

NOTES OF THE CINDER TRACK TASK GROUP - 18 SEPTEMBER 2018

Present:

Members of the Task Group: Cllr Hazel Lynskey (Chair), Cllr Godfrey Allanson, Cllr Liz Colling, Cllr Gerald Dennett, Cllr Jane Mortimer

Advisers: Paul Thompson (Operations, Transport and Countryside Manager, SBC) and Richard Gunton (Director of Parks Services, North York Moors NPA)

1. Declarations of interests

Member of the Task Group, Cllr Gerald Dennett declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest since his property adjoined the Cinder Track. He added that he had been given a dispensation by the Deputy Monitoring Officer to take part in the review as a Member of the Task Group.

2. Views of stakeholder groups

Cyclists

Andy Sharp, Chair of Friends of the Old Railway

- FoOR grew out of Scarborough Renaissance Active Transport Group to encourage sustainable modes of transport to ease congestion on the roads and improve public health. FoOR has previously received Heritage Lottery Funding to improve parts of the track, but nowhere near the scale of improvements required for the track as a whole
- Sainsburys car park to end of Manor Road Cemetery is acceptable to FoOR (2.5m wide, smooth tarmac, used by cycles, pushchairs, scooters, mobility scooters, wheelchairs without conflict between users. Usage increased when it was improved)
- FoOR priorities for the track:
 1. End of Manor Road Cemetery to Station Road in Scalby – needs upgrading to release pent up demand by commuters / cyclists for daily journeys – track bumpy and not wide enough
 2. Hawsker to Whitby – needs upgrading - sensible distance for everyday journeys
 3. Scalby to Burniston – loose nature of material and ruts catch out cyclists and lead to accidents, in particular beginners – commutable distance to Scarborough
 4. Borough is disconnected for road cyclists between north and south. Particular difficulty on the main road between Falcon Inn and Boogle Hole turn off. So would like Ravenscar to Boggle Hole section of track to be upgraded to help connect Borough for road cyclists

Rob Brown, Scarborough Ryedale Community Cycling

- His not for profit community interest company initially worked in schools, teaching children to ride and then extended its remit to work with disabled

people. They now have some 50 adapted bikes. Bikes are a vehicle for social interaction

- So many sections of the track are too challenging for adapted bikes – uneven surface, ruts and too narrow.
- A lot of accidents between Scalby and Burniston
- Also operate a Bike Library to promote cycling – increasingly popular among visitors – good for visitor economy, but has to warn cyclists about certain sections of the track

Horseriders

Catriona Cook, Regional Access Officer, British Horse Society

- Horse riding comes second only to agriculture as the land-based industry with most value to the local economy
- 90% of riders are female and most prevalent socio-economic group among riders is C and D – not elitist
- Many of the people who ride locally are in the caring professions who spend much of their income on their hobby
- Some 1000 horses in the Scarborough area. Horse riding contributes some £4m to the local economy
- Females feel safe to hack out by themselves
- Please also refer to horse riders when you refer to walkers and cyclists in the document
- A high proportion of horses and carriages on the roads suffer accidents – higher percentage than other modes of transport
- Report states that only 6% of track users are horse riders. Question this statistic since many riders hack out in the early hours of the morning. Willing to undertake a head count of horse riders and frequency of track use to assist the Task Group (*Paul Thompson – will check data, and undertake more survey work as required, and yes, accept Mrs Cook's offer*)

Ramblers

Les Atkinson, Secretary, Scarborough and District Group, Ramblers Association

- There are four embankments each with a tunnel in the centre and a stream running through between Stoupe Brow and Boggle Hole road which are in a poor state of repair. Danger of collapse and flooding. Repairs should be included in the Project Plan.
- Against use of tarmac on the track below Stoupe Brow. The people who use their vehicles on the track to access their properties do not want it. Their vehicles do not damage the track, rather it is the farmers' tractors and trailers. Prefer use of crushed stone as the Forestry Commission use
- Tarmac will break up on top of the cinders and will encourage speeding cyclists
- Believe should scrap licences for vehicular use of the track since does not generate much revenue and not all users pay
- Cinder Track needs volunteer support to maintain it, not a new surface

Local residents

Ray Clifford

- Supports the general direction of the draft Plan although would have liked more time to study it before the meeting
- Comments with page references to the report

p.3 – Cinder Track is known by different names since some do not like this name. The Sustrans Plan was not the subject of an ‘extensive consultation’.

p.16 – Against use of road planings in some areas – even if well compacted, they are little more than a poor person’s tarmac

p.17 – Against chicanes – will encourage rogue cyclists to show off. Gates should not be locked and should be accessible for all users. Limit signage to the necessary (should not be an art display) and prevent street clutter

p.20 – Memorial benches can become a negative influence when adorned with vases and flowers – cannot be used to sit on. Limit non-natural street furniture to that of need. Do not decorate the track, but allow people to see the natural beauty around

p.21 – ‘The management committee would undertake the day to day running of the track’ Is this a change of responsibilities? Last year, was informed that the management committee e.g. Friends of the Old Railway had overarching management responsibility, not the day to day

p.24 – ‘Improved signage on Lancaster Way’ (residential cul-de-sac/turning circle). Congestion problems raised by residents of LW do not seem to have been taken into account, including use of turning circle as a free parking area by track users

p.35 – Fylinghall car parking – believe this should be free, otherwise drivers will clog up neighbouring single track roads to avoid payment. Prefer a donations approach.

- Suggest a track maximum speed limit of 10mph which would be self-policing
- Suggest a priority code for users as seen elsewhere:
 - i Bikes and motorised vehicles give way to walkers, wheelchair users and horse riders
 - ii Walkers give way to horse riders
 - iii Horse riders to be aware of all other users

Bob McGovern

- Welcomes the change in tone in the document and the emphasis now given to describing the Track as both a multi-user track path connecting villages and dwellings, and a unique wildlife and ecological corridor supporting a wide range of biodiversity, rare plants and species.
- Plans that work on this scale cannot be undertaken without adequate baseline data. However, the document is generous to the earlier work done by Sustrans. Need to be clear that the Phase 1 survey of 2012 by Sustrans was then, and still is, out of date and partial. It helped to highlight the scale of diversity on the Track but, sadly, was ignored by Sustrans themselves when they came to planning and sequencing the works. This can’t be allowed to happen again. Notes the intention in the document to update the Phase 1 study and would hope that it goes further and is seen to underpin the scale and nature of the works along the Track. To that end hopes to see rigorous

planning conditions applied by NYMNP/NYCC and independent ecological oversight of the proposed works.

- Notes there is no funding immediately available for the £3.5 million cost of the works. This presents a challenge. Not least it requires that the change in the tone of these proposals and the core principles continue to guide funding applications and any phased work does not become so ad hoc that it undermines them and further damages the wonderful resource already there – for all that it needs maintenance and some TLC

Heather Dale

- Very impressed by new Plan – reflects her campaign's views, is readable and accessible
- Would like to continue to work with the Council to make the Plan a reality. Campaign group with a mixture of skills who can offer much to the ongoing management of the track. Would like her campaign group and others with an interest to be represented on the Management Group (*Paul Thompson – welcome this offer and will involve campaign group in future management*)
- Funding is a challenge – needs strong community support but huge educational and leisure potential
- Would like funding to be prioritised on the maintenance and development of the track and to see money ringfenced on an annual basis for maintenance

Peter Beeforth

- Concur with most of what has been said, particularly Mrs Cook
- Vital facility for tourism – promote as a safe environment for walkers, riders and cyclists, but through disrepair is becoming dangerous in places

Parish Councils

Burniston - Cllr David Joyce

- Please keep it as a natural, off-road rather than an all-weather track. Do not want to encourage speeding cyclists many of whom have no insurance (*Chair- people with household insurance have public liability insurance*)
- Ultitrec is recycled road which behaves like tarmac. Prefer crushed limestone (*Paul Thompson – visit to Peak District – Ultitrec – more akin to a forestry crushed stone than a sealed, tarmac surface – Cllr Mortimer – crushed limestone dissolves to mush in wet weather*)

Cloughton – Cllr James Brace

- Problem with speeding cyclists in lycra. Can reach speeds of up to 30mph from Ravenscar to Station Lane in Cloughton. Where are measures to reduce speed of cyclists? (*Paul Thompson – yes, omission on this section of track. Will address*)

Newby and Scalby – Cllr Ken Martin

- Against track becoming a race track.

3. Public questions and comments

- i Timescale for delivery of the Plan?
 - *Planning application to the National Park Authority in the new year*
 - *Delivery of improvements will depend on receipt of grant funding. Expect infrastructure funding streams to come forward in future, particularly EU funding, although there are other sources*
- ii How will Code of Conduct be monitored and enforced?
 - *Largely self-policing. Create family friendly environment that will discourage racing cyclists. Most users are respectful to other users. Ultitrec surfaces slows down cyclists, and discourages speeding*
- iii Code of Conduct should also respect wildlife
 - *Yes, agree. Plan seeks to preserve the character of the route creating sinuous path of different widths*
- iv Impressed by all the work which has gone into the Plan. Disappointed by the track's deterioration. There is no single solution which will please everybody, but important that it remains accessible to all sections of the community. Current problems with the track will be overcome by the right design, surface and width. An invaluable asset for sustainable tourism. Very encouraging that we have all this expertise in the room to contribute to its future flourishing.
- v Very diverse, beautiful linear park
- vi Concern that any increase in the number and frequency of family leisure bikes or cyclists will add to the somewhat precarious and dangerous route from the end of the Cinder Track at Yorkshire Water pumping station at Lingers Beck in Robin Hood's Bay to a single track road through a busy car park and then crossing the Whitby Road through residential streets crowded with cars. A residents parking scheme and traffic management scheme is required to mitigate this risk.
- vii Making the surface of the track safer for less confident cyclists will increase its usage, and therefore make it more difficult for speeding cyclists
- viii Effect on roosting bats of opening up the Ravenscar Tunnel?
 - *Bat surveys have revealed small numbers of bats which use the tunnel to transit from one end to the other. Confident that if the tunnel is returned to use, that working with the ecologists, a solution can be found which will enhance the habitat for bats*
- ix The important cultural heritage of the track is not reflected in the draft Restoration Plan
 - *Will take this into account*
- x Cllr Colling, Member of the Task Group – would be very interested to see some of the evidence and references cited at the meeting e.g. horse riding data raised by Catriona Cook, and Askham Bryan College study of gates and accessibility

NOTES OF THE CINDER TRACK TASK GROUP - 20 SEPTEMBER 2018

Present:

Members of the Task Group: Cllr Hazel Lynskey (Chair), Cllr Godfrey Allanson, Cllr Liz Colling, Cllr Gerald Dennett, Cllr Jane Mortimer

Advisers: Paul Thompson (Operations, Transport and Countryside Manager, SBC) and Richard Gunton (Director of Parks Services, North York Moors NPA)

3. Declarations of interests

Member of the Task Group, Cllr Gerald Dennett declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest since his property adjoined the Cinder Track. He added that he had been given a dispensation by the Deputy Monitoring Officer to take part in the review as a Member of the Task Group.

4. Views of stakeholder groups

Naturalists

Wendy English, Botany Recorder, Whitby Naturalists' Club

Alan Ritson, Vice-Chair, Whitby Naturalists' Club

Brian Walker, President, Scarborough Field Naturalists

- Very pleased with draft Plan and the Environmental Principles. Most of the points raised at the public meeting at Whitby Coliseum have been taken into account.
- 2:1 tree replacement ratio may be too onerous if applied rigidly – should allow some flexibility.
- Envisage the WNC/SFN continuing to help National Park and Borough Council ecologists with providing records, monitoring, survey work and conservation tasks. SFN have state of the art bat detectors which have already been put into use in the Ravenscar Tunnel.
- Would very much like to see a nature trail developed in Larpool Wood and Cock Mill Wood as an offshoot/loop off the Cinder Track to enhance visitors' enjoyment of the spring flora here (WE)
- Recent surveys have revealed bat foraging habitat at the Whitby end of the Cinder Track. If lighting goes ahead here, then suggest further survey work to mitigate impact.
- A very interesting set of habitats have developed along the disused railway line. Many species – mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles, invertebrates, fungi etc. Important to establish a comprehensive baseline. Hope survey work planned in 2019 achieves this, updating the work undertaken by Ken Trueman in 2012.
- Good management of the site as proposed in the draft Plan will enhance its biodiversity.

Disability access

Ian Lawson, Yorkshire Coast & Ryedale Disability Forum and Disabled Ramblers

- 20 % of the population live with some form of disability, and disabled people are no different to able bodied people, as they enjoy the views of the coast, woodland and moors just the same. Add in the sounds, smells and audible

descriptions of the scenery, from those with us, access for all must be the aim of this Task Group.

- Feedback from the national Disabled Ramblers organisation demonstrates that their experiences of multi-user redundant railway lines are all extremely positive. Different user groups use these routes at the same time, without incident or problems. In addition their feedback about the increase in footfall, fully endorses the economic reports on pages 4 & 5 of the draft Plan. If signage indicates clearly that it is a multi-user trail, and that respect to other users, should be given and received, I do not believe that there will be the problems that others predict.
- I would like the draft Plan to prioritise the work, as I anticipate that funding will be received over a number of years. I have recently done the entire length of the track, in my wheelchair. What I now know is that access for disabled people is possible, at several places at the south end of the track, but currently very, very limited at the northern end. If disabilities of all forms are considered, then surfaces along the track, nearest to Scarborough, are reasonable for most, if not all, of the year. At the northern end, from the tourist hot spot of Whitby, the only access is onto a rough, wet, usually muddy track that needs immediate attention. For most of the year the surface deters those with visual and mobility impairments, as well as young families walking or cycling to school, and those commuting to town.
- I see that a new access is proposed both north and south of the Larpool viaduct, which is excellent, as the views of the river Esk are good. I would suggest that the plan adds a viewing platform for wheelchair users, to be able to see over the walls of the viaduct. Alternatively remove the iron sheets, one on either side, and replace them with toughened glass screens, creating a perfect view from a wheelchair. Seats are always appreciated by the disabled, their partners and the elderly, on viewpoints like the viaduct as well as along the track itself.
- The House of Lords Select Committee in 2016, then both the Equality and Human Rights Commission and the United Nations in 2017, reported that the UK is going backwards on the rights of disabled people. I would ask that the Cinder Track Task Group prioritises access issues, along with disabled parking, especially in the Whitby area.

Tourism

John Senior MBE TD, South Bay Traders Association and Member of Yorkshire Coast Tourism Advisory Board

- Commend the draft Plan very highly, but the critical thing is that the Plan is delivered
- The Camel Trail in Cornwall has volunteer marshals at busy times to advise users about the trail's code to help minimise potential conflict between users

Whitby Gateway Community

Sandra Smith, Secretary

- Believe strongly in disabled access to The Cinder Track and also that commuters and schoolchildren should be able to use the track easily to get from one side of Whitby to the other
- Excellent report

Parish Councils

Cloughton - Cllr Duncan Barker

- Welcome Plan. Support the track being accessible to all users. Very popular with tourists.
- Would like to see connections with the Cleveland Way coastal path (*Richard Gunton – work is ongoing to establish these links*)

Whitby – Cllr Linda Wild

- A lot of concerns about the original Sustrans proposals.
- This report is very good. Congratulations to Mr Thompson.

Staintondale – Cllr Eric Morgan

- Surface by the brickworks between Ravenscar and Robin Hood's Bay is very poor, but most of the trail between Cloughton and Ravenscar does not need resurfacing, but maintenance and repair. Worst section is by Whitehall Farm. Support restoring cinders between Lancaster Way to Ravenscar.
- Against reopening Ravenscar tunnel on the grounds of cost, light pollution and attracting anti-social behaviour. Against pay and display car parks and additional street furniture in Ravenscar.
- Concern that special events in the Plan may include cycle time trails. Heard that Monsal Trail has been taken over by cyclists to the detriment of other users (*Paul Thompson – take on board comments about the Ravenscar tunnel and the risks of attracting anti-social behaviour which would need to be mitigated and managed if it goes ahead. The restoration of the Cinder Track will afford opportunities for any future events to be properly marshalled and managed with appropriate signage, rather than the current free-for-all*)

5. Public questions and comments

Will Terry, farmer and Cinder Track user

- Lives in Fylingdales parish. Separated from the rest of the parish by a 14 mile road trip. The distance along the Cinder Track is 2.5 miles.
- Pays an annual licence to the Borough Council to use the Cinder Track. Carries out some 20-30 hours of maintenance a year of the track on a voluntary basis. For example, that day had moved some trees which had fallen across the track.
- Very important that both HM Coastguard and the Fire Service can continue to use the track to access isolated dwellings and the cliff top (*Paul Thompson –*

agree. Plan seeks to restrict unauthorised access, and to avoid the separation of communities)

- How much do/could Sirius Minerals pay towards the upkeep of the track? *(Paul Thompson - will have to look into this)*

Tim Marshall, cyclist

- Fear that motorcyclists start using the track *(Chair/Cllr Mortimer – previously, the Police has taken effective action against motorcyclists between Gallows Close and Burniston, and in the Hawsker vicinity)*

Ray Clifford, user

- Gates should be easy to use by all track users including wheelchair users
- Concern at Council communications that some attendees were not aware that they had been invited to speak, and some members of the public did not think it was a public meeting *(Paul Thompson – the imminent engagement with parish councils – open forum events in village halls - will be widely publicised)*

Val Russell, Staintondale parish councillor

- Can parts of the Restoration Plan be amended or reprioritised according to the availability of funding? *(Paul Thompson – yes, the Restoration Plan establishes the principles and the Project Plan within is subject to refinement according to funding etc)*

Eric Morgan, Staintondale parish councillor

- Can we see a sample of the proposed Ultitrec material? *(Chair – a sample will be provided at the open forum events – this is a permeable, unsealed surface, similar to the crushed stone of a forest trail that actually deters speeding cyclists because it slows them down)*

Michael Fenby, resident and local businessman

- Willing to pay for a 20 tonne lorry load of Ultitrec which can be laid on a section of the track so users can assess it
- Concern that action taken sooner rather than later *(Chair – actions will be prioritised according to available funding)*

Wendy English, naturalist

- Width of track required to install the Ultitrec? *(Paul Thompson – narrow sections of the track do not have to be widened to install the Ultitrec. It can be installed more easily on narrow sections, in the same way that potholes and damage can be more easily repaired)*

John Senior, South Bay Traders Association

- Suggest fundraising methods such as forming a charity, and/or seeking financial contributions from local users and businesses

Stakeholders invited to the public meetings who declined and submitted written comments instead

Nicole Hillier, Assistant Campaigner - Ancient Woodland, Woodland Trust

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

I have assessed the draft Restoration Plan details and we are pleased to note that no widening or maintenance work will now occur within areas of ancient woodland.

Will there be lighting installed within areas of the track bordering ancient woodland? If so, we would ask that for these areas that bat friendly lighting is provided to reduce any disturbance on nocturnal species.

Overall, the Trust is satisfied that the measures outlined in the draft Restoration Plan should adequately protect the areas of ancient woodland adjacent to the track from disturbance during the restoration works.

We hope our comments are of use to you, if you would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Rupert Douglas, Network Development Manager (Yorkshire), Sustrans

The North Sea Cycle Route (Euro Velo 12) status of the Cinder Track stems from it being part of the National Cycle Network (Route 1 in this case) which is coordinated by sustainable transport charity Sustrans – www.sustrans.org.uk

Larpool Viaduct, a small but very significant part of the Cinder Track, is as you know and acknowledge is owned and managed by Sustrans

Sustrans already supports a number of local volunteers who help to maintain the Cinder Track

I've referred to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Review in our more recent discussions and attached are the currently available Quality Standard Design Principles. In it you'll see that we're calling for NCN routes to 'have a smooth surface that is well drained' and your proposals for a combination of tarmac and Ultitrec may well achieve that. This also relates to the other principle of a path being 'designed to minimise maintenance'.

You'll also see that a route should 'be wide enough to comfortably accommodate all users' and I don't think planning for a width of 1.5-2m even for rural areas will achieve that. Generally the usable width of the track should be 2.5m wide (with additional width for a mown verge either side) for convenient and comfortable shared use (now and in the future) and only 1.5m where physically restricted. Some of the images I've seen of the Tissington Trail suggest it's wider than 2m in

many places and we know that disused railway line upon which the Cinder Track runs allows for greater width.

Being 'accessible for all legitimate users' is another important principle to draw your attention to, which in part relates to comments above about surface and width, but also about any barriers not being unnecessarily restrictive.

In our draft plan we've already covered measures that relate to 'conflict management' i.e. a combination of carefully considered design measures, emphasising that the track is a special place at entry points, promoting a code of conduct, Share Respect Enjoy type notices, recruiting more volunteer rangers etc. I can only repeat that we have considerable experience of managing multi-user greenways elsewhere in Yorkshire and further afield, and where issues do arise we consult with local partners to agree appropriate action e.g. recently introducing a chicane on the Chester Greenway in response to concerns about 'speeding cyclists'.

In our draft plan we also talk about facilitating further discussion about route branding in response to mixed feedback about the current Cinder Track name i.e. Ultitrec and tarmac aren't cinders?

In terms of developing smaller projects that can help begin to deliver agreed improvements to the Cinder Track (such as that the Whitby end using the available S106 funding) we remain willing to discuss solutions working with the local community if invited to do so.

Whilst appreciating being given the opportunity to be part of the route's management group it's unlikely that we'd be able to regularly attend meetings but will support and advise as best we can.

I'm in no doubt that Sustrans would like the Cinder Track to remain as a multi-user greenway part of the NCN, and I sincerely hope your plan will be successful in securing the required support, approvals and of course funding that will deliver the standards that we and users of the NCN (both local and visiting) reasonably expect of it.

Dr Tim Reed BA MA DPhil FCIEEM CBiol MRSB MBOU, Director, Tim Reed Ecological Consultants

Summary

It is important that when producing documents for policy purposes that they should meet a basic number of quality expectations. This is especially so when an apparent Plan is produced as the basis for decisions or funding applications costing millions of pounds. Expectations include:

- That the Plan is founded on credible, and available, baseline data.

- That claims of current and potential use and income flow are referenced and supported by data, rather than dimensionless statements incapable of verification or assessment.
- That statements are supported by data.
- That the Plan is not a mix of aspirations and principles which are actually summaries of prescriptions of how to do things.
- That a range of options is presented, so that a preferred option can be understood and compared against alternatives. A Single option is not an alternative to a range of options.
- That options are costed (financially and for ecological impact) in a clear and transparent and verifiable way.
- That full-cost accounting for the short, medium and longer terms is available for each option; this is especially critical if only one option is offered in a Plan.
- That claims are substantiated, and limitations are recognised.

If these basic precepts are not met, then Policy makers have no basis for informed decision-making. Where this may impact on Protected Species, ignorance is not a legitimate defence. As evidence matters in policy making at local, regional and national policy making, its absence is fundamental (ODI 2004). What Councillors have before them is a set of aspirations, largely devoid of context or credible data. In the preliminary notes for the Agenda it is stated that:

“3.2. The result is a plan containing a comprehensive and complete package of improvement and Management proposals which aim to make the best and most appropriate use of this valuable resource. It is intended that this plan is adopted by stakeholder organisations as the blueprint for the long term development of the track, providing a strategic vision which can be delivered over a number of years. It is also intended that this plan will form the basis of future grant funding applications. “

Sadly, the plan is neither comprehensive nor is it in any way complete, nor are there data to support almost any of the claims or assertions that are made. The result is that any potential funding body would review the many holes and chasms and demand information and material that cannot be readily provided. It is not fit for any purpose other than general discussion; a blue print it is not.

Conclusion:

Councillors are asked to seek a fully informed set of documents with which they might make reasoned long-term commitments or seek funding. What is presented is inadequate and unsafe for decision-making. The draft needs urgent and thorough revision before any potential use.

NOTE: further detailed comments are appended to this note.

Detailed Comments on *Cinder Track Restoration Plan 2018*

Reference is to paragraphs and headings used in the document.

Introduction

Para 2: Reference is made to both ongoing maintenance and ‘future’ restoration. No data are provided in the Plan for existing costs of ongoing maintenance, nor for apparent savings/ improvements if a restoration of some sort is undertaken. This precludes any meaningful evaluation of the Plan. No details are given in claims in para 5.

Para 4: Contextless statements are made, so that the multiple locations, and scales of claims, are impossible to assess.

Para 6: The earlier Sustrans (2017) report on the Cinder Track failed to provide a credible ecological baseline, and it is clear that the ecological importance of the track is underestimated due to an inadequate ecological baseline.

Para 8: This is a circular, and misleading, set of statements on opportunities. There are no supporting data in the main document.

03 Strategic Context

Policy INF4: This lacks any detail for locations, baselines, thresholds, limits, maxima, volumes or other basic parameters that would turn this set of aspirations into deliverable tools. Policy INF4 refers to a track of a minimum of 2.5m wide; this is contradicted in Principles 04.

P4 last para and P5 : Claims of economic benefit are without any scale or basis. Note that the subsequent 3 Devon cases (67 miles compared with the Cinder Track which is 21.5 miles long- 1/3 of the Devon cases) present only a *gross* figure and that no proof is provided that jobs were additional. No data are provided for the Cinder Track of use or potential visitor market numbers in order to allow comparisons. These are critical to the business case, but are absent.

04 Restoration Principles

The principles are actually a mix of Aspirations and Management Prescriptions, few are principles. Reference is made to maps that are not provided.

Ultritec Box: There appears to be a degree of confusion about the attributes/ needs of Ultritec. In Scotland paths cite 100mm depth over a sub material (Paths for all 2015), not 20mm, and describe the material as semi-bound. Others note that it is at best semi-porous (Langley Vale 2015). Both of these are critical to the model and costs posited for its use. Runoff will be an issue and have potential ecological effects, as well as drainage impacts. Ultritec's actual performance data are missing from the documents.

Surfacing and Drainage:

P 5 para 3: No details are provided for where sealed or semi-bound surfaces will not be used, and why open stone asphalt is suitable, but not Ultritec.

P5 para 4. Reference is made to location of construction works. The word 'ideally' is used about siting storage areas. This is not discretionary for areas of high ecological value, which need to be reassessed due to out-of-date data. That this could be stated as such must be a serious potential planning issue- especially in the NY Park Planning area.

Structures and lighting

Given the local concerns, the business case, and practicality of any loss of existing toilet facilities at the Station area in Fylingthorpe, needs to be made; it is not a principle.

Ecology

This section is poor. Earlier representations to SBC (Reed 2017) noted the inadequacy of the ecological sections of the 2017 Sustrans draft plan- especially the datedness of the data: too old for use (BSI 2013). However, the text mistakenly asserts that the desk survey which is partial, dated and omitted major taxa such as bats, assessed the potential impact of path improvements. Because of multiple data problems that statement is demonstrably incorrect and misleading (Reed 2017).

Both the principles and data sets need to be significantly updated in 2019 (data were not collected by SBC in 2018) before any process might proceed.

Woodland/Trees

The case for tree removal is not made, and no consideration is made for coppicing or pollarding which would be ecologically effective and sustainable.

The offset ratio of planting 2 trees to replace one felled tree has no support in the ecological literature and is without foundation or basis (Laitila et al 2014) in practice.

The basis for planting trees elsewhere for compensation ignores the ecological issues on site, and is only partially recognised in the text. Why flowering trees are advocated is not explored, and seems a generic answer in search of a valid ecological question; more rigorous thinking is needed.

Vegetation Management

Like the two previous sections, the principles/ prescriptions here are simplistic.

Cutting of vegetation omits the requirement to remove it offsite. Failing to do this may result in loss of the target species for which the management was intended.

All three sections (Ecology, Woodland and Vegetation) omit proper baseline surveys prior to any work, and then any subsequent monitoring of the actions for effectiveness. This is basic to any ecological management planning and undertaking in practice (Alexander 2013).

Specific sites of ecological value

Notwithstanding the work of the local naturalists groups, SBC is focused on the out-of-date botanical Phase 1 survey of 2012 (Sustrans 2017). This needs re-undertaking as a matter of priority in 2019, and condition assessments for the whole line reassessing. With a 7 year gap, there may be other areas of importance, and this should also include surveys of mammals; it is clear that bats use more of the cinder track than has been previously documented (see NE Biol Rec Centre data base ERIC).

Ensuring future sustainability

The discussion omits indications of current, apparently inadequate, management costs, and any future annual costs after any restoration. That makes the basis of the discussion opaque at best and not open to third party evaluation.

The 5 possible measures to offset costs have no numbers attached to them, so that gross and nett figures cannot be evaluated. This precludes any meaningful basis for assessing any sustainability claims. For example, how (ref 37 in 06 Identified works) £300,00 for replacement of toilets in the Station Car park at Fylingthorpe by a visitor centre and cycle store (given as including a toilet on p7) might be offset is not immediately clear. As the Fylingthorpe Parish Council has had to take over the Bay Top toilets due to SBC cuts, this seems optimistic and unrealistic.

Overall, the whole section is aspirational and cannot be evaluated in any clear way; that is not a sound basis on which a Council might endorse a document.

The basis for a Track maintenance spend of £70,000 per annum, and how this might be underwritten, is not clear.

Governance

It is not possible with the material presented in the 'plan' to endorse the apparently "bright future" claimed.

As there will need to be recurrent management interventions in the first period of any credible plan- and one has yet to be presented- any Governing Board should meet twice a year for the first 5 years, not just once.

As to the make-up of the day-to-day management, the role of Sustrans is not obvious- as they would require a fee, and external ecological inputs are also needed. More thought is required in practice.

06 Identified Works

The heading for the section notes that costings are indicative and will need refining. In practice, these will be minima, so that costs- including the 10% project and contingency costs- will also be potentially significantly higher. There are no recurrent monitoring costs for the ecological status of the extensive green corridor; this is a basic omission and remains un-costed.

07 Background

As SBC is the owner and maintainer of the Cinder Track, the distant, almost third party, tone of the neglect adopted in the text seems at odds with its fiscal responsibilities.

P19 para 1-3. SBC makes a series of unsupportable statements on use, potential and benefits. None of these have any data; all are based on unverifiable assertions. As support for a business case, these are inadequate and lack any obvious rigour.

Ecological management

On p21-22 short bullet notes for 7 sites are given. These need updating, and wider thought on management actions e.g. coppicing, pollarding, basis of tree planting as noted above is needed.

Summary

The absence of data, and other basic material means that any problem evaluation of claims or assertions made in the draft are impossible or uncertain. Before presenting to the main SBC Board or Cabinet the Consultation Draft needs major revision.