

**EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO**  
**THE NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITIES' TRAFFIC ORDERS (PROCEDURE)**  
**(ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2007**

**2007 No. 2542**

1. This explanatory memorandum has been prepared by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and is laid before Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.
2. **Description**
  - 2.1 These Regulations prescribe the procedure to be followed by National Park authorities when making orders to regulate traffic on byways, bridleways, footpaths, and certain other (generally unsurfaced) roads within National Parks.
3. **Matters of special interest to the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments on Statutory Instruments**
  - 3.1 None
4. **Legislative Background**
  - 4.1 Section 72 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, which is to come into force in England on 1st October 2007, amends the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the 1984 Act") by inserting new sections 22BB and 22BC relating to traffic regulation on byways etc. in National Parks.
  - 4.2 The new sections of the 1984 Act confer powers on National Park authorities to make orders, corresponding to the orders which may be made by local authorities pursuant to sections 1 to 4, 9 and 14 of the 1984 Act to regulate traffic on highways. The powers apply only in relation to byways, bridleways, footpaths, and certain other (generally unsurfaced) roads within National Parks, and do not apply in relation to such roads if an existing order to regulate traffic is already in force.
  - 4.3 This instrument prescribes the procedure to be followed by National Park authorities in the exercise of those powers. The procedures are based, with appropriate modifications, on the existing procedures which must be followed by local authorities when making corresponding orders, pursuant to the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (S.I. 1996/2489, as amended by S.I. 2000/1547, 2004/696 and 2004/3168) and the Road Traffic (Temporary Restrictions) Procedure Regulations 1992 (S.I. 1992/1215, as amended by S.I. 2004/3168 and 2006/1177).
5. **Extent**
  - 5.1 This instrument applies to England.

## **6. European Convention on Human Rights**

- 6.1 As the instrument is subject to negative resolution procedure and does not amend primary legislation, no statement is required.

## **7. Policy background**

7.1 Local authorities have for many years had powers to make traffic regulation orders to restrict or regulate the traffic on roads within their area. The powers are set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. These powers are widely used to regulate many aspects of use of the highway network from one-way systems and speed limits to weight limits and width restrictions.

7.2 National Parks were designated to conserve and enhance their natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and to promote understanding and enjoyment of their special qualities by the public in recognition of their natural beauty and the opportunities they afford for open-air recreation. Partly because of their often challenging and rough terrain, some National Parks have seemed to attract considerable numbers of recreational vehicular use that may be acceptable in other areas, but are inappropriate within National Parks and incompatible with their special qualities.

7.3 Section 72 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 gives National Park authorities similar powers to those possessed by local authorities to make traffic regulation orders for limited purposes on public rights of way recorded on the definitive map and statement and on predominantly unsealed carriageways. The power does not cover the normal, tarmacked road network and there are no new grounds for making a traffic regulation order introduced by the section.

7.4 In January 2007 the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs consulted on the implementation of this new power for National Park authorities. The consultation period closed in April 2007.

7.5 A total of 52 consultees responded to the consultation paper. The largest number of respondents came from Countryside User Groups (42.3%), followed by County Councils, District, National Park Authorities (15.4%), Borough and Local Councils (11.5%) and Local Access Forums (11.5%). Other respondents included individual members of the public (11.5%) and private companies (3.9%).

7.6 92.3% of respondents agreed with the general guiding principles that National Park authorities should follow broadly similar procedures to those currently followed by local authorities. Of the remaining 7.7%, disagreed and thought that the National Parks should not be given this power. 82.6% respondents agreed that providing a new single set of regulations targeted at National Park authorities is the correct way to implement new powers. Of the remaining 17.4%, respondents thought that the risk was too high and that it was important to use regulations that were already established.

7.7 Defra studied all the responses carefully and took account of all relevant suggestions and ideas in drafting the Regulations. For example, a number of respondents raised concerns about advertising the notice of the proposed traffic regulation order only on a website. To meet these concerns, these Regulations require the notice to be advertised both in a local newspaper and on the National Park authority's website.

7.8 The Government plan to issue guidance to all National Park authorities and local authorities to help establish this new procedure.

## **8. Impact**

8.1 A Regulatory Impact Assessment is attached to this Memorandum.

8.2 The impact on the public sector will be to work in association with the National Park authorities to agree the routes which will be part of the traffic regulation process.

## **9. Contact**

Paula Reading at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Tel: 0117 3728585 or e-mail: [Paula.Reading@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Paula.Reading@defra.gsi.gov.uk) can answer any queries regarding the instrument.

# Final Regulatory Impact Assessment:

## Traffic Regulation Orders made by National Park Authorities in England

### Objective

1.1 This document is a Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) of the commencement (in England) of section 72 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC) which introduces new sections 22BB and 22BC into the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA). This will empower National Park Authorities to make Traffic Regulation Orders on certain roads within their areas.

### Background

2.1 Local Authorities (County, Unitary and Metropolitan District Councils) have for many years had powers to make traffic regulation orders on roads within their area. The powers are set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA84). Traffic regulation orders are widely used to regulate many aspects of use of the highway network from parking restrictions and speed limits to weight limits and pedestrian crossing points. Traffic regulation orders can be made without limit on their duration (hereafter referred to as “permanent”) or for temporary periods and can be made on an experimental basis to see whether a proposed measure is effective before making a permanent order.

2.2 Roads are defined as any length of highway or of any other road to which the public has access (s142 RTRA84) and thus include public rights of way such as Public Footpaths, Public Bridleways, Restricted Byways and Byways Open to All Traffic and other unsurfaced routes recorded on the Local Authority’s List of Streets (a record of highways maintainable at public expense) or that otherwise carry public rights.

2.3 Section 72 NERC was introduced primarily to enable National Park Authorities to tackle problems caused by excessive or inappropriate use of recreational motor vehicles on public rights of way and other minor highways by the making of traffic regulation orders. Whilst the power to make such orders already exists for Local Authorities, due to their limited resources and differing priorities, they have been unable to make the traffic regulation orders that National Park Authorities consider necessary within a reasonable timescale.

2.4 In recognition of their wider role in managing the rights of way and minor highway network for recreation, the provisions also extend existing powers to National Park Authorities to make a wide range of traffic regulation orders on such routes including Temporary Orders to enable works to take place.

2.5 As the section merely extends the ability to exercise the traffic regulation orders making power from Local Authorities to National Park Authorities, its implementation is not considered to have any wider ranging impacts beyond these two sectors of local government, and specifically does not have impacts on the private sector.

2.6 Informal discussions with National Park Authorities indicate that only a relatively small number of permanent / experimental traffic regulation orders are likely to be made using the new powers, perhaps one or two per National Park Authority per annum on average. Nonetheless, concern was sufficient in Parliament to ensure support for the primary legislation. Although the absolute number is small, they will address problems that are significant in the local context of the parks. Furthermore, as there are a finite number of routes with problems that might merit the making of a traffic regulation order, numbers of permanent orders made are likely to decline with time.

2.7 If no action is taken, then routes that the National Park Authorities consider require a traffic regulation order will continue to be subject to damaging use unless the Local Authority can be persuaded to implement a traffic regulation orders on their behalf.

### Rationale for Government Intervention

3.1 The Government considers that in many cases a level of recreational vehicular use that may be acceptable in other areas will be inappropriate within National Parks and incompatible with their special qualities. The use of recreational vehicles in National Parks may lead to a number of external costs to the environment and other users of the parks which are not taken into account by the users of the vehicles.

3.2 Local Highway authorities also need more guidance by which they can exercise influence or have control over the recreational vehicles in the minor highway networks in National Parks.

3.3 The Government believes that in order to assist authorities in carrying out their network management duties, the existing range of powers which they have to control activities in the National Park Authorities need to be revised, for example to allow conditions to be imposed on the way activities are carried out as well as the timing of activities to be influenced by authorities.

3.4 By enabling National Park Authorities to have greater powers, those authorities will be able to reduce the current levels of disruption to road users and local residents and the environmental features of the national parks.

## **Consultation**

4.1 A consultation on traffic regulation orders in National Parks was carried out between 25th January and 20 April. As this subject is quite specialised and is only relevant to National Park Authorities and Local Highway Authorities, the consultation list was quite narrow.

4.2 The Government agencies that were consulted on this were Natural England, Government Offices across England and the Local Government Association. The Government departments that were consulted on this were the Department for Transport and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

4.3 A total of 52 consultees responded to the consultation paper. The largest number of respondents came from Countryside User Groups (42.3%), followed by County Councils, District Councils and National Park Authorities (15.4%), Borough and Local Councils (11.5%) and Local Access Forums (11.5%). Other respondents included individual members of the public (11.5%) and private companies (3.9%).

4.4 From the 52 responses to the consultation paper, 45% supported the proposals, 29% did not agree with the proposed option and 27% made no comment. Additional comments were made from the organisations that supported the proposals, such as they still wanted the requirement to advertise a traffic regulation order (or a proposed traffic regulation order) in a local newspaper as well as the National Park Authority website.

4.5 From the 29% of respondents who did not agree with the RIA, further comments were made, such as; that the true costs of not applying traffic regulation orders had not been considered and that the estimated time that regional Government Offices would have to be involved in agreeing signage for the additional traffic regulation orders.

4.6 Another concern was the time it takes for charity organisations to respond to the additional proposed traffic regulation orders.

4.7 The consultation did not identify any new significant costs that were not identified in the partial RIA.

## **Options**

### **5.1 Option 1 - Do nothing.**

- Not implementing s72 will leave the traffic regulation order making power limited to Local Authorities and vulnerable routes within National Parks will remain available to potentially damaging uses unless and until the Local Authority can be persuaded to make the traffic regulation order itself. National Park Authority staff, and to a lesser extent Local Authority staff, will be required to manage and minimise the effects of the damage.

**Risks of Option 1:** The risks of this option include continued damage to the routes themselves, to the environment and special qualities of the parks and to the enjoyment and well-being of residents and other visitors.

### **5.2 Option 2 - Implementation by amending existing regulations.**

- Local Authorities are currently controlled by two sets of regulations when making traffic regulation orders, one applicable to Permanent and Experimental orders and the other to

Temporary Orders. It is feasible to simply extend the scope of these regulations to enable National Park Authorities to operate them.

- Implementation of s72 in this manner will require two Statutory Instruments; a commencement order and a new set of regulations that extend the definition of Local Authority in the existing regulations to encompass National Park Authorities.
- Guidance will be issued to National Park Authorities to assist them in operating the regulations and to promote best practice.

**Risks of Option 2:** The risks of this option include a risk of errors being made in the making of traffic regulation orders due to the complexity of the existing regulations. This could result in additional costs in remaking orders and / or costs of damage resulting from use that would otherwise have been prevented by a valid traffic regulation orders.

### 5.3 Option 3 - Implementation by laying of new regulations.

- The existing regulations are fairly lengthy and complex covering a wide range of situations that a Local Authority might be faced with. Given the much more restricted circumstances in which a National Park Authority can make a traffic regulation orders, there is an option to simplify and reduce the regulations faced by them.
- Implementation of s72 in this manner will require two Statutory Instruments; a commencement order and a new set of regulations that will apply only to National Park Authority s but cover all types of traffic regulation order – permanent, experimental and temporary.
- The most significant changes proposed in the consultation paper would lead to a move to consulting with Rights of Way User Groups (e.g. ramblers, horse riders and motorcyclists) instead of the transport related organisations currently required under existing legislation. It also suggests that the requirement to advertise a traffic regulation order (or a proposed traffic regulation orders) in a local newspaper be replaced by an equivalent notice on the National Park Authority website and on the route affected.
- Guidance will be issued to National Park Authorities to assist them in operating the regulations and to promote best practice.

**Risks of Option 3:** The risks of this option include the possibility that the Department for Transport will significantly revise the regulations governing Local Authority traffic regulation orders creating differences in principle between them and National Park Authorities. This, in turn, could lead to pressure to amend the proposed Defra regulations.

5.4 Both Option 2 and Option 3 shift the burden of work in preparing and implementing a traffic regulation order from the Local Authority to the National Park Authority. To the extent that these orders are not being made by Local Authorities at the moment, then this will represent a net increase in work.

5.5 It is anticipated the outcomes of Option 2 and Option 3 will be similar; the essential difference is the emphasis placed on non-statutory guidance or regulation.

5.6 An open informal consultation exercise is being carried out to inform the drafting of regulations which will set out how s72 is to operate. This will be sent to local authorities, National Park Authorities, relevant Government departments, Public Rights of Way User Groups, Land Management organisations and other stakeholders as well as being made publicly available on the Defra website.

5.7 The implementation of s72 may be viewed as part of a wider programme introduced by Part 6 NERC to restrict inappropriate and excessive use of mechanically propelled vehicles. The Department for Transport has indicated that it intends to review and update some of the existing regulations within the next year or so.

## Benefits

### Background information and assumptions

6.1 It is recognised that some of the orders that are likely to be made by National Park Authorities. As following commencement would otherwise have been made by the Local Authority. It is assumed that 90% of Permanent / Experimental traffic regulation orders constitute “new work” and 10% of temporary orders constitute “new work”. These figures are based on the premise that it is the inability of National Park Authorities to persuade Local Authorities in most cases to make sufficient Permanent Orders within a reasonable timescale that led to the inclusion of s72 in the NERC Act, hence a high proportion - 90% - of the orders will represent “new work”. However, for Temporary Orders, the proportion of orders that would not have been made by the Local Authority is estimated to be much lower because these orders are to prevent dangers to the public or to allow work to proceed and it is

probable that the Local Authority would normally have acceded to requests for these as they are less controversial and administratively more straightforward.

6.2 Consequently, in assessing the costs and benefits of the options 2 and 3, it is appropriate to take into account 90% of values estimated for Permanent / Experimental Orders and only 10% of the values for Temporary Orders.

### 6.3 **Benefits of Option 1 – Do nothing.**

- The benefits of this option include the avoidance for Government of costs of drafting and implementing new regulations and for local authorities and the public of adapting to them. Recreational motorists will continue to derive enjoyment from their use of the affected routes at least until the Local Authority undertakes to make the traffic regulation order itself.

### 6.4 **Benefits of Option 2 - Implementation by amending existing regulations.**

- Benefits will accrue largely in the form of reduction in damage arising from inappropriate uses of the routes as such uses are restricted by new traffic regulation orders. The damage could be in a variety of forms – physical damage to the surface of the route or nearby buildings, disturbance to wildlife in the vicinity, disturbance to local residents, diminished enjoyment / suitability for other users of the route – and thus these benefits are difficult to quantify
- There will also be future benefits to both National Park Authorities and Local Authorities from reduced staff time spent managing and mitigating the effects of damage from use prevented by a traffic regulation order, i.e. in the absence of a traffic regulation order the National Park Authority or Local Authority would be required to commit resources for additional repair and maintenance of vulnerable routes. If a traffic regulation order is made these resources can be used elsewhere.
- Adherence to the Guidance should ensure that Users of the route – those affected by the order – will benefit by being able to influence the order or to make alternative arrangements more easily and thus mitigate any inconvenience that may otherwise have been caused by the traffic regulation order. Such benefits will arise from enhanced early publicity for proposals and the consequent ability to modify the resulting orders to avoid unnecessary or unintended negative effects.

### 6.5 **Benefits of Option 3 - Implementation by laying of new regulations.**

The benefits arising from option 2 will be reproduced by option 3. Additional benefits include:

- Most of the benefits of enhanced consultation will be guaranteed by the regulatory framework rather than the more uncertain compliance with the non-statutory Guidance.
- There will be benefits from having a simplified regulatory framework. This should be more straightforward for National Park Authorities to operate reducing any (already small) need for training and induction for staff and the likelihood of Orders being challenged or quashed on the grounds of being incorrectly made.
- Such benefits are again very difficult to quantify.

## **Costs**

### **Background information and assumptions:**

7.1 The costs of implementation are largely proportional to the number of orders likely to be made. National Park Authorities have been asked for their estimates of the number of orders they think they may make in the first three years after commencement. Responses from them indicate that there will not be extensive use of the new powers, perhaps an average of 2 permanent order and 1.5 temporary orders per annum per National Park Authority. There are 8 National Park Authorities in England, thus the expected number of Orders is 16 permanent and 12 temporary traffic regulation orders per annum.

7.2 National Park Authorities have been managing such routes for some time and it is assumed that, in most cases, they have already identified those for which they consider a traffic regulation order is the appropriate management tool.

7.3 Any IT, procurement or capital costs associated with the proposals are considered to be negligible.

7.4 There will be an initial training requirement for National Park Authority staff involved in making traffic regulation orders. Whilst the existing regulations are more complex than the proposed new

regulations, there is a degree of familiarity with the existing ones that could compensate for this. For this reason, the training costs are assumed to be the same for both option 2 and 3. A figure of £1500 per National Park Authority to cover staff time and a trainer has been estimated for this. Future training needs are considered to be negligible.

7.5 The differences between the costings for options 2 and 3 arise from the fact that Option 2 is based on using the existing regulations that are more complex than the proposed new regulations underlying option 3. They also require the placing of 2 advertisements in a local newspaper. The costs arising from these aspects are perhaps 2 hours of National Park Authority staff time (1 hour for temporary Orders) and the cost of placing the adverts per Order.

7.6 Whilst outside bodies and members of the public may request the making of a traffic regulation order, the decision will lie with the National Park Authority. Thus it is the National Park Authority that will bear the majority of these costs. There will be a slight increased burden for central government largely made up of dealing with requests for dispensations for non-standard signage.

7.7 Adoption of either Option 2 or 3 will result in a diminution of the enjoyment of recreational motorists at least to the extent that the activity is not displaced elsewhere in less sensitive environments. The value of this is considered largely intangible.

**7.8 Costs of Option 1 – Do nothing.**

No figures are evaluated for this. This is because it would be hard to assess the cost of the damage that has occurred on the existing use of these routes by mechanically propelled vehicles. This outcome does not deliver the desired aim of Parliament when the NERC Act was being considered.

**7.9 Costs of Option 2 - Implementation by amending existing regulations.**

The figures below for Permanent traffic regulation orders are based on the following broad assumptions:

- Each traffic regulation order takes 77 hours of National Park Authority staff time once the decision has been taken to pursue the traffic regulation order management option.
- National Park Authority staff time is costed at £35/hour<sup>1</sup>.
- Public Inquiries are not held into proposed traffic regulation orders.
- There will be 4 hours of regional Government Office (GO) staff time for each order, mostly agreeing signage for the traffic regulation order.
- GO staff time is costed at £35/hour.
- Advertising and other administrative charges amount to £1000 per traffic regulation order.
- Signage, barriers and other physical works average £2000 per traffic regulation order.

Therefore the total cost per Permanent Traffic Regulation Order is estimated to be £5835

The figures below for Temporary traffic regulation orders are based on the following broad assumptions:

- Each traffic regulation orders takes 11 hours of National Park Authority staff time once the decision has been taken to pursue the traffic regulation order management option.
- National Park Authority staff time is costed at £35/hour.
- Advertising and other administrative charges amount to £500 per traffic regulation order.
- Signage, barriers and other physical works average £200 per traffic regulation order.

Therefore the total cost per Temporary traffic regulation order is estimated to be £1085

The estimated annual costs of the implementation of the new power using Option 2 is thus:

Type of Order	Estimated number p.a.	Proportion of orders that would not otherwise be made by LHA	Cost per order (£)	Total cost p.a. (£)

<sup>1</sup> This represents the ‘gross’ total.



Permanent / Experimental	16	0.9	5835	84024
Temporary	12	0.1	1085	1302
Total				85326

There will also be one-off training costs of £12,000 for the eight National Park Authorities collectively.

#### 7.10 Costs of Option 3 - Implementation by laying of new regulations.

The figures below for Permanent traffic regulation orders are based on the following broad assumptions:

- Each traffic regulation orders takes 75 hours of National Park Authority staff time once the decision has been taken to pursue the traffic regulation order management option.
- National Park Authority staff time is costed at £35/hour.
- Public Inquires are not held into proposed traffic regulation orders.
- There will be 4 hours of regional Government Office (GO) staff time for each order, mostly agreeing signage for the traffic regulation order..
- GO staff time is costed at £35/hour.
- Advertising and other administrative charges amount to £500 per traffic regulation order.
- Signage, barriers and other physical works average £2000 per traffic regulation order.

Therefore the total cost per Permanent traffic regulation order is estimated to be £5265

The figures below for Temporary traffic regulation orders are based on the following broad assumptions:

- Each traffic regulation order takes 10 hours of National Park Authority staff time once the decision has been taken to pursue the traffic regulation order management option.
- National Park Authority staff time is costed at £35/hour.
- Advertising and other administrative charges amount to £250 per traffic regulation order.
- Signage, barriers and other physical works average £200 per traffic regulation order.

Therefore the total cost per Temporary traffic regulation order is estimated to be £800

The estimated annual costs of the implementation of the new power using option 3 is thus:

Type of Order	Estimated number p.a.	Proportion of orders that would not otherwise be made by LHA	Cost per order	Total cost p.a.
Permanent / Experimental	16	0.9	5265	75816
Temporary	12	0.1	800	960
Total				76776

There will also be one-off training costs of £12,000 for the eight National Park Authorities collectively.

#### Assessment of costs and benefits

8.1 Option 1 – “do nothing” – does not deliver the desired aim of Parliament and allows damaging use of sensitive routes in National Parks to continue incurring management costs for the National Park Authorities and Local Authorities.

8.2 Option 2 and Option 3 deliver similar benefits although these are more certain under option 3. However, Option 2 has higher annual costs than Option 3.

#### Monitoring and evaluation

9.1 Defra will monitor and review the operation of the new measures to ensure that they are operating efficiently and delivering the benefits intended. This will be achieved by research,

consultation and discussion with relevant stakeholders (National Park Authorities, Local Authorities and land management and user groups).

9.2 Once the regulations have been brought into force on the common commencement date of 1 October 2007, the Rights of Way Policy Team will measure the effectiveness of whether the regulations have been a success, by discussing this regularly with the National Park Authority. The Rights of Way Policy team meet with the National Park Authorities frequently in rights of way meetings, so an update of traffic regulation orders could be easily added as an additional agenda item

### **Summary and Recommendations**

10.1 Option 1 (do nothing option) does not achieve the desired aim of Parliament of enabling National Park Authorities to protect vulnerable routes from inappropriate and excessive use by recreational vehicles.

10.2 Options 2 and 3 will enable the necessary traffic regulation orders to be made by National Park Authorities. Option 3 achieves this at marginally lower cost by means of a combination of new regulations and guidance; option 2 relying more on the non-statutory Guidance to deliver the desired outcomes.

10.3 Whilst there is a preference to limit the amount of new regulation, in this case the proposed new regulations are essentially a simplified and targeted version of the existing regulations.

10.4 On this basis, Option 3 is the recommended option.

### **Implementation and delivery plan**

11.1 The change in policy will be brought about by commencing new regulations and a commencement order on 1 October 2007. This new set of regulations were introduced to control excessive or inappropriate use of mechanically propelled vehicles away from the ordinary road network. However the National Park Authority will be able to use these powers to regulate all forms of traffic in a wide variety of circumstances, and are not limited to tackling problems specifically related to use by mechanically propelled vehicles.

### **Post Implementation Review**

12.2. It is expected that there will be an increase in the number of applications when the legislation is brought into force on 1 October 2007, but it is expected that the numbers of applications will level out. The Rights of Way Policy Team will review the number of traffic regulation order applications made on a regular basis.

12.3 The Rights of Way Policy Team will issue guidance to National Park Authorities and Local Authorities in October 2007. National Park Authorities have already had an input into this guidance.

### **Summary and Recommendation**

13.1 this represents from the consultation and from discussions with Defra lawyers and other Government departments including Department for Transport and Department for Culture Media and Sport, it has been decided to go with Option 3 – the implementation of a new set of regulations. Option 3, the implementation of new regulations, is recommended as this provides the best outcome

## Summary costs and benefits table

Option	Total benefit per annum: economic, environmental, social	Total cost per annum: - economic, environmental, social - policy and administrative
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoidance of Government costs of drafting new regulations</li> <li>Local authorities and the public would not have to adapt to the new regulations</li> </ul>	Continuing damage to these routes and continuing use by mechanically propelled vehicles.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in damage arising from inappropriate uses of the routes</li> <li>Reduced staff time spent managing and mitigating the effect of use</li> </ul>	Total cost of a permanent traffic regulation order is £5835  Total cost of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order is £1085
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simplified regulatory framework – easy for National Park Authorities to adhere to.</li> </ul>	Total cost of a permanent traffic regulation order is £5265  Total cost of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order is £800

### Declaration and publication

*I have read the regulatory impact assessment and I am satisfied that the benefits justify the costs*

**Signed ... Phil Woolas**

**Date 27th August 2007**

**Minister's name, title, department**

**Contact point for enquiries and comments: Paula Reading, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Zone 1/02, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay Square, Bristol. BS1 6EB. Tel: 0117 3728585 or email: Paula.Reading@defra.gov.uk**