

Appendix 2 – Summarised Objections

Objection 1

This objector covered a number of areas, the first was that we have not specified the basis on which permits will be issued to motor vehicles. Secondly landowners requiring access to Ramsden Road, Holme Woods Lane, Kiln bent Road, Rake Head Road & Old Gate would be inconvenienced by the introduction of the permit scheme.

They also believe consultation has been particularly poor and that residents, landowners (and their tenants) or Holme Valley Parish Council have not had an opportunity to shape the proposal.

For the section Cheese Gate Nab Side, Scar End Lane and Scaly Gate the objector believes a section has been missed off the extent of the prohibition of driving. The western end of Scaly Gate or the southern end of Scar End Lane.

Objection 2

As a representative group for horse riders they want to see TROs on these routes but object to the TROs as currently proposed because the public has been given no information about the proposed permit scheme. This makes it impossible for anyone responding to the consultation to give an informed opinion and invalidates the consultation.

Objection 3

This objector does not agree with banning vehicles, if you ban vehicular use you will not stop anti-social use as these are people who don't care and will still use the routes.

Let us not forget that throughout the whole proposal, the routes that are being proposed are repeatedly being referred to as ROADS, or HIGHWAYS, and all legal users should have equal right to use them.

The " considered increase in vehicular use " mentioned is an effect of this policy, by persistently closing legal routes used it concentrates use on the remaining routes. I have no doubt there are an incredibly small minority of anti-social users of the roads mentioned, this does include walkers and horse riders but only vehicle users are getting banned.

Objection 4

As a local resident and with passion for off-road motorcycling this objector believes it is wrong to prevent access. Stronger enforcement and a police presence should be enough to deter those abusing these routes.

Objection 5

This objector states that permits will not improve things as they will be impossible to police and they will not prevent damage, noise, pollution or safer riding.

Objection 6

The TRO proposes a permit scheme but not who will be entitled to receive a permit. The objector believes no motor vehicle should be allowed on these routes. A review of where all the barriers are sited to prevent unwanted access should be undertaken and this review should include how the restrictions affect those persons with protected characteristics under the Equalities Act.

Objection 7

This objector supports the introduction of the TRO but not the inclusion of access being made available by permit holders. So they are saying no motorised vehicles should have access on any of these routes.

Objection 8

This objector supports the introduction of the TRO but not the inclusion of access being made available by permit holders. So they are saying no motorised vehicles should have access on any of these routes.

Objection 9

This objector request that full details of the permit scheme are made available with this TRO. They then go on to say no motorised vehicles should have access on any of these routes.

Objection 10

This objector campaigns for the rights of walkers, horse riders, pedal cyclists, carriage drivers and the disabled to use green lanes (byways open to all traffic and unsealed unclassified roads) without danger, difficulty and inconvenience caused by recreational motor vehicle use. They support the introduction of the TRO but not the inclusion of access being made available by permit holders. So they are saying no motorised vehicles should have access on any of these routes.

They also believe that the western end of Scaly Gate or the southern end of Scar End Lane should have been included in the prohibition of driving.

Objection 11

This objector supports the introduction of the TRO but not in the current way it has been drafted. This is due to the fact some vehicles will be exempt from the “prohibition” if they display a valid permit, without the TRO explaining to whom or to what class of user the permits may be granted.

Objection 12

This objector supports the introduction of the TRO but all motorised vehicles should be prohibited. Priority use of the lanes should be for horses, pedestrians and cyclists only, not for any motorised vehicles.