motorcycle traffic. We are unconvinced that the traffic authority, acting rationally and properly, can conclude that the TRO as proposed is a practicable option to satisfy its traffic management duties.

5. Motorcycle use by XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX is safe and compatible with creating safe area for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders.

XXXXXXXXXXXX responsible use of motorcycles on The Road is conducted in accordance with the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. Such responsible and considerate motorcycle use is safe and compatible with other classes of traffic, including pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders. There are no factors identified within the TRO consultation process to demonstrate otherwise.

XXXXXXXXXXXX is so very safe and compatible with non-motorised traffic that XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, for many decades, provided marshalling services for equestrian events where our members ride their motorcycles on the course as equestrian competition takes place. The equestrian event area, and surrounding event area, is a safe area for all classes of non-motorised traffic XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX is both present and welcomed by the event organisers. Our safely, compatibly, and peacefully sharing road space with non-motorised users is well-documented and acknowledged. The XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX recognised as good practice by authorities, and we are pleased to note the Highway Code has more recently caught up with the XXXXXXXXX.

Our members have responsibly motorcycled on The Road for many decades and report no difficulties in safely, peacefully, and considerately sharing The Road with other road users in a manner that is compatible with and convenient for all.

A safe space for non-motorised users already exists on the The Road in the presence of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. It is practicable to continue to provide that safe space without the most extreme option of a total prohibition of all motorcycle traffic for all time.

Alternative Options

Gloucester County Council should undertake maintenance and repair and remove highway obstructions. Doing so would make it easier for road users to pass and re-pass on the highway, and to share road space with other users without having to contend with obstructions and disrepair whilst doing so.

Sympathetic clearing of vegetation (maintenance) would allow for more sun and wind to reach the carriageway, and this would keep the carriageway surface drier and in a more robust condition that is less prone to being slippery and particularly hazardous for non-motorised users.

XXXXXXXXXXXX use of The Road is suitable, sustainable, not damaging, and compatible with providing a safe area for non-motorised users. We are still open to improving the sustainability, safety, suitability, and compatibility of motor cycling on The Road. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX of aims to advance the interests of other road users, provided that this does not unduly restrict responsible motorcyclists.

	<p>To that end we recommend the following alternatives to the extreme of imposing an absolute prohibition on motorcycling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting access to motorcyclists holding a permit. Permits could be issued by Gloucester County Council or Gloucester County Council could authorise XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX to issue permits to members. Permits would be issued with an education pack and be subject of conditions to adhere to the XXXXXXXXXX • Prohibiting overnight use between evening and early morning hours. • Limiting group sizes so as to prevent large groups of motorcycles. • Restricting rear tyre choices, so as to ensure use of lower-impact tyres and riding. • Limiting motorcycle use to that taking place as part of a road safety rally held in accordance with regulation 5(c) of the Motor Vehicles (Competitions and Trials) Regulations 1969 • Combinations of the above • Gloucester County Council deferring decision on the proposed TRO until the management of The Road has been thoroughly explored and considered in round table discussion between stakeholders, such discussion exercise to be facilitated by Gloucester County Council. <p>TRF has examples of TRO's that provide for all of the aforementioned and we can provide further information on request. We welcome opportunity to engage in constructive dialogue with a view to conserving green roads for the benefit of responsible users.</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed closure of the Burial Path and Wyegate Lane in Newland.</p> <p>Pre COVID XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.</p> <p>I am also objecting because of the lack of any sound reasoning as to why it should be closed.</p> <p>The Forest of Dean has been preserved to not only serve those who live within its boundaries, but also others who live in conurbations that are reasonably close.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir /Madam</p> <p>Arial;color:#050505;mso-fareast-language:EN-GB">I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the intended prohibition of vehicles on the Newland track due to, " concerns raised by local representatives about unsuitable motor vehicle use."</p> <p>I have lived and worked in this area all of my adult life, enjoying many different forms of countryside access including walking, cycling and motorcycling and have personally never witnessed any "unsuitable" motor vehicle use in the many years of enjoying this, and many other un-metalled roads in our area.</p> <p>If there is indeed actual proven unsuitable motor vehicle use then surely this can be addressed by the introduction of simple measures to remind <u>all</u> users that they have a duty of care towards <u>all</u> other users and residents, as the many councils throughout the UK have done with simple updated signage etc. So that everyone can enjoy this legal un-metalled right of way in a responsible manner.</p> <p>mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-bidi-font-family:Arial; color:#050505;mso-fareast-language:EN-GB"></p> <p>I would also like to raise a point regarding the seemingly vague reason for the proposed restriction quoted as, " unsuitable motor vehicle use." If there have been any motoring offences actually committed on this road then have the police ever been called or involved in any way? Or, is it just a perception by some who object to the legal right of others to enjoy motorised access to a historic road in their area? If the latter is the case, then I and many others would ask what about the rights of others to enjoy our historic road network via some form of motorised vehicle?</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX, are writing to you in support of a Traffic regulation Order Prohibiting motor vehicles on the stretch of the Burial Path from Birchamp House to the elbow at High Meadow. Newland is a small and tranquil village which benefits from stunning vistas over the Forest of Dean and the Wye Valley, it is also home to All Saints church, known locally as the Cathedral of the forest. Due to these amenities, Newland village benefits from a great deal of tourists and locals who come to enjoy the local countryside and to learn about its long history. The Burial Path itself is part of that history and is the original path from Coleford to All Saints Church that victims of the plague were carried along in procession. In recent years, we have observed an increased number of off-road motor vehicles entering the village for the purpose of "Green Laning". These</p>

	<p>nuisance off-road vehicles not only spoil the aforementioned tranquility of the village and surrounding countryside, but have also caused significant damage to the Burial Path, eradicating its history and making it dangerous and almost inaccessible to other users on foot or horseback. In addition, the highway leading through the village has seen an increased amount of mud contamination and accelerated deterioration due to the off-road vehicle tyres churning up its surface to leave potholes, both of which are dangerous to other users of the highway. For these reasons, we are in support of the Traffic regulation Order.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>RE: (PROHIBITION OF DRIVING & PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES) (VARIOUS ROADS IN THE PARISHES OF NEWLAND AND LITTLEDEAN) (FOREST OF DEAN DISTRICT) ORDER 2023</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I wish to object to following aspect of the proposed traffic regulation (5227/40):</p> <p>To introduce a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles Restriction on the following road (Newland): Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034) from a point approximately 147 metres east of its junction with Road from Swanpool Wood to junction with Almhouse Road (C357) for a distance of approximately 728 metres in a north-easterly direction.</p> <p>This TRO failed to correctly assess the impact to protected XXXXX, as driving non-metalled roads is a widely recognised method XXXXXXXXXXXX the countryside.</p> <p>Furthermore, restricting the already minimal (post-NERC) non-metalled access will not reduce off road traffic, it will simply force legal users onto the few remaining non metalled roads thus increasing the impact on the surrounding areas. It will not cause any reduction of illegal usage, as illegal users typically ignore TROs.</p> <p>kind regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear sir/madam</p> <p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed TRO on the Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034).</p> <p>My I remind you that you have a duty to protect and assert the public's rights rather than reduce or remove those rights, and under that duty all user classes should be treated equally and fairly. Recreational vehicular users have already lost a massive amount of green roads in the county due to the NERC Act in 2006. Further reduction of the limited network will only force more pressure on the remaining green roads in the area. I XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and little has changed... in fact, if anything it's become easier to traverse.</p> <p>Authorities should not apply measures on a byway or UCR that they would not consider using on other highways. Byways and UCRs are not an optional extra to be closed to users to save expenditure.</p> <p>S.130 of the Highways Act 1980 imposes on the highway authority the duty,</p> <p>(1) To protect and assert the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of highways for which it is the highway authority;</p> <p>(3)(b) ... To prevent as far as possible the stopping up or obstruction of those highways.</p> <p>Aside from able bodied people, your restrictions will also affect the less able, disabled or elderly. As I am getting older, I find access to the countryside getting more difficult and green roads provide me with a freedom of access to the countryside. So it is possible that not only are you discriminating again a minority user group but you could be going against The Equality Act 2010. I would encourage you to take a look at the section starting on page 19 in the following link: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>Local communities often feel disassociated with the recreational vehicular user groups, but engaging in conversion often bring up similarities with issues on the ground. Highway authorities often disengage themselves from the unsurfaced rights of way network, even this it is a valuable resource for many users. By discussing issues with user groups and locals at a site meeting can often yield results for the benefit of all users and avoid a TRO altogether.</p> <p>Arguments used for closing unsurfaced public road are often flawed. The same reasoning could easily be used against the ordinary road network, e.g. the narrow width of some carriageways that have no footway or</p>
----------------------	---

refuge for non-vehicle users. Furthermore, these routes being tarmac will experience speeds much higher than on the unsurfaced network.

You cannot use the lack of funds to maintain these routes argument because you are bound by law to maintain them. It is your duty. If you fail to do this, or ban one user group, then you are failing in your duty to assert and protect the rights of all users. Perhaps you could kindly supply me with maintenance details describing what has been carried out over the last 25 years, along with a list of accidents and incidents on this road?

Some of the arguments for a TRO are not factual:

I believe one of the local parish arguments is that MPV users have damaged the walls along the lane. It is actually the tree roots that have damaged the walls forcing stones onto the surface of the lane.

Vehicles will be damaged with a real risk of oil and other liquids leaking and entering the watercourse. If that is the case, then the road is out of repair and it doesn't need a TRO, but maintenance by the highway authority.

Recreational use is a motorsport. Incorrect. Green laning is a pastime in the same way as walking, cycling, horse riding or using a carriage on an unsurfaced road is.

Non road legal vehicles are being used on the road. If this is the case, then that is illegal and falls on the police to deal with. You can't close a road because of illegal users. That would be like banning football matches because of hooliganism.

Illegal use on adjacent land. Again, this is for the police to deal with.

Speed of vehicles spooks animals. You cannot drive fast on this lane and legal users slow down for other users and switch off engines to let them to pass. Motoring groups have a code of conduct. For example: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Promises by clubs to repair and maintain are 'fanciful'. Not so... there are plenty of examples here: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

	<p>Real life stories</p> <p>I would like to point you in the direction of a few videos that highlight the importance of the minor road network to those that are less able...</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX Story: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX Story: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX Story: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>And consider this... these public roads are multi-user routes:</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>If you do instigate this TRO, there's a good chance that you may be challenged in court that may see significant costs awarded against you if you lose. Whereas working with MPV user groups can be proactive, productive and positive with a potential for help with issues of maintenance for the benefit of all users.</p> <p>Please reconsider and engage with all parties to allow all users groups to enjoy this rare and important resource.</p> <p>Can you confirm receipt of this email?</p> <p>Thank you</p>
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>Re: GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL,(PROHIBITION OF DRIVING & PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES) (VARIOUS ROADS IN THE PARISHES OF NEWLAND AND LITTLEDEAN) (FOREST OF DEAN DISTRICT) ORDER 2023</p> <p>Your ref, 5227/40</p>

Dear Traffic Regulation Orders Ltd,

Please find attached our objection to the proposed order

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge its safe receipt

Yours faithfully,

XXXXXXXXXXXX

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing on behalf of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX to protecting access to this country's network of ancient unsealed public roads and historic vehicle rights of way. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX organisations and XXXXXXXXXXXX. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX is seriously concerned that Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) intends to misuse its powers to appease the prejudices of a minority of residents who dislike the public using public roads with motor vehicles. We are concerned that the order process is discriminatory and that GCC has failed to undertake its statutory duties under s.122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, s.149 of the Equality Act 2010, and s.41 and s.130 of the Highways Act 1980. We look forward to receiving your assurance that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will not progress and that you will discuss future proposals with us to achieve a reasonable outcome.

The XXXXXXXXXXXX objects to the proposed Traffic Regulation (Prohibition of Driving) Order in respect of the XXXXXXXXXXXX towards Bircham Wood (500034) (Item 1 in Schedule 2 to the Order) on the following grounds.

1. The reasons given by the Council for making the Order are spurious and unsubstantiated.

1.1. The Statement of Reasons provided by the Council is ill-conceived and inadequately thought through. Neither it nor the notice or draft Order provides either justification for making the proposed Order or any evidence of the need for an Order. The Statement of Reasons is not fit for the purpose of meeting the Authority's obligation to enable meaningful consultation.

1.2. The first three bullets presented as “reasons” replicate the wording of section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 without providing any substantive indication of why those grounds for making an Order apply in this case. The fourth and fifth bullets, although they give the impression of being “reasons”, are similarly re-iterations of various grounds on which the Council may wish to consider a traffic regulation order but fail to justify why an Order has been deemed necessary.

1.3. The unsubstantiated “concerns raised by local representatives about unsuitable motor vehicle use” is not an adequate reason to deny the long-established public rights.

1.4. The proposed TRO is rooted in lobbying from individuals that have singled out motorised users based on pre-judged characteristics. They believe motor vehicle use on unsealed roads is inappropriate. It is wrong, irrational and prejudicial for GCC to use its powers to defeat its statutory duty to assert and protect the rights of the public because some people dislike the thought of other people using public roads.

2. Notwithstanding the fact that the reasons given by the Council are spurious and unsubstantiated and therefore provide no credible basis for making the proposed Order, if there is any such data, which can be substantiated, then this could be dealt with by selective measures and by engaging with the motoring organisations, who would be willing to work with the Council on implementing a suitable scheme. The XXXXXXXXXX invites GCC to consider the suggestions proposed to XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXX. We ask GCC to give a reasoned response to the options presented.

The Association makes these following additional grounds for this objection to the Order based on the headings put forward by the Council.

3. For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.

3.1. The Police are required to use the national ‘Stats 19 Report Form’ to record injury accidents involving motors, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The Police also log and investigate ‘non-accident’ allegations of bad driving made to them. These are given incident numbers and logged by the Police for statistical and other purposes. Therefore, if a road is, or is likely to be, dangerous, there will be evidence in Police records to substantiate this. No such evidence has been put forward. Anecdotal evidence alone is not

a defensible basis for making Traffic Regulation Order.

3.2. If there are no records that substantiate a current danger 'to persons or other traffic' on any road, then there can be no likelihood of danger in the future, unless some significant circumstance has changed, or is going to change. The Association asks Gloucestershire County Council to provide the research it has undertaken, the Police report it relied upon, and its risk assessment produced when deciding that this road is especially dangerous.

3.3. Given the highway authorities' duty to ensure highways are available to the public for use and apply the least restrictive option available to deal with any issues, the priority should be to remove or ameliorate the danger, or to warn drivers; only the final option is to prohibit traffic. The Association asks Gloucestershire County Council to detail the alternative options researched and to provide the reasons why they were thought inappropriate.

4. For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.

4.1. There is no indication of what traffic is considered unsuitable or what type of use is considered unsuitable, and the reasons why they are considered unsuitable. The Association asserts that the defining characteristic of a road is that it facilitates convenient passage of vehicles and other traffic. This road has been a vehicular highway since time out of mind, and it is unlikely that its character has suddenly changed. The Association is puzzled why GCC has determined that the road is now unsuitable for motor vehicles because it has sustained their use for over 100 years. The Association asks Gloucestershire County Council to provide the research it has undertaken to show the character of the road has changed significantly. We invite GCC to provide a reasoned justification for why motor vehicle use is now considered unsuitable.

4.2. Where the call is to prohibit vehicles, the guiding principle is that their presence must be so inappropriate and unacceptable that the public must be prohibited from undertaking the activity. It is important to remind the decision-makers that the test is not that one, two, several or even many people claim that they cannot tolerate the activity because, by extension, in an increasingly intolerant world, most activities would be banned. The test is that no reasonable person believes it acceptable.

4.3. Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty upon traffic

management authorities to use their powers in a way that secures the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. This duty must be construed purposely for the benefit of the public. It is inappropriate for the Council to use its powers in support of a request from residents or landowners, and it's certainly not a tool to benefit or pander to the prejudices of certain groups or classes of users. The prime concern of the Highway Authority is to assert and protect the rights of the public, and it must maintain those routes that the public use.

4.4. Proposals to prohibit the public from using a public highway to go about their lawful business must be made only as a last resort, after considering the arguments for and against the prohibition of driving and what alternative measures are available to achieve the objective set out in the duty. The XXXXXXX asks Gloucestershire County Council to provide the basis of fact that necessitated the investigation of a TRO, its justification that a prohibition of motors will benefit the public, and its consideration of alternative measures.

5. For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot

5.1. There is no Government guidance on what is 'unsuitable' or what makes one road 'specially suitable' for equestrians or walkers compared to the character of other roads. Unsuitability, or special suitability, cannot be quantified in isolation, and there must be a comparison and therefore an objective test. If proposing a TRO on these grounds, the Council should be able to provide objective evidence of unsuitability or special suitability.

5.2. The power to regulate traffic is not available to make a road more suitable to the wishes of a minority of landowners and residents. Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 places an absolute duty of maintenance of a highway on GCC, which it cannot avoid. It is a duty not merely to keep a highway in such state of repair as it is at any particular time but to put it in such good repair as renders it reasonably passable for the ordinary traffic of the neighbourhood at all seasons of the year without danger caused by its physical condition. Roads are not lavatories for the dog-walking elite nor open ground for garden allotments. An assessment of the character of the road must start from the premise that GCC has performed their duty. Anything less is a misuse of powers to normalise a situation of neglect.

5.3. GCC gives no objective evidence to support its claim of special suitability for persons on

horseback or on foot. The Association asks Gloucestershire County Council to provide the research it undertook into special suitability and justify what makes this road especially suitable for use on horse and foot compared to other unsealed roads in the county.

6. To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders

6.1. Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 places a statutory duty on GCC to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of the highway. All users must be treated equally, fairly and without prejudice. No explanation is provided as to why the removal of public motor vehicles from the road will create a safe environment for other road users. The Association is puzzled why its members are thought to pose an unacceptable risk to road safety while delivery lorries, builders' vans and other vehicles are considered safe (article 5 of the Order).

6.2. Studies have shown that the average daily public vehicle movement on the green lane network is 2 motorcars and 1 motorcycle 2. The nature of the impact of these vehicles is transient given that it is infrequent, and once the vehicle passes it quickly subsides. Speeds are low because the terrain naturally constrains the law-abiding motorist to slow and steady progress. Because of this, the risk posed to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders is minimal. We assert that these minor, momentary and transient encounters are unlikely to ever create a situation that a reasonable person could find unsafe.

6.3. The Association asks Gloucestershire County Council to provide the research it has undertaken into road safety and to provide a reasonable justification for why prohibiting our members will result in a substantive improvement in road safety and a reduction in casualties.

6.4. If the Council has any such data, then this could be dealt with by selective measures and by engaging with the motoring organisations, who would be willing to work with the Council on implementing a scheme of voluntary restraint.

6.5. If the aim is to improve the general safety for these user groups, then Council efforts and resources would be more effectively directed at managing traffic on the surrounding road network because they face vastly greater risk where vehicular traffic numbers and speeds are considerably greater.

7. To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway.

7.1. It is not clear why the word “accelerated” is used since there is no evidence of any increase in the use of this highway.

7.2. Preventing damage to vegetation is not in itself a plausible or lawful reason for making a Traffic Regulation Order.

7.3. As regards surrounding biodiversity, the correspondence on this issue provided by the Council on request shows that this reason is purely speculative and that there is no evidence to substantiate it. Several studies exist on species diversity on green lanes compared to single hedgerows and surrounding arable land. While each paper has its perspective, some look at flora, fauna, or both, while others focus on particulars such as bees and butterflies. What they all do is agree on the following points:

- that species diversity is more abundant on green lanes;
- that there is a case for continued use of green lanes, lack of use causing the creation of less diverse linear woodland that leads to a decline in biodiversity.

7.4. People often intuitively believe that the motorised use of green lanes is detrimental to the environment. They point to specific instances of animals being disturbed, hedges dying back, or ruts being created. These are all part of those special conditions that exist within the green lane, and scientific studies show instead that responsible and sustainable use is, in truth, helpful to biodiversity

7.5. These studies show that maintaining the diversity of vegetation inside green lanes requires continued usage of green lanes by farm vehicles, livestock, horses, and people to prevent lanes from becoming overgrown and eventually strips of linear woodland, which, although valuable in their own right, would be unlikely to maintain the structural and plant community diversity found in green lanes.

7.6. The parallel hedgerows protect the interior environment from pesticides that would deter insect species and provide shelter for both flora and fauna. One reason species diversity is increased is the variety of environments created by motorised use. The wheel ruts and central section between them encourage the growth of different ‘trample-hardy’ species and grasses, while the inner and outer verges attract different species simultaneously. Light levels are different again for the inner and outer verges, and the central section, as are nutrient and water availability.

7.7. The credible, well-researched evidence is clear, biodiversity increases with use. Distinctly

different conditions develop over time, and animals, insects, and species tolerant to the transient presence of motor vehicles have a unique environment to thrive. The sudden exclusion of motor vehicles rapidly changes this dynamic, and the monoculture returns.

7.8. Regarding damage to the highway, there is nothing to suggest that our members are using the road in any extraordinary way; They are simply exercising their lawful right to freely pass and repass. Any perceived damage is likely to result from the GCC's failure to undertake its duty to ensure the road is reasonably convenient for all its users.

7.9. There is no evidence that GCC has taken its maintenance duty seriously, nor is there evidence that GCC has thoroughly researched the likely change in biodiversity caused by excluding motor vehicles. The Association asks Gloucestershire County Council to provide its long-term survey of the condition of the road and its research on the anticipated change in biodiversity.

7.10. Surveys by xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx indicate that the maintenance issues there could be easily remedied by work that would be willingly undertaken by Grxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, at no cost to the Council. These proposed solutions are set out in a letter that our local representative, xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

There are other grounds on which the TRO should not be applied as follows.

8. Illegal or irresponsible motoring

Practical experience shows that a total prohibition of access is unlikely to have much if any, deterrent effect on people who use motor vehicles illegally or irresponsibly. The police do not have the resources to enforce TROs in remote rural locations. Practical experience indicates that once responsible and lawful use is prevented, then those intent on illegal and irresponsible use will be left to their own devices without any restraining influence or fear of prosecution. In many cases illegal and irresponsible use increases in the absence of responsible users. Illegal and irresponsible use would be less likely if responsible use can continue.

9. Highway maintenance

A Traffic Regulation (prohibition of driving) Order would do nothing to help maintain the highway. As noted above, the maintenance issues identified could be easily remedied by work that would be willingly undertaken by Green Lane Association volunteers, at no cost to the

Council. The proposed Order would eliminate that as a viable option and the specialist knowledge and voluntary skills would no longer be available. As the highway has not been maintained by the highway authority for many years, it is highly improbable that the highway authority would undertake that maintenance work.

10. Access for people with disabilities

10.1. The Association is alarmed and concerned that GCC has failed to recognise the impact the Order will have on our disabled members. In the Statement of Reasons, you state, "Thorough consideration was given to the equalities duty of the Council under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010." Yet in your due regard statement, you report, "No negative or positive impact on this group has been identified at this time." The Association strongly disagrees.

10.2. 20% of people in the UK face daily barriers to various activities due to some form of disability. Our membership demographic reflects this. Vehicle users have a tiny proportion of the countryside access network nationally (circa 3%), and it is fair to say they are a minority user group. In addition, motorised users are often less able, disabled or elderly. A vehicle is the only convenient way for them to leave the tarmac road and access the countryside in a way that they feel safe and comfortable.

10.3. Our members with disabilities face challenges that vary hugely from one person to the next. Challenges that cannot be overcome simply by using motorised wheelchairs or scooters, particularly on the kind of highway in question here. In any case, it is inappropriate to guardrail those with disabilities into accepting access based on what others determine is appropriate for them.

10.4. Many of our members find distance a barrier to access due to fatigue, health concerns, needing to carry medical equipment or sensory overload. Enjoying the amenity of ancient unsealed roads from the comfort and safety of a vehicle can make the countryside accessible to disabled people who find that the rights of way network for foot, cycle and horse traffic offer little or no opportunity to them.

10.5. Newland Parish has 4 unsealed roads. This Order affects 2. We understand that a similar Order is under consideration for the remaining 2. It is incomprehensible that GCC believes prohibiting the public from one or more of these roads will not affect our disabled members. The Association wants to be clear; the loss of amenity will have a significant

	<p>and lasting impact on our disabled members!</p> <p>10.6. Article 30 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) places a duty on everybody involved to ensure those with disabilities can participate in cultural life, recreation, leisure and sport to the fullest extent possible.</p> <p>10.7. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on all those in public service to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other similar conduct.</p> <p>10.8. The Act and Convention place an absolute burden on everyone involved to consider whether their actions are discriminatory. It is no defence to claim that discrimination had entered the process earlier and that person was facilitating its passage.</p> <p>10.9. For the avoidance of doubt, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>"98. The test whether a decision maker has had due regard is a test of the substance of the matter, not of mere form or box-ticking, and the duty must be performed with "vigour and an open mind": XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>"102. "Due regard" must be given "before and at the time that a particular policy that will or might affect disabled people is being considered by the public authority in question": XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>10.10. The Association asks GCC to provide its assessment report on the effect the Order has on disabled drivers, the reasons why it has determined it is inappropriate for our disabled members to access the countryside using unsealed roads, and its plan to replace the loss of amenity they will suffer.</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Please find attached objections to proposed TROs Reference 5227/40 on behalf of All Terrain UK.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p>

On behalf of our members and the wider green laning community, we would like to raise objections to the following proposed TROs.

“Various Roads in the parishes of Newlands and Littledean Ref 5227/40.”

Specifically: -

- Coxbury Lane, Redbrook
- The Burial Path, Newlands

Coxbury Lane, Redbrook

The handrail appears to be an illegal obstruction to prevent motorised access. We would politely suggest GCC Highways investigate why it has been put there, and if deemed not official, should be removed, especially as this road has vehicular rights and is maintained at public expense.

Also, please consider: -

- Better signage
- One way to make the section easier to navigate.

Raising a TRO to prevent access to a highway appears to be illegally blocked would not be in the best use of public funds.

The Burial Path, Newlands

To implement a TRO on this lane on the basis that there is anti-social behaviour and mud on the road neither seems an effective measure or the best use of public funds.

Whilst we appreciate concerns of the residents, anti-social behaviour is a local policing matter and by implementing a TRO, it will simply move the problem elsewhere. At the same time preventing use by responsible law-abiding citizens, including those less able and relying on motorised vehicles to access the countryside.

Likewise, any “off-piste” behaviour is a policing matter for which there is already robust legislation under Section 34 of the Road Traffic Act and Section 59 of the Police Reform Act.

The lane could also benefit from some maintenance, which responsible organisations would be happy to support, although GCC have a statutory duty to maintain this route to a safe standard.

As responsible green laners: -

- Our vehicles & drivers are taxed, insured and road legal.
- We often put money back into the local economy, buying fuel, supplies, using local accommodation and campsites.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For some members with health or mobility issues, this is their only practical way of getting access to the countryside. • Even for those members that don't have these issues, this pastime allows us to explore the countryside in a responsible manner and contributes to our positive mental health.
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed prohibition of motor vehicles restriction on the above lane.</p> <p>My reasons are that this will adversely affect my enjoyment & offer reduced amenity of the lane as part of a healthy lifestyle using an appropriate road legal motorcycle.</p> <p>The Lane forms a limited range of legal 'green lanes' within the area, that bring health, wellbeing and economic benefits to myself and others living in the area and brings tourism into the county.</p> <p>The loss of this lane will adversely affect my well being and that of others.</p> <p>I am not aware of any safety issues with the use of this lane when used responsibly and see no reason to prohibit motor vehicles in this discriminatory way.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>Good Afternoon</p> <p><u>Reference :- the introduction to Prohibition of Motor Vehicles Restriction on the following green lane below :-</u></p> <p>To introduce a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles Restriction on the following road (Newland): • Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034) from a point approximately 147 metres east of its junction with Road from Swanpool Wood to junction with Almhouse Road (C357) for a distance of approximately 728 metres in a north-easterly direction.</p> <p>My XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and I am writing this email to object to the proposed restriction above, I have used this particular road as a means of access and recreation for XXXXXX, I am also a member of the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXX to access the XXXXXXXX during this event which has been running for XXXXX, every year we spend time doing PR along the route including Newland and we have had no real objections for the time this event has been running.</p>

	<p>On a personal note XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and find my time bimbling around on XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX on the very few green lanes left in the Forest Of Dean including the above road very good for relieving the stresses of the working week which can only be good for my mental health.</p> <p>I am not sure why the above action is necessary but there will always be two sides to every story and sometimes the minority will spoil it for the majority and with the above lane being very open and wide it surely could be saved as an ancient right of way for all users to use and maybe controlled with signage instead of a closure to motor vehicles that have used it for many many decades.</p> <p>A prime example of this type of closure would be the green lane from XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX many years ago to motor vehicles and the last time I tried to ride my push bike along it was impassable because of vegetation and lack of use.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing in regards to the recent announcement of the prohibition of vehicles on The Newland track. As someone who XXXXXX down the track, I am extremely disappointed to hear about this decision.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX on The Newland track has been a source of joy and excitement for me, and I believe that many others share the same sentiment. It is a unique experience that cannot be replicated on other roads or tracks.</p> <p>While I understand the concerns about safety and environmental impact, I believe that the prohibition of vehicles on The Newland track is not the solution. Instead, proper safety measures and regulations should be put in place to ensure that everyone can enjoy the track in a safe and responsible manner. Additionally, steps can be taken to minimize any negative impact on the environment, such as enforcing a speed limit and prohibiting littering.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider the decision to prohibit vehicles on The Newland track and instead work towards finding a solution that balances safety, environmental concerns, and the enjoyment of the track. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>

	<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear sirs,</p> <p>This email is to voice my objection of the proposed TRO on the Newland track in the Forest of Dean. The TRO would stop me from getting any access to the countryside and pursuing my passion it also curtails my mental and physical health greatly. The closure would not enable me to be included in the enjoyment of the outdoors on a XXXXXXXXX which i do so legally and sensibly.</p> <p>yours sincerely</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear sirs,</p> <p>I write to voice my objection at the proposed TRO on the Newland track in the Forest of Dean. I use XXXXXXXX to stay fit and healthy mentally and physically; the closure to vehicles would take away my pastime and enjoyment of the outdoors. I ride legally and sensibly and have very little area to pursue my passion. The TRO would take away my enjoyment and access to the countryside.</p> <p>yours</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I write in response to the public consultation regarding the proposed traffic regulation orders in West Gloucestershire reference 5227/40. I live in neighbouring XXXXXXXXX, I am a XXXXXXXXXX.</p> <p>The following refers only to the Coxbury Lane proposal and the Newland 'track' proposal. I have no objection to the TRO proposals for Littledean.</p>

Coxbury Lane

The public notice says 'The measures on Coxbury Lane are being proposed in order to address the inappropriate use of this section of Coxbury Lane by cycles and motorcycles. The Prohibition of Driving restriction will prevent all vehicles from using the road, which is a stepped area with a central handrail, and will provide a safe area for pedestrians to utilise.'

A Prohibition of Driving will not legally stop cycles according to the road traffic act and definitions therein. The proposal would appear to be in error in this respect.

How and when did this section of Coxbury Lane, a road with vehicular rights to pass and repass have steps constructed on it?

Who constructed these steps on Coxbury Lane and under whose authority?

Were/are these steps an illegal obstruction on a road with vehicular rights to pass and repass?

Why have the steps not been removed or smoothed over to allow vehicles to legally and safely exit Coxbury Lane?

What records of accidents, incidents or complaints do Gloucestershire County Council and or the Police hold in connection with vehicles using these steps?

This section of Coxbury Lane is not a footpath it is not even a bridleway or restricted byway it is a vehicular road. Why are pedestrians being prioritised over other road users irrespective of the hierarchy of road users?

Why are horses not also being prevented from using this section of Coxbury Lane? Surely in its current state it is unsafe for horses? The public notice makes no mention of a proposal to do so.

What alternate public vehicular route is proposed instead of these steps when exiting the north end of Coxbury Lane?

For both Coxbury Lane and the Newland road are alternative routes proposed to be signed? If so

where are these proposed to be?

Newland track

Referring to plan drawing number 5227-40-002 which highlights in red the proposed part of the road to be subject to the prohibition of motor vehicles. Why does the proposal stop at the north end where it joins two further sections of unsealed unclassified county roads? One leading the North and one leading to the west. The one leading to the west being a continuation of this same road.

The statement of reasons says:

'Prohibition of Motor Vehicles: Following concerns raised by local representatives about unsuitable motor vehicle use, the measures along the Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034) are being proposed for the following reasons:

- 1 For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.
- 2 For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.
- 3 For preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot.
- 4 To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders.
- 5 To prevent accelerated damage to vegetation, surrounding biodiversity, and the highway.'

I have numbered the above points to make reference below easier.

Despite the description as a 'track' this is a public road with vehicular rights to pass and repass. At some point in the recent past this road has come to be known locally as the 'burial path', even to the extent that the council have erected misleading 'burial path' signs. It is not surprising then that the locals perceive this is a path when in fact it is a public vehicular road. Had the council instead erected 'unmetalled road' or similar signs, as other county councils have to similar unsealed roads, there would perhaps not be the local misunderstanding or worse the anti-vehicle propaganda promoted in the local community.

The first bulleted reason is said to be 'For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.' What is meant by 'any other road'? This is unclear and confusing.

What accidents or incident are actually recorded by Gloucestershire Council and or the Police on this road?

Can you tell me when Gloucestershire council last carried out any works to maintain the surface of the road? The road being listed by Gloucestershire County Council Highways department as maintainable at public expense. If Gloucestershire County Council have maintained the road surface when was this and what works were done? What is the total council expenditure incurred maintaining the surface of this road in say the last twenty years?

If Gloucestershire County Council have not maintained this road why have they not done so? This road is maintainable at public expense and maintenance is surely a more inclusive step than jumping straight to prohibiting motor vehicles. The statement of reasons says 'it is the duty of a highway authority to manage their road network and to improve road safety' surely the first step in this involves maintaining roads to be suitable for all legal users. Why has this road not been the subject of any apparent maintenance prior to this prohibition proposal?

As I'm sure you know a public road is defined by road tax legislation as "a road which is repairable at public expense". There is a direct link between paying road tax to use a motor vehicle on a public road and funding the maintenance of public roads. Road maintenance is not funded by local council rates so it should not be solely the domain of residents local to the road to determine who uses a road. To prohibit the owners of motor vehicles whose collective road tax funds public road maintenance is unjust, unfair and manifestly illogical. The public who pay vehicular road tax have a right to expect the road to be signed, maintained and repaired as required in just the same way as potholes in public tarmac roads are. I and the general public would not expect a public tarmac road to be permanently closed to motor vehicles just because the road had not been maintained. Giving over the road to users who do not pay road tax is unjust, unfair and illogical.

What highways inspection records exist for this Newland road since 2005? Do they show any recorded defects? 2005 I believe is when the local community started discussing the road. If there were defects recorded what actions were taken on each defect and what was the recorded effectiveness of those actions on reinspection?

This road is no different to the many other roads in the county of a similar width to which pedestrians, horses, cyclists and vehicles have access. Particularly similar width roads that happen to be metalled or tarmac. Does the council propose to prohibit motor vehicles on these similar width tarmac roads for the same bulleted reasons 1, 2, 4 and 5 that would surely apply? Obviously not. So where is the logic in prohibiting motor vehicles on this road?

Bulleted reasons 1, 2, 4 and 5 above could equally apply to many hundreds of tarmac roads in the county. As far as I am aware there is no council intention to propose similar prohibitions of motor vehicles on these tarmac roads.

If as is said in bullet point 3 the road ‘...is specially suitable for persons on horseback...’ then it is also specially suitable, if not more so for persons on motorcycles. Motorcycles are proven to cause less damage to unsealed road surfaces than horses. Horses typically being 8 to 10 times the weight of a typical trail motorcycle and exerting a ground pressure far greater than motorcycles. The surface of this road is such that traversing on a motorcycle is easy and unchallenging in just the same way as it is for a horse.

Motorcycles give the same recreational well-being to their riders as horses do to their riders. Both types of riders bring similar monetary value to the community in the use of and need for facilities and local businesses. Such as cafes, public houses, local shops and in the case of motorcyclists petrol stations, campsites and BnB services too. Their riders are both equally tourists. Surely tourism is to be welcomed. Most local communities proactively welcome tourism.

Horse riding events and motorcycle trail riding events are equally welcomed in the Forest of Dean on unsealed unclassified county roads and other PROW. Horse riding events being held annually at Speech House and trail motorcycle events being held annually at the Orepool Inn, Sling, the latter for at least the last 40 years. In fact motorcycle trail riders are employed by the Speech House

horse event organisers to assist with the running of events. I know because I have assisted on a motorcycle on such an event. Both these types of events raise money for charitable causes. Motorcycle trail riding events on unsealed roads have a national heritage that stretches back to before the invention of tarmacadam and to the beginning of the 1900s.

This Newland road has no severe bends and does not suffer excessive overgrowth of vegetation so the visibility along the lane to all users is good and no different to numerous similar tarmac roads.

Have any notices been served on the owners of the dry stone walls lining part of this road with regard to tree ingrowth and deterioration of the walls onto the road? What subsequent inspection records exists after these notices were served?

Due to the nature of this road surface the progress of vehicles along the road is likely to be a lot slower than similar width tarmac public roads, so the risk to other road users is far less on this unsealed road than on other similar width tarmac public roads.

Mechanically propelled vehicles are far more controllable and predictable than a lot of horses, so much so that it is easy for different users to pass each other without issue. This would be particularly true of motorcycles which take no greater space than a pedestrian and less than a horse.

As occurs regularly everyday on tarmac public roads of a similar width to this unsealed road it would be easy for four-wheeled vehicles to reverse to a suitable point to allow another user to pass if required.

Bullet point 4 says 'To prevent unsuitable use by vehicles to provide a safe area for pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders'. It could be said that pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders are 'unsuitable' users of public tarmac roads, yet there are no plans to prohibit them from using public tarmac roads. There would be a public outcry if there were! Why then is the reverse occurring in that a minority of recreational vehicular users are being described as 'unsuitable' on a road that they have had a legal long standing right to use? Further pedestrians have access to 100% of the public rights of way and unsealed unclassified county roads in England and Wales whereas vehicular users have access to less than 2%.

Risks on similar width tarmac roads are often mitigated by signage yet there has been no obvious attempt to propose or install appropriate signage before this proposal. I cannot imagine the result if the same stance was taken on all similar width tarmac public roads in the county! No attempt has been made to install appropriate signage on this road showing that the road is shared by all users as is typically employed in other counties.

Why have the council not installed narrow road signs such as 516, see link https://link.edgepilot.com/s/671ec04d/uniDToQ7JUKnieWxZYL_uQ?u=https://startsafety.uk/road-signs/permanent-road-signs/warning-road-signs-permanent/road-narrows-on-both-sides-ahead-post-mount-sign-dia-516 This sign is said to be used 'where a road with one lane gets narrower on both sides enough to potentially be dangerous'.

Gloucestershire County Council could follow Devon County Council as a good example of the use of signage on unsealed road. Devon have extensively used finger post signs such as 'Unmetalled Road' and 'Byway Open to All Traffic'. As well as road user icons/symbols on signage to show who has a right to use a road as a way of bringing harmony between all users. Why has Gloucestershire Council not followed Devon and other counties in the use of such appropriate signage?

I would encourage those decision makers behind this TRO proposal to take a few moments to read this link. It is self-explanatory and if the same approach were adopted by Gloucestershire County Council it could be very productive and financially expedient for them. https://link.edgepilot.com/s/6edfc9d0/3mtF_Dj8uUyUtvBkvEsqvQ?u=https://www.trf.org.uk/highways-and-byways/

Is there a requirement legal or otherwise for Gloucestershire County Council to use measures such as road signage and as necessary road maintenance before considering prohibition? The wording of this proposal is such that Gloucestershire County Council seem to be reacting to local residents requests for a TRO and ignoring or missing other reasonable and responsible predicate steps.

It is nationally a well-known fact that prohibition of driving or prohibition of vehicles in the form of a TRO only prevents legal users it does not prevent illegal use. In fact it is most likely that illegal

	<p>users are the cause of the residents issues from what I have read in the local community council meeting minutes. Expecting the Police to monitor and enforce the TRO to prevent illegal use is a fallacy. They are known to be under resourced as it is and have very little success in this area which won't give the residents what they desire.</p> <p>I have enjoyed access to this Newland road for several years and have never seen anyone else on it let alone had any issues when using it. I hear similar feedback from other users, a number of which live locally to the road.</p> <p>The condition of the road considering it is unsealed is in relatively good condition. There are dozens of unsealed vehicular roads in poorer condition in Gloucestershire. Is it Gloucestershire County Council's intention to close those to vehicles also?</p> <p>The road is not proposed to be closed to cyclists. Why not? How are cyclists any different to motorcyclists considering the reasons given for this proposed TRO?</p> <p>Prohibiting motor vehicles from using this road restricts my amenity, recreational pleasure and well-being as it does of all other vehicular users of the road. It restricts recreational motor vehicle tourists from visiting the area and making use of and financially contributing to local businesses.</p> <p>Not all recreational users are able bodied. Some may not have visible disabilities. Some need assistance in form of a mechanically propelled vehicle to enjoy the countryside. Why are these people being discriminated against? I have a very good friend who has a prosthetic leg, he rides a trail motorcycle to enjoy the countryside as he cannot easily walk on uneven unsealed roads. He and others like him are being discriminated against by this proposed prohibition of motor vehicles.</p> <p>I object to the proposal of a prohibition of motor vehicles on this road in Newland it is manifestly unnecessary.</p> <p>Yours faithfully XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Good morning,

I am writing to you in reference to the prospective Newland greenlane closure. This email expresses that I am **not** in favour of the closure of the four green lanes in the Newland Parish and would like to them to remain open to motorised traffic. Please see below for the detailed reasons.

The proposed closure of these lanes would lead to a loss to XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX in the area. I have been XXXXXX for approximately XXXXXX and these lanes form key part of routes used regularly XXXXXXXX. Not being able to access these would lead to a large negative impact on the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and there for a negative effect on my mental health. I have come to rely XXXXXXXXXXXX within this great community of XXXXXX important aspect of keeping my mental state healthy. Removing access to these lanes would badly affect the health and well being of myself and others.

XXXXXXXXXX on these lanes has increased my social circle, which therefore leads to better personal support and mental stability, not having access to these lanes will lead to disruption of this community, negatively affecting my health.

The recreational use of these lanes also benefits my physical health as I XXXXXXXXX on them to stay fit, closing these lanes would lead to a loss of fitness and there for have a negative affect on my health. It would be extremely if the current and future generation could not maintain their physical and mental well being but the use of these lanes. I am sure that I do not need to go into the extra pressures this will lead to putting on both the local and the national NHS, not to mention the economy.

I also use these lanes as part of my way to XXXXXXXXXXXX as I XXXXXXXXX and maintain great relationships with my valued partners during my course of work in my XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

In a wider view, the loss of these lanes would have a negative effect on local business as the access to the area is diminished, tourist and visitors to the area are decreased and revenue created in cafes, hotels, fuel stations etc is consequently lower.

Enjoyment of this beautiful local area is one of the reasons I moved to the Forest of Dean, beginning a XXXXXXXX here and becoming an integral part of the local community. It goes without saying that XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX with treat this area and the other recreational users on the lanes with the utmost respect and look to keep it in a great condition for all types of users.

Thanks for reading my explanation of why our use of these routes should not be prohibited.

	<p>Best Regards, XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>15 March 2023</p> <p>Traffic Regulation Orders Ltd ADL House Oaklands Business Park Armstrong Way Yate BS37 5NA</p> <p>Reference 5227/40: GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (PROHIBITION OF DRIVING & PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES) (VARIOUS ROADS IN THE PARISHES OF NEWLAND AND LITTLEDEAN) (FOREST OF DEAN DISTRICT) ORDER 2023: Prohibition of Motor Vehicles: Track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034)</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am writing to you XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>I object to the proposed order.</p> <p>Regarding the Statement of Reasons (SoR), I have been using the track from Newland towards Bircham Wood (500034), Coxbury Lane and the other unsealed routes in the Newland Parish for XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, individually and when XXXXXXXXX in XXXXXXXX organised by XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. I have enjoyed the use of these routes as a thoroughfare and for recreational access to the countryside in my XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. During this time, I have not witnessed any danger or likelihood of danger to persons or traffic. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX took place here when she was XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX lanes around Newland, over eight years later. We have enjoyed the company of many other vehicle users over the years, some of whom relied on their XXXXXXXXX get them off the main roads due to limitations of wheelchair access. We have always driven courteously and in XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX as a guide for members (this includes guidance on switching off engines while horse riders pass and respecting other users). Over the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX started,</p>

many young and new XXXXXXXXX have joined our green laning trips and learned how to enjoy our unsealed rights of way responsibly. Beyond XXXXXX, both XXXXX and XXXXX have been involved in raising funds for local charities and contributing to the local community in a variety of ways: these range from XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, maintaining green-lanes, XXXXXXXXX events and using XXXXX to help out in extreme weather.

Over the years XXXXXXXX XXXX these lanes, undergrowth and fallen branches have periodically narrowed or obstructed some sections, but vehicle users continue to make efforts to clear and report obstructions as they occur, in order to keep them open for all. Surface conditions have varied seasonally and some sections can become rutted, particularly when water runs off the surrounding land or when used by agricultural or forestry vehicles. However, these unsealed routes are all long-established sunken roadways which generally recover well from use in winter conditions.

I have not witnessed any overall deterioration during the time I have been using these routes.

My concern is that the suggested prohibition of vehicles on the named routes would amount to a significant loss of amenity for the local community and for visitors to the area. While there are vast areas of public access land in the local area and an extensive network of unsealed rights of way for non-vehicular users, the prohibition of vehicles on these routes would destroy a significant proportion of the (already small) network of unsealed vehicular rights of way in the area. Not only would this decimate the hobby of law-abiding individuals XXXXX, it could also threaten the existence of XXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXX the benefit of their health and wellbeing.

If the passage of vehicles were to be prevented on these routes, narrow sections could quickly become overgrown, rendering them impassable to all users.

The SoR indicates that the proposals accord with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTA), however, it is my understanding that prohibition of the public from using the highway to go about their lawful business must only be made as a last resort. I have spoken to several parish residents, XXXXXXXXXXXX on 7 October 2022 with a County Councillor, two Gloucestershire Highways managers and representatives from two motor user groups) and although many constructive suggestions have been made for enforcement (to tackle any illegal or irresponsible use) and highway management (to maintain and repair the routes), the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles has been made as a first resort.

XXXXXXX members have volunteered to carry out maintenance and repairs on these routes and I have seen proposals from national vehicle user groups who are willing to help resource this work, including the provision of signage, materials and additional volunteers. This work would have no cost implication to the tax payer, allowing resources to be better used elsewhere. XXXXXXXXX volunteers have successfully carried

	<p>out XXXXXXXXXX the past and the XXXXXXXXXX who support this have had great success and experience in implementing such projects.</p> <p>I believe that allowing motorised user groups to implement proposals to improve the signage and condition of these routes would be beneficial to all users and would discourage any illegal or antisocial use. We have offered to implement these proposals on an initial 12-month trial basis to demonstrate to those supporting this order that a prohibition of motor vehicles would be unnecessary and less effective in allaying their concerns than proper management of the routes.</p> <p>The SoR goes on to state that "An extensive residents/business consultation process has been carried out". The prohibition of motor vehicles from these routes would have a direct negative impact on my business: I am a self-employed Land Rover specialist, one of several individuals and garages in the local area who make our livings from repairing and maintaining enthusiasts' vehicles which are used to drive unsealed roads. Any drop in revenue would have a knock-on effect on suppliers of parts, accessories, tyres and so forth, yet I received no correspondence in relation to these proposals, neither am I aware of any of the other related businesses in the area having been consulted. Furthermore, no contact was made with XXXXXXXX, any of the other local vehicle clubs or the national organisations representing vehicular users of unsealed rights of way. This indicates that the residents/business consultation may be biased and unreliable and has missed opportunities to gather data to establish if there has ever been or is likely to be any danger to persons or traffic using these routes.</p> <p>I am in full support of resolving any issues with vehicles using these routes but believe that prohibiting vehicular use on them would be unfair to responsible users, ineffective in preventing irresponsible users and would completely exclude many with disabilities from enjoying the local countryside.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your assurance that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will not progress and that you will discuss future proposals with the local and national clubs who represent vehicular users of these routes to achieve a reasonable outcome.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully, <u>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</u></p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	I would like to register my objection to the closure of these rights of way to vehicular use.

	<p>As a responsible road user I positively discourage un-sustainable use of green lanes, and through XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX look to educate road users so these facilities remain available to all.</p> <p>Closure of these lanes is a knee-jerk reaction to a minority, that will negatively impact those of us that are unable to access such areas without the use of a motorised vehicle.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>I would like to object to the closure of this lanes as XXXXXXXXXXXX been using them for many years. Now my XXXXXXXXX and is XXXXXX XXXXXX I XXXXXXXXX out on a regular basis.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Hi all</p> <p>i have been a user of these roads for the best XXXXXXXX, i travel XXXXXXXXXX with my XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and i use XXXXXXXXXX, we have never had to turn back due to bad conditions nor had issues with other users in either direction, these are a great place to be and especially during the spring to autumn period - i have to offer my strong objection to any TRO being put in place on these</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>I hope you find it in your hearts to leave these alone as they are, they offer great enjoyment to many users especially ourselves as motorcyclists of 5 decades</p> <p>all the best</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXX</p>

5227-40-003 The Ruffitt

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I write regarding the notice that has been placed at the entrance to the Ruffit & Reddings lanes in Littledean. Reference 5227/40</p> <p>The notice does not explain what the restrictions on these roads is to be. I have logged on to the web sites shown in the notice and can find no information regarding the restriction to be imposed on these roads. These roads already have a access only restrictions, which are not observed, if this restriction is to be policed and enforced then as residents we will be very grateful.</p> <p>Can you please advise of what exactly the notice is proposing, and how this affects us?</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>XXXXXXXXXXXXXX</p>
----------------	--