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# Chapter 1: Executive Summary

1. Between 27 February 2014 and 10 April 2014, the Government consulted on a proposal to permit motor sports events, including stage rallies, hill climbs and trials of speed, on public roads in certain circumstances.
2. The consultation sought views on:
3. The proposal to give local authorities the powers to allow motor sport events on public roads, subject to local consultation.
4. The proposal to give local authorities the ability to close roads for motor sport events.
5. The proposal to give local authorities the powers to suspend speed limits and associated traffic regulations, in certain conditions.
6. If the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle union should be the “Authorising Authority” for any motor sports events on public roads.
7. If the Sports Ground Safety Authority could have a role in providing expertise and guidance for the safe delivery of motor sports events.
8. If local authorities would be willing to work with an authorising body to host an on road event.
9. If local authorities anticipated a potentially negative implications from motor sport events being run by authorising authorities.
10. If local authorities envisaged any further powers in order to hold safe, efficient events.
11. How many motor sport events local authorities would anticipate being held each year.
12. If local authorities had identified any policy impacts that had not been identified in the consultation document.
13. If local authorities were aware of any further evidence on the monetary impact of the policy proposals.
14. A total of 6077 responses were received, although some respondents did not comment on every question. 58 of the responses were from local councils, police forces, local access forums and other organisations with an interest in motor sport, many of whom were listed in Annex A of the consultation document. 5045 of the responses received were template responses to the first five consultation questions, sent from Motor Sport supporters strongly in favour of the proposals. For statistical purposes, these responses have been counted throughout this proposal response as one response, though each has been acknowledged. 375 of the responses were from members of the public answering as individuals in favour of the proposals, but only providing a generic supportive statement. 27 of the responses were from members of the public answering as individuals against the proposals, offering generally negative statements. 553 of the responses were from members of the public who provided individual responses to the questions outlined in the proposal, though did not necessarily answer every question. 19 of the responses were sent by members of the public providing neutral responses, not focusing on specific questions.
15. Responses were received from a range of local councils such as Lincolnshire County Council, Highways and Traffic, East Herts Council, Tendring District Council, Gloucestershire County Council and Westminster City Council. Several police forces responded including North Yorkshire Police, Derbyshire Police, Police Scotland Road Policing and the Association of Chief Police Officers. There was also a good level of response from other organisations that have an interest in road usage and from motoring organisations, such as the Motor Sport Association, British Cycling, the British Horse Society and the Ramblers Association.
16. There was support for the majority of the questions put forward in the public consultation and having carefully reviewed all the responses, we propose to finalise the regulations in line with the consultation proposals. This is subject to one minor clarification, that though the Sports Ground Safety Authority should not have a formal role in the running or organisation of closed road racing events, their advice may be sought by Local Authorities who might want to draw on their expertise, especially in regards to crowd management.
17. The detailed replies to the consultation questions together with the Government response are considered in the following chapters. This response document has been jointly prepared by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, and the Department for Transport.

Chapter 2: Overall proposal to allow motor sport events on public roads

**Question 1**

1. Question 1 asked “Do you agree with the proposal to give local authorities the powers to allow motor sport events on public roads, subject to the local consultation? If you disagree please give reasons.”
2. Of the 48 organisations who responded to Q1, 8.3% (4) responded ‘No’, 79.2% (38) responded ‘Yes’ and 12.5% (6) were neutral.
3. The majority of those in favour of local authorities being given powers to allow motor sporting events on public roads acknowledged the economic boost which would be given to communities and were in favour of supporting the growth of UK motor sport and associated industries. Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council felt strongly that in giving local authorities these powers, it would be a positive step which would allow areas to host closed road rally events in the future, which could bring significant economic benefit to the area.
4. The Sport and Recreation Alliance, along with the Motor Sport Association felt strongly that that empowering local authorities would facilitate the growth of motor sport in England and offer economic benefits to communities through the hosting of events. They state that the UK is a world leader in motor sport employing around 41,000 people – a considerable economic contribution which could be further enhanced by opening up opportunities for events on public roads.
5. Buckinghamshire County Council also agrees with the proposal to give local authorities the powers to allow motor sport events on public roads, subject to local consultation. They state that as the home of Silverstone Racing Circuit, they understand the benefits motor sport events can have for the local economy. The evidence outlined in the proposal shows that the industry anticipates up to 20 on-road motor sports events per annum and suggests that this would generate up to £40 million for the host communities during the initial 5 year period. Buckinghamshire state that they are highly successful in encouraging new business enterprises and believe that a new motor sport event could help them to do even more.
6. It was also acknowledged that local authorities would be most effective to decide where, when and if events are held as they are best placed to understand the needs of local residents and to consult relevant parties.
7. Of the 38 organisations who responded in favour of this question, 23 gave caveats which would need to be addressed before they felt that local authorities could be given these powers. These included:
8. The majority of organisations who responded positively shared a concern for public safety towards competitors, spectators and members of the public. It was suggested by the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership that Local authorities and associated Safety Advisory Groups (SAG), involving the emergency services, would need to fully risk assess, incorporate control measures, maintain access to critical services such as hospitals and agree traffic management arrangements.
9. It was suggested that Local Authorities may not have the necessary expertise or experience to allow motor events, so may need to consult with other agencies and partners to ensure appropriate standards are met. Many respondents also felt that consultation should also occur with local residents to counteract concerns of noise and general disturbance
10. It was felt that for Local Authorities to make effective decisions on the matters that National Guidance and Good Practice information should be provided to ensure these high risk events and potentially contentious events are well thought out.
11. An issue was raised surrounding who would be the authorising authority in two tier local authority areas. It was suggested that the local highway authority with responsibility for public roads should be responsible and not a local district council.
12. Several Local Authorities raised concerns regarding who would incur the costs for dealing with applications for and the management of events and also increased pressure on staff resources for Local Authorities. Two councils also responded asking that councils should be indemnified against any claims arising from the event.
13. The Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management responded stating that it needs to be clearly understood that any change that allows motor sport events on public roads must clearly include public rights of way (footpaths, bridleways and byways) as they are ‘roads’ within the meaning of the Road Traffic Acts and the existing Statutory Regulations. Any proposal to consider motorsport events on public roads, must consider all the minor highways including the public rights of way network
14. The South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership felt that it was appropriate for local authorities to “allow” or “permit” an event to take place, but not to enable the local authority to “run” or “undertake” an event as is implied in paragraphs 37 and 39 of the consultation document.
15. Of the individuals and organisations who responded against Local Authorities being given powers to allow motor sporting events on public roads, the following additional concerns were cited:
16. Local Authorities would be put in an unfair position because the dependency to fully risk assess, incorporate control measures, and agree traffic management and diversions for such specialist events.
17. The Derbyshire Police commented that the profit levels from on road motor sport events needs full evidencing because it has to be balanced against traffic disruption, noise pollution, local business and community impacts.
18. Transport for London and Westminster City Council both raised concerns about racing in London as the structure of London is such that permission would have city wide implications and an impact on London far greater than the physical location of the proposed event. Transport for London suggested that the authority to permit these deregulatory powers should be overseen by the Greater London Authority in consultation with London Boroughs, highways authorities and emergency services because of the potential impact on London as a city.
19. Some raised concerns that allowing motor racing on public roads would set a precedent that public roads can be used for racing, potentially embracing a ‘speed culture’.
20. The detrimental impact on the government’s green agenda in terms of both noise and air pollution was a concern for the majority of those opposed to this question.

**Government Response:**

1. The Government notes that the majority of respondents agrees with the proposal to give local authorities powers to allow motor sport events on public roads, subject to local consultation, and that local authorities are well placed to decide where, when and if events should be held since they are best placed to understand the needs of local residents and to consult relevant parties.
2. The Government agrees that safety of competitors, spectators, local residents and the travelling public is paramount. It is the duty of organisers to ensure that all reasonable precautions are taken to protect the public and applications for course licenses or certificates will be accompanied by details of the measures to be put in place to protect the public. No event should be held unless the organisers have the necessary authority from the appropriate public authority or private individual or landowner.
3. The local traffic authority would be responsible for authorising the closure of roads for events. We plan to consider Transport for London’s comment that the granting of permission should be overseen by the Greater London Authority for events in Greater London. It is not intended that local authorities be barred from running events but all events would need an event permit from the Motor Sport Association or the Auto Cycle Union, and in addition drivers taking part in a motor sport event would need to be licensed by the Motor Sport Association or Auto Cycle Union.
4. The Government has noted concerns that racing on public roads could encourage a ‘speed culture’, and that events could cause increased noise and air pollution. It is for the organisers, together with the local authority, to seek to minimise these, for example by paying particular attention to the siting of routes, and in particular the start areas in relation to local residential properties. The governing bodies’ rules, which competitors are expected to adhere to, cover (among other things) a variety of environmental issues.

Chapter 3: Road Closures

**Question 2**

1. Question 2 asked “Do you agree that local authorities should be able to close roads for motor sport events? If you disagree please give reasons.”
2. Overall, 5645 responses to this question were received. 5045 of these responses were template responses sent from Motor Sport supporters strongly in favour of the proposals. For statistical purposes, these responses will be counted as one response, though each has been acknowledged. Therefore, Overall, 601 responses were received for this question. 2.2% (13) responded ‘No’, 97.5% (586) responded ‘Yes’ and 0.3% (2) were neutral.
3. Of the 45 organisations who responded to Question 2, 15.6% (7) responded ‘No’, 80% (36) responded ‘Yes’ and 4.4% (2) were neutral.
4. The majority of those who answered this question felt that giving local authorities the ability to close roads for motor sport events was an integral element of the overall proposal without which it has little value.
5. It was strongly felt that by empowering local authorities to be able to close roads for motor sport events would represent a positive devolution of power, meaning that local people will be able to determine what happens on the roads in their region and will ensure that Parliament does not need to spend time debating whether or not to close a road somewhere in the country. The majority of respondents, both individuals and organisations, felt that is an important principle that no organisation other than the Local Authority should be granted powers to close its roads, as this ensures that no event can be forced upon a region against the will of the locally elected Authority.
6. It was noted by Conwy County Borough Council, among others, that local authorities are best placed to authorise such road closures and that it would be sensible for motor sport event road closures to follow the established practice that local authorities already have in place for closing roads for other events and activities. However Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group added that local authorities should be allowed to close roads but should not be expected to be granted as of right to event organisers.
7. Hampshire County Council, Lincolnshire County Council and Lancashire County Council both felt strongly that Section 16A-C of the Road Traffic Act 1984 is too restrictive and would like it to be amended to allow closures to occur more than once per calendar year owing to the popularity of sporting events on roads. They also felt that the requirement to obtain the Secretary of States approval and the limitation on the number of closures allowed on a street should be removed from the Road Traffic Act 1984. The Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management felt strongly that regulations must make it clear that ‘roads’ include public rights of way.
8. Though the overall response to this question was positive, a concern shared by both organisations and individual respondents was that of the overall road safety message that closing the roads would bring. Though not opposed to the suggestion, South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership was keen to ensure that the message does not contradicting their safety campaigns and objectives. Similarly, Cheshire West and Chester Council felt that each Local Highway Authority is continually trying to combat road traffic collisions to meet local targets and work towards the outcome and objectives of the Department for Transport’s Strategic Framework for Road Safety.
9. Police Scotland Road Policing and Transport for London, among others, expressed an opinion that it may be appropriate to consider the risks associated with an event route attracting unofficial ‘races’ where riders or drivers utilise the route at speed when no closures or safety measures are in place. This may increase the number of complaints to the police but may also increase the number of injury/fatal collisions. To provide protection to a level approaching that of an enclosed racing circuit would require engineering changes to road layouts that would have considerable cost and time implications.
10. Of the organisations who responded to this question, 17.8% were concerned about the cost to local authorities associated with permitting the closure of roads. It was strongly felt, especially among councils, that the costs of advertising and arranging the road closure should be the responsibility of the event organiser. Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management). It was also felt by the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership, Derbyshire Police, and the Devon Countryside Access Forum that the deregulatory measures would bring about additional cost burdens for the local authority in processing closures, putting up notices and associated administration. The impact, particularly on a long speed trial, could be significant and full cost recovery from the organisers would be warranted.
11. There were also some concerns raised about the conditions of the road. It was felt that many rural roads particularly are already in a poor condition and high powered motor sport vehicles could exacerbate the situation. Buckinghamshire County Council suggested that should the route be agreed, but the condition of the road need improvement, the organiser will need to meet the costs to bring the carriageway surface up to an appropriate and safe standard.
12. Some of the local councils, who responded favourably to this question, felt that in order for local authorities to enforce road closures, there would need to be clarification that any accident or incident would not contribute to any road safety indicators that the authority is responsible for.
13. Many of the individuals and organisations who responded positively to this question also expressed some concerns surrounding the disruption that would be caused to local communities. The Ramblers Association and the Rights of Way review Committee felt that organisers and authorities would need to assess all routes affected by a proposed closure as well as access to open country available under the provisions of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 as the closing of even a short length of road could have a magnified effect on the connecting rights of way network. The Ramblers Association added that organisers of events must be given clear guidance on the assessment and mitigation of the impact of a road closure on users.
14. There was strong feeling that the road closures would need to be properly advertised and consulted on locally. Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council added that in two tier authorities this power needs to be given to District /Borough authorities with the consultation of the local Highways Authority, in order for them to be able to support such events themselves.
15. Gloucestershire County Council was did not object to the principle in general, but stressed the importance of access for local people and the emergency services. The North Yorkshire Police took a similar stance stating that local roads are essential for local traffic and businesses which could suffer from road closures. Transport for London raised similar concerns for London, adding that holding a motor racing event requires testing and practice on the route in order to minimise the danger to competitors and spectators as well as testing the vehicles. This may require some activity to take place well in advance of event, requiring further road closures

**Government response**

1. The Government notes that a majority of respondents agrees that local authorities should be able to close roads for motor sport events, recognising that this would be necessary if these proposals were to go ahead. We are consideringproposals to end the provision that the local traffic authority may only close a stretch of road once in a calendar year, for a maximum of three days, including options that would permit the three day period to be extended in certain circumstances but we have concluded that we should not accommodate this. It would not be easy to define the circumstances under which a local authority would have discretion to make such an extension and we would need to make such a definition or risk the default position being that the closure would normally be for whatever longer period was requested unless there was a very good reason for its being shorter.  We would not wish unduly to inhibit access to fields, industrial sites or open countryside for prolonged periods any more than to places where people live. Our view is that, if particular circumstances justify more than one closure in any calendar year or a longer closure period, the promoter of a specific event ought to apply to the Secretary of State under section 16B(6) or section 16B(1)(b), respectively, of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
2. A number of respondents have highlighted local consultation and advertising of road closures. Local authorities may already close roads for events, though not at present for motor racing, and they advertise them in a similar way to closures being made for other purposes.
3. The Police record details of road traffic collisions, which feed into local and national statistics.  Department for Transport issues detailed guidance on what types of road accident should or should not be recorded in the official road casualty statistics (STATS19), and data collection and guidance are reviewed regularly in consultation with representatives from the Police and Local Authorities.  Department for Transport will meet the review group later this year and aim to come to a decision on how casualties occurring during motor races (under the new legislation) should be treated.
4. Cost recovery is already a feature of motor sport events. Local authorities sometimes levy charges associated with the closure of roads, and any special provision for infrastructure, or compensation for damage, would be the responsibility of the organiser.

Chapter 4: Suspension of Speed Limit

**Question 3**

1. Question 3 asked “Do you agree that local authorities should have the power under certain circumstances to suspend the speed limit and applicable road traffic regulations? If there are any traffic regulations you would prefer not to see suspended, please give reasons”
2. Overall, 5646 responses to this question were received. 5045 of these responses were template responses sent from Motor Sport supporters strongly in favour of the proposals. For statistical purposes, these responses will be counted as one response, though each has been acknowledged. Therefore, Overall, 602 responses were received for this question. 1.8% (11) responded ‘No’, 97.7% (588) responded ‘Yes’ and 0.5% (3) were neutral.
3. Of the 45 organisations who responded to Question 3, 11.1% (5) responded ‘No’, 84.4% (38) responded ‘Yes’ and 6.6% (3) were neutral.
4. The majority of those who answered this question felt that giving local authorities the ability to suspend the speed limits and applicable road traffic regulations for motor sport events was an integral element of the overall proposal.
5. Many of those who responded positively to this question stated that speed limits and applicable traffic regulations would be suspended would be on the understanding that the road traffic regulations are replaced by established and robust sporting regulations, as laid down by the Motor Sport Association and Auto Cycle Union, to ensure that all events are well organised, fully regulated and properly insured.
6. The Motor Sport Association also stressed that sporting regulations laid down by the Motor Sport Association and the Auto Cycle Union provide a fully structured and responsible framework and environment that is appropriate to the nature of the sport. Both organisations’ regulations find their roots in the regulations of the respective world governing bodies, and have been tried and tested over many decades on closed road events in the Channel Islands, Isle of Man and Northern Ireland as well as on the few closed road events in possession of road closing legislation on the mainland
7. The Sport and Recreation Alliance stated that they believed that local authorities should have the power under certain circumstances to suspend the speed limit and applicable road traffic regulations. In these circumstances the Motor Sports Association and the Auto-Cycle Union should be trusted to ensure that robust regulations are applied in place of road traffic regulations and that events are well organised, properly regulated and fully insured.
8. Westminster City Council agreed with this proposal, but also suggested that the consultation is extended to remove the requirement in subsection 6 of section 16B of the Road traffic Regulation Act 1984 which requires the local authority to seek recourse to the Secretary of State for closures of more than three days in any year. This would remove unnecessary red tape which sees local authorities having to apply to the Secretary of State for the closure of roads which they are otherwise responsible for.
9. The International Organisation of Professional Drivers Yes also agreed that local authorities should have the power to suspend the speed limit. However, they suggested that legislation should specify replacement of the protection of the Road Traffic Acts provisions with comprehensive Authorisation Conditions for the use and conduct of all mechanically propelled vehicles within a defined and controlled area of an ‘event’. They stated that they have many years experience of this and impose strict conditions for the entire defined area and not only the ‘track’ or ‘course’ which is, otherwise, the usual procedure at motorsport venues.
10. The Association of Chief Police Officers were in favour of this question and also felt that it would be necessary to ensure that the exemption is only available to competitors for the duration of the event, and only along the specified “competitive sections”. Where competitors are using the public road for transport to a competitive section they shall comply with the speed limits and other traffic regulations. Likewise, officials and other event traffic should not exempt from the suspension of speed limits at any time. Police Scotland Road Policing was of a similar view, adding that it may be considered appropriate to look at the requirements for each event in conjunction with the requirements of homes and premises along the given route and issue appropriate suspensions as opposed to a ‘blanket suspensions’ of all regulations.
11. Transport for London has suggested that rather than suspend the speed limit and applicable road traffic regulations, it may be more appropriate to temporarily suspend the road designation as a highway. The roadway would effectively become an event venue over which more control could be exerted.
12. The main concern raised by those individuals and organisations who responded to this question was the issue of safety. Transport for London in particular had strong views on this, responding that any motor sports event route would be required to be properly barriered and stewarded to prevent the incursion of persons and vehicles onto the race “track” to prevent danger or serious injury. This view was supported by Devon Countryside Access Forum who also raised the issue that speed limit suspensions could result in collisions with wild animals, such as deer, and livestock on unfenced land. The British Horse Society raised concerns that the suspension of speed limits would encourage more people to speed and to emulate race drivers once the race has concluded, who may be inclined to see if they can match race times on certain sections of the route.
13. Network Rail provided a robust answer to this question, regarding the safety of railway employees, passengers and the public who interact with the railway. They state that the removal of speed restrictions and / or regulations prohibiting restricting or regulating traffic significantly increases the potential for vehicle incursion risk in a variety of areas which interface with the railway. If an incident does occur, not only is it likely that extensive damage would be caused to the railway infrastructure, the event would heighten the risk of injury to spectators using the railway infrastructure (i.e. footbridges) as a viewing platform for the event. In addition, Network Rail would have obligations to investigate any damage to the railway and its infrastructure, which may result in rail services being suspended and costs being incurred in respect of both of these actions. Network Rail also identified level crossings to be a risk which should ultimately be avoided.
14. Transport for London feel strongly that drivers should not be removed of any culpability and sanction for offences such as dangerous driving and causing death by dangerous, reckless or careless driving. This opinion was shared by many individual respondents who feel that competitors must take due care and drive within the regulations of that sport.
15. The final issue raised by a small percentage of respondents, including Transport for London, is the matter of liability. If the death of a competitor or spectator were to occur during an event where speed restrictions have been suspended on a pubic road then it could be seen as corporate manslaughter. If such an incident were to occur there would be question as to liability, whether this would rest with the event organisers, the authorising bodies, highways agencies or jointly with the Safety Advisory Group representatives.
16. They state that the ability of a local authority to suspend aspects of national legislation sets a precedent and creates an opportunity for individuals to launch a legal challenge to that and associated legislation in other circumstances. To grant exemption from prosecution for some offences would make it considerably more difficult to enforce those offences outside of the event environment.

**Government response**

1. The Government notes that the majority of responders agree that local authorities should in certain circumstances have the power to suspend the speed limit and applicable road traffic regulations.
2. We agree that the exemption from certain traffic legislation should be available only to the competitors during the race itself, and only along the competitive sections.
3. The question about ending the provision that the local traffic authority may only close a stretch of road once in a calendar year, for a maximum of three days, is dealt with in the response to question 2 in Section 3.16.
4. We note the suggestion that the legislation should temporarily suspend the designation of the road as a highway rather than suspending applicable traffic regulations. Our view is that a more flexible approach would be preferable, permitting selective disapplications or modifications appropriate to the circumstances because different types of event may require different treatment.
5. The response of Network Rail regarding the safety of railway employees, passengers and the public who interact with the railway is noted. We would require organisers and authorising bodies to undertake appropriate consultation on local issues in the authorising process.
6. We have noted Transport for London’s opinion that the offences of careless and dangerous driving, etc. should not be relaxed for competitors in authorised events. But this is necessary because a number of the things that one would not do in driving normally on the road such as exceeding the speed limit are an integral part of racing and we do not want to make participation in legitimate sporting events an offence. Competitors in off-road motor races and trials of speed are already exempt from these offences. The national bodies penalise drivers and riders who do not drive or ride within the regulations of the sport.
7. In the event of a casualty during a race where the speed limit had been lifted liability would depend on the individual circumstances. The various parties to the organisation of an event, whoever they may be, will need to manage that risk appropriately as regards their respective participations in the event.

Chapter 5: Event Safety

**Question 4**

1. Question 4- “Do you agree that the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union should be the “Authorising Authority” for any motor sport events on public roads?”
2. Overall, 5638 responses to this question were received. 5045 of these responses were template responses sent from Motor Sport supporters strongly in favour of the proposals. For statistical purposes, these responses will be counted as one response, though each has been acknowledged. Therefore, Overall, 594 responses were received for this question. 2.2% (13) responded ‘No’, 95.6% (570) responded ‘Yes’ and 1.7% (10) were neutral.
3. Of the 44 organisations who responded to Question 4, 20.5% (9) responded ‘No’, 59% (26) responded ‘Yes’ and 20.5% (9) were neutral.
4. The majority of those who answered this question felt that the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union would be appropriate organisations to give effective guidance and approval to events. The Sport and Recreation Alliance, along with many individual respondents who answered, felt that the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union have many decades of experience of governing motor sport in the UK and retain the experience, knowledge and resources necessary to act as the Authorising Authorities for any motor sport events on public roads.
5. The Motor Sports Association added that only drivers and riders who have been formally licensed by the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union for competition by the governing bodies would be eligible to take part in motor sport events on closed public roads; the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union licensing structures are suitably robust and rigorously enforced to ensure that licensed competitors are suitably competent to take part in the motor sport events they enter. This ensures that individuals without the requisite skills and experience would not be able to participate in events in which they might put themselves, other competitors and/or members of the public at risk. The Motor Sports Association state that only the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union have existing experience of the responsibilities and issues specific to motorsport on closed roads.
6. Although 59% of organisations who responded to this question agreed that the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union should be involved and could give effective guidance, only half felt that they should be the “Authorising Authority”. Half of those who said yes to this question felt that although it would be considered appropriate for the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union to approve events, it may be more appropriate for the relevant local authority, after consultation with partners, to authorise an event.
7. Many of the organisations who responded, including Transport for London, Conwy County Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council felt that the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union are recognised bodies for motor sports competition. Their accreditation of proposed events, vehicles and drivers should be a requirement of the application and planning process. However, the fact that the event meets the requirements of sporting bodies which have specific responsibility for governing and promoting such events should not automatically mean that the event is suitable for the location, the environment or residents. They felt that final decision to permit the event to take place should be made by a fully competent Safety Advisory and Licensing group chaired by the Local Authority concerned and be fully represented by the appropriate highways authorities and emergency services. They did however concede that events which are agreed through this process must be accredited by the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union who should accept responsibility for the declaration that the event meets all reasonable safety requirements and confirms that all vehicles and the drivers are appropriately licensed.
8. The South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership and the Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group added that the local highway authority should be the “authorising authority” as they are permitting the event to take place by agreeing to closures of the highway. Cheshire West and Chester Council was of a similar opinion noting that the Local Highway Authority should be the authorising authority as they have the statutory responsibility for improving and maintaining the highway network.
9. The majority of respondents were in agreement that the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union should authorise the safety arrangements for the event and that the event should be operated under the race conditions and marshalling arrangements operated by these organisations. These organisations should also have an active role in approving the overall event plan and should be willing to work with the event organiser and local safety advisory group members to that end.
10. The Scottish Government noted that while these bodies have considerable experience of authorising events and their input would be valued, they would wish for any legislation to make provision for Scottish Ministers to be the authorising body for motorsports events in Scotland.
11. Powys County Council raised the issue of the Motor Sports Association and Auto Cycle Union being the recognised body for regulating the sport by the Federation Internationale de l'Automobile**,** and is not accountable as a public body. They therefore question the suitability of these organisations as competent bodies to be authorising public road events.
12. Lancashire County Council felt strongly that the Highway Authority should have the power of veto over an event, even if it was authorised by the Motor Sports Association or the Auto Cycle Union.
13. Among the respondents who strongly disagreed that that the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union should be the authorising authority, there were questions as to whether these organisations could act impartially to be able to effectively and safely regulate on-road motor sport events. The International Organisation of Professional Drivers added to this, stating that it would be highly partial and anti-competitive to grant an effective monopoly to these organisations.

**Government Response:**

1. The Government notes that the majority of respondents were in favour of the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union being the Authorising Authorities for any motor sport events on public roads in England. They are responsible for accrediting vehicles, drivers and events and have many decades of experience of governing and authorising motor sport in the UK and, in the case of the Motor Sport Association, already authorise those motor competitions on public roads in Great Britain which do not involve racing or trials of speed.
2. We propose that the appointment of bodies that may authorise the holding of competitions on the highway should be by regulations made by the Secretary of State, in a similar way to the current regulations appointing authorising bodies for both off-road and on-road competitions and events. We will take into account the respondents’ views when drafting the Regulations naming the authorising bodies.
3. Following devolution, the Welsh Government and the Scottish Government are responsible for the function of authorising both on-road and off-road motor sport events in their countries and any new legislation will need to enable the national Governments to regulate to appoint their Ministers to be the authorising body for motorsport events in their countries.
4. A number of respondents commented that local highway authorities (referred to here as traffic authorities) should be appointed as authorising authority. The government recognises that local traffic authorities have the statutory responsibility for most roads in their areas, and that the decision whether or not to close a road or roads for a motorsport event must be for them. But the government recognises that the Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union have the experience, together with the knowledge and resources, in authorising events and proposes that they should be the authorising bodies. It is for the organisers of an event to approach the local traffic authority if they wish to hold a motor sport event on a closed road; but if the traffic authority considers that the road should not be closed then the event would not be able to be held in that form. It would be open for a traffic authority to constitute a safety advisory and licensing group to consider the issue.

**Question 5**

1. Question 5 asked “Do you agree that the Sports Ground Safety Authority could provide valuable expertise and guidance to ensure motor sport events on roads can be delivered safely?”
2. Overall, 5637 responses to this question were received. 5045 of these responses were template responses sent from Motor Sport supporters who were strongly against the involvement of the Sports Ground Safety Authority. For statistical purposes, these responses will be counted as one response, though each has been acknowledged. Therefore, Overall, 593 responses were received for this question. 63.7% (378) responded ‘No’, 25.8% (153) responded ‘Yes’ and 10.3% (61) were neutral or unsure how to respond.
3. Of the 40 organisations who responded to Question 5, 22.5% (9) responded ‘No’, 55% (22) responded ‘Yes’ and 22.5% (9) were neutral or unsure how to respond.
4. Overall, there were mixed feelings about the involvement of the Sports Ground Safety Authority. Those who felt that they should be involved felt strongly that the organisation would be able to provide additional safety advice and could be a useful source of knowledge for local safety advisory groups. Leeds City Council and Buckinghamshire County Council recognised that public and participant safety are paramount for any event where motor vehicles are driven at high speed and in challenging circumstances. They would support the provision of independent expert advice and guidance by an established and recognised national body, with Buckinghamshire County Council believing that this should be a prerequisite to an event taking place.
5. The Sports Ground Safety Authority contributed towards this question, stating that:

“*As the authority on all matters relating to sports ground safety, the SGSA currently offers trusted knowledge and advice to a wide range of sports both nationally and internationally. This proposed extension to our role would mean extending that independent oversight and the reassurance we already provide to Government and the public into motor sport events on public roads… Our inspectors come from a wide range of backgrounds and have an extensive knowledge of the event and spectator safety industry covering Green Guide compliance, public order, emergency planning, event and stadia management, development of operations manuals, mass crowd movement/management, capacity calculations, temporary demountable structures, installation and management of stands, stewarding and many other related areas that could be of practical use when planning and tagging motor sports events of public roads.*”

1. It was suggested by some respondents, including Lancashire County Council, that as the events would undoubtedly attract many spectators, the Sports Ground Safety Authority would be able to provide valuable guidance. If any 'temporary' demountable covered stands are to be erected which will exceed a spectator capacity of 500 it will be mandatory that a 'Safety Certificate' be issued by the relevant Local Authority under the Fire Safety and Safety of Places of Sport Act 1987. The Sports Ground Safety Authority could give an invaluable contribution towards maintaining safety standards situations such as these.
2. Others, such as The Ramblers Association, took the view that whilst the Sports Ground Safety Authority has valuable expertise necessary for the organisation of major events, it would need to work with other bodies familiar with the organisation of events beyond the confines of an arena or sports ground, and with the locality concerned.
3. Of those members of the public who responded positively to this question, there was strong feeling that the Sports Ground Safety Authority’s involvement would provide reassurance to the public that a body without a vested interest in the sport was contributing to the oversight of events.
4. Many who responded were unsure of the relevance of the expertise that the Sports Ground Safety Authority would be able to provide. Transport for London felt that there would be aspects of crowd management, event planning and safety considerations which are not necessarily applicable to venue based motor racing events but are essential for events proposed to take place on public roads. If the Sports Ground Safety Authority were to be consulted then they would need to develop new guidance and best practice in conjunction with the main stakeholders. Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council added to this stating that they agree that a competent body should oversee the running of events and the effectiveness of the governing bodies. Any such competent body needs to have the expertise and competence to do this, which it is thought presently the Sports Grounds Safety Authority would not possess given they concentrate their advice and guidance on stadia, rather than the events themselves.
5. Many respondents, including Westminster City Council, expressed in their response that they would wish the Sports Ground Safety Authority’s involvement to be limited to guidance purposes only. As the local authority is ultimately responsible for safety on its public roads, they would expect to remain the ultimate arbiter of safety issues. Redcar and Cleveland Council suggested that rather than the Sports Ground Safety Authority, the local authorities Safety Advisory Group would be a suitable alternative to seek safety advice from as they are used to approve other events within a local authority area.
6. The majority of respondents agreed with the Motor Sports Association’s response, that the Sports Ground Safety Authority would be able to add little value to the organisation of closed road sporting events. Both the Motor Sports Association and the Auto-Cycle Union operate comprehensive, long-established and successful risk management programmes for four- and two-wheel motor sport respectively. Furthermore, they felt that the involvement of another regulatory body would introduce an additional layer of bureaucracy, adding costs to organisers, local authority’s and competitors alike.

**Government response**

1. The government notes that while the Sports Ground Safety Authority has valuable experience in the event and spectator safety industry the majority of respondents consider that its operations do not extend to events on road where it does not have equivalent expertise. The government agrees that adding another layer of bureaucracy is not in the sport’s interest and while organisers of specific events might seek the Sports Ground Safety Authority’s guidance on particular issues the government is not minded to pursue the option of extending its regulatory functions.

Chapter 6: Local Traffic Authorities

**Question 6**

1. Question 6 asked “Would you consider working with an authorising body to host an on road event in your local authority?”
2. Overall, 212 responses were received for this question. 5.2% (11) responded ‘No’, 91% (193) responded ‘Yes’ and 3.8% (8) responded ‘Maybe’.
3. Of the 30 organisations who responded to Question 6, 6.6% (2) responded ‘No’, 83.3% (25) responded ‘Yes’ and 10% (3) were neutral. Of these 30 responses from organisations, 23 were from local authorities and police forces.
4. 182 of the responses to this question were from members of the public who would welcome the opportunity to marshal at events or support the Motor Sport Association or local authorities in any way that they could.
5. The vast majority of organisations who responded to this question (most of whom were local councils and police forces) felt that they would consider working with an authorising body to host an on road event in their local community.
6. Lincolnshire County Council, Highways and Traffic felt that any road event would need to be subject the necessary safety measures, planning, organisation and consultation required to mitigate the impact of the event to local people and road users.
7. Derbyshire Police, Police Scotland Road Policing consider consultation between the police and local authorities to be essential in relation to the planning and management of such proposed events and would welcome involvement at the earliest opportunity.
8. The Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group and the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership would like to see the final proposal for changes to legislation and consider what events came forward with any proposals.
9. Transport for London stated that they regularly work with other agencies and commercial organisations to deliver large scale events within London. Consideration would be given to each individual proposal according to its perceived benefits and the identified impact upon the city and its inhabitants. It would be essential that a fully inclusive multi-agency planning and licensing process took place before Transport for London could support such an event.
10. Buckinghamshire County Council would consider working with an authorising body to host a road event within Buckinghamshire. This would need to be properly consulted on and the authorising body would need to include Buckinghamshire County Council in all appropriate discussions and decisions. Applications and submissions would need to be timely and early engagement would be required. The Council states that they currently host in excess of 800 events in the County; therefore, it cannot be assumed that a motor racing event will take precedence over any other event that has been held annually for many years.  Nor should it be assumed that this event would take priority over any other pre-planned works.
11. Braintree District Council responded stating that they would not be actively seeking an event of this nature, but would maintain an open mind on any proposal. Similarly, Leeds City Council have no plans to host, nor have received any recent proposals for motor sport events in the local authority area. However, should this change, they would consider working with a recognised and competent body for the sport to provide the assurance an appropriate standard of event and safety was authorised.
12. Hertfordshire County Council and Westminster City Council responded that they would not consider hosting an event of this nature at this stage.

**Government response**

1. The government welcomes the assurance that many organisations and individuals would be prepared to work with an authorising body to host an on-road event.

**Question 7**

1. Question 7 asked “Do you anticipate any potentially negative implications from motor sport events being run by authorising bodies in your local area?”
2. Overall, 208 responses were received for question 7. Of these, 24 were from organisations and 184 of the responses to this question were from members of the public offering various potentially negative implications from motor sport events being run by authorising bodies in their local area.
3. The responses received raised a variety of potentially negative implications, but can be classified into the following categories: Disruption, Damage/Costs, Safety, Legal implications and environmental impacts.

Disruption

1. The implication which most commonly identified was the possible negative impact on local communities. Road Closures and other temporary traffic management measures associated with such events could bring significant disruption to roads, residents, businesses and visitors. Some local councils did however, concede that it is expected that these concerns could be offset by effective organisation and strong oversight by the authorising body. Torbay Council Highway Authority added that there is always the potential for negative impacts if the local community feels they are not part of the event. It is therefore a key role of the local authority to establish good community links, be driven by the support of the locals and ensure that all professional bodies work together to deliver an economic, sporting and safety promoting event for the area.
2. There could be a marked impact on local services such as buses and train station access which are essential for communities, especially those in rural areas. If the events were to happen during term time, schools may have to be closed or it may make travel arrangements very difficult for parents and teachers. Limited access to roads could also limit social care provision and emergency vehicle access as well as local people’s ability to access medical appointments.
3. Westminster City Council stated that they would expect the closure of roads for an extensive period of time to ensure such events take place safely. This would have a marked impact on businesses and the local community.
4. Care would need to be taken that any event did not interfere with licensed street traders/markets and, if they did, they would need to arrange for alternatives or reimbursement to take place.
5. Some respondents raised concerns that vibrations from high powered cars could potentially undermine nearby houses.
6. From those who responded to this question, a small number referenced the recent disruption for the people living in the Surrey Hills due to the high number of cyclists using the area since the London 2012 Olympics. Concern was expressed that road closures restrict access to their properties and businesses and in some cases; levels of local trade have decreased.
7. Respondents who live within rural communities gave possible negative implications for agriculture and its associated activities as they are commercial activities which run twenty-four hours per day. Harvest-time and lambing time should be considered as well as due recognition given to the need to look after and feed livestock which is a daily occurrence in winter.

Damage/Costs

1. A common concern among local authorities is the risk of damage to the highway, and associated street furniture. There are also concerns about worn lining or additional lining that may be difficult to remove from the road surface as well as oil spills, litter and debris. Hampshire County Council expressed concerns about additional costs in repairing any damage done to the highway or infrastructure. They wish for that compensation measures to be put in place to ensure that the event organiser is liable for any such damage. There is also a concern that roads might need resurfacing prior to an event where the grip is deficient.
2. Gloucestershire Local access forum identified that there would be additional costs to the Local Authority, which could include officer time for risk identification, public notices and legal issues, plus repair and reinstatement following the event.
3. Westminster City Council expressed a concern that damage might be caused to buildings of important historical significance due to accommodating motor sports events in an historic setting such as central London.
4. Transport for London expressed concerns that London has an iconic status for international events and is therefore likely to attract proposals for the most prestigious of events. Although these may bring with considerable commercial benefits to the organising bodies and the hospitality industry they will also have considerable cost implications which are more likely to fall upon public bodies in a form which is less likely to be cost recoverable.
5. There could be costs for utility companies in securing that their apparatus is maintained to a higher standard than is necessary for normal highway use. Hampshire County Council
6. Additional car parking and toilet provision requirements along the routes where spectators are expected to gather should be considered so as to minimise the impact on the local community.

Safety

1. Safety was a significant possible implication identified by most of these who offered a response to this question. The safety of the public as well as the safety of competitors, organisers and stewards was of concern. In addition to this, Lincolnshire County Council, Highways and Traffic added that crowd control and crowd numbers would need careful management.
2. The Association of Chief Police Officers responded stating that during the course of a motor sport event it will be necessary for the “authorising body” to have a presence amongst the organising teams to ensure that the event is run as the permit requires. This individual should ensure that the organisers comply with the requirements that have been made of the organisers; and that in the event of circumstances arising during the running of the event that may need dynamic intervention to ensure public safety is maintained.
3. A number of respondents share concerns that is the slight danger that any route or temporary circuit may be used outside of the event by members of the public to drive at high speeds or race when an event is not taking place.
4. The Dorset Local Access Forum shared the concern that a typical mile of most public road will include several points where it is joined or crossed by various forms of Public Right of Way, at which points walkers/cyclists/riders will need to join or cross the road. There are also many roads which cross moorland or run through woodland, where the adjacent land has been designated as Open Access under The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. In this situation, walkers are likely to emerge onto the public road at more or less random points along its length, rather than at well-defined intersections, jeopardising public safety.

Legal implications

1. Some organisations and councils such as Transport for London Leeds City Council shared concerns about the message that these events would portray when they are also championing road safety. Transport for London and its partners are working towards the Mayoral objectives of reducing the incidence of road users Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) by 20% of the baseline figure by 2020. Considerable activity has been undertaken and emphasis laid on engineering safer roads and influencing driver behaviour to reduce collisions and their consequences. To allow parts of London to be used for such motoring events, particularly if the participants were removed from the potential consequences of infringements of existing legislation, would be contrary to the intent and current policies of Transport for London.

Environmental damage

1. Concerns were raised by both organisations and individual respondents regarding noise levels and negative consequences for air quality arising from associated traffic congestion.
2. There was also concern raised for the protection of the environment, flora and fauna, especially in rural areas.

**Government Response**

1. The government notes the variety of implications which could potentially arise.

1. The authorising process for existing motor sport events imposes a range of safety requirements that competitors must comply with in order to take part in events. They require the licencing of the participating drivers and vehicles, as well as approving the route and take account the needs of residents and communities when planning events.
2. In deciding whether or not to close a road for an event the traffic authority will need to take a view on any negative impacts and if appropriate will require the organisers to provide mitigating measures. Any special provision for the infrastructure, or compensation for damage, would be the responsibility of the organisers.
3. No traffic authority can be forced to close a road under section 16A of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. A traffic authority will only consent to a closure if it can satisfy itself that appropriate arrangements can be made to mitigate the impacts and it may impose appropriate conditions to that effect. If an authority has good reason to refuse to close a road, it will be able to do so.

**Question 8**

1. Overall, 209 responses were received for question 8. Of these, 30 were from organisations and 179 of the responses to this question were from members of the public.
2. The Local Authorities and Police Authorities who responded to this question identified several additional powers which may need to be granted in order to hold a safe and efficient event. These include:
3. Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council identified that any enforcement body overseeing governing bodies or events must be given adequate powers to investigate incidents and if necessary prosecute offenders.
4. Hertfordshire County Council, Police Scotland Road Policing and the Association of Chief Police Officers all identified that police might need new powers to control any situation that arises as a result of the event, as well as the right to be consulted at the earliest opportunity. The Association of Chief Police Officers stated that it may be necessary to ensure that there are adequate powers for the police to take dynamic action to ensure public safety during the running of the event. These powers should be appropriately balanced by the application of a set protocol for managing issues rapidly as they arise and to give organisers the opportunity to put in place immediate remedial arrangements to rectify organisational shortcoming that may arise doing the running of an event. This would allow for consideration to be given to issues which the authorising body would not normally be aware of. Police Scotland Road Policing also noted that it may be considered appropriate to allow the Chief Constable to impose additional conditions relating to the time, date, route of an event and the number of permitted competitors
5. Cheshire West and Chester Council identified the need to control event crowds, reduce congestion around vicinity of closed off race event and allow for emergency access.
6. (Finally, should a collision occur which resulted in a fatality (whether competitor or spectator) and following a subsequent investigation where driving behaviour was to blame no prosecution would be possible, this may attract considerable public dissatisfaction (Association of Chief Police Officers).
7. Transport for London added that new or amended legislation to deliver such events safely and efficiently is required in order to ensure compliance to a sufficiently high standard and to allay reasonable public concern.
8. In order for events to be held more efficiently, we would recommend that the government removes the requirement in subsection 6 of section 16B of the Road traffic Regulation Act 1984 which requires the local authority to seek recourse to the Secretary of State for closures of more than three days in any year (Westminster City Council).
9. Powys County Council raised concerns regarding the flow of traffic in the Traffic Management Act 2004 and S.122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. A new traffic regulatory process would need to be considered.
10. Network Rail provided a robust answer to this question, raising concerns about interactions with the rail network. They have asked that they should be included as a statutory consultee within the consultation and planning process for all proposed motor sport events which cross over, under or are near to the railway to ensure that there are sufficient measures in place to protect the network, as well as spectators of and participants in the event. Furthermore, Network Rail suggest that insurance for the event should specifically include cover for the potential safety and other liability risks associated with an event’s potential interface with the railway.
11. Hampshire County Council has advised that event organiser’s attendance at Safety Advisory Groups convened by the Local District Councils should become mandatory.

**Government Response**

1. The government notes the responses suggesting further powers that might be needed in order to hold a safe and efficient event, and is considering whether or not it is necessary or desirable to extend the existing powers of highway authorities in order to facilitate the organisation of events.
2. Practical issues will vary according to the circumstances of each event and will be dealt with by appropriate conditions of authorisation. Promoters or competitors who fail to comply with the conditions of authorisation may be prosecuted as if there had been no deregulation.
3. We do not propose to change the regime applicable to traffic management. No traffic authority can be forced to close a road under section 16A RTRA 84. A traffic authority will only consent to a closure if it can satisfy itself that appropriate arrangements can be made to mitigate the impacts and it may impose appropriate conditions to that effect. If an authority has good reason to refuse to close a road, it will be able to do so.
4. Obligations to consult others on local details (e.g. Network Rail and other statutory undertakers, the local police authority etc.) could be dealt with by way of appropriate conditions of authorisation.
5. The question about ending the provision that the local traffic authority may only close a stretch of road once in a calendar year, for a maximum of three days, is dealt with in the response to question 2 in Section 3.16.

Chapter 7: Impact of the proposals

**Question 9**

1. Question 9 asked “Under the proposals, how many motor sport events do you anticipate will be held each year?”
2. Overall, 137 responses were received for question 9. Of these, 22 were from local councils, highway authorities and the International Organisation of Professional Drivers.
3. 115 of the responses to this question were from members of the public expressing their interest in events being held in their areas or offering their help to organise events locally.
4. Of the 22 local authorities who responded to the question, 7 anticipated holding events motor sport events under the suggested proposals. 5 councils did not anticipate holding any events, and 10 were unsure at the present time.
5. Powys County Council estimated about 15 events taking account of special stage events that currently use public rights of way under the s.33 Road Traffic Act 1988 authorisation process. They stated that on average the council currently authorises 35 motor events per year that include road rallies, special stage events, time trials and sprints. This does not include other events, such as cross-country events. However, being a rural area with ideal tarmac stages the Council would suspect that if approvals were gained and events were successful, these would increase over time.
6. Hertfordshire County Council anticipate holding 0-3 events per year and Tendring District council similarly expect 1 or 2 events to be held each year.
7. Torbay Council Highway Authority Torbay commented that they previously hosted a very successful hill climb event in conjunction with the Torbay Motor Club which was extremely popular. They also hold Torbay's Super Weekend where performance vehicles are displayed off the highway, which enjoys massive public support and has the potential to expand onto the highway. I would anticipate these 2 events per year initially on the public highway with a review as to their success.
8. Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council stated that they would most likely hold 1 event per annum, focused in the Borough of Hinckley & Bosworth. Similarly, the Borough of Poole stated that they would most likely hold 1 event, associated with already established annual Sunseeker Rallye.
9. The International Organisation of Professional Drivers stated that they receive regular enquiries about authorisation of events that are on or cross public roads in the UK. They would expect perhaps four or five per year to evolve into actual events and of these we would expect two or three per year to become annual events.
10. The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, Cheshire West and Chester Council, Westminster City Council, Leeds city Council and Braintree District Council do not presently anticipate authorising any motor sports events under the provisions of these proposals.
11. The following local councils and organisations responded that they are unaware of any proposals to host motor sport events in the local area: Hammersmith and Fulham Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Conwy County Borough Council, Highways and Traffic, Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group, South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership, Hampshire County Council, Sefton Council, Lancashire County Council and Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council.
12. Transport for London replied stating that London already has a large number of events taking place and accordingly the opportunity for further large scale events is and should be limited. The merits of such events should be considered on a case by case basis, in the context of all other major event proposals, and with a view to minimising their number and their impact on those working, living, doing business and travelling in the capital.

**Government response**

1. The government notes that a number of local authorities expect that motor sport events may be held in their areas.

**Question 10**

1. Question 10 asked “Are there any policy impacts that have not been identified in the consultation document?”
2. Overall, 35 responses were received identifying potential policy impacts that had not been acknowledged in the consultation document. Of these responses, 16 were from organisations including local authorities and police forces and 19 of the responses to this question were from members of the public.
3. The majority of members of the public who contributed towards this question were concerned with consequential impacts on third parties, such as property and land owners, that might arise from any decision by the local authority to authorise a motor sport event on the local highway. This view was shared by Leeds City Council.
4. Lincolnshire County Council, Highways and Traffic responded stating that a potential policy impact could be regarding accidents (i.e. death or serious injury) occurring as a result of the event. Clarity is required with regard to legal investigations required and normally carried out by the Police if occurring on Public Roads. They also state that clarity is needed on whether any casualties resulting from an event would be included in the statutory road casualty statistics and reports. This view was shared by Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group who would like to see a clear statement on where liability for accidents would lie.
5. Lincolnshire County Council, Highways and Traffic also added that any changes required, either permanent or temporary, to the public road network which are necessary to hold the event need to be agreed with the local highway authority and all costs associated with this work should be the responsibility of the event organiser.
6. Transport for London responded stating that there could be policy implications regarding the Low Emission Zone in London. There is existing policy and legislation in relation to the Low Emission Zone within London, introduced to improve and maintain air quality. If the vehicles have general exemption from construction and use regulations there is the possibility that they will breach the emission zone limits and compromise the air quality standards.
7. Transport for London also stated that London is driving forward the importance of cycling and London becoming a greener city. Should these proposals go ahead, there is a potential conflict with these and the proposals for the Cycle Superhighways.
8. Powys County Council responded stressing the council’s duty to conserve biodiversity under Section 40 of the Natural and Environment Rural Communities Act 2006 in its functions. They note that some form of environmental assessment appropriate for the task will be required. The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea raised concerns about the likely noise pollution associated with motor sport events.
9. Many of the responses to this question which were received note potential disruption that may occur to deliver such an event. Transport for London wrote stating that full consideration needs to be given to the physical changes that may be necessary to existing infrastructure or road layouts to accommodate such an event. Polices would need to be amended as existing street furniture and traffic management measures do not necessarily permit driving at excessive speeds on most of London’s roads. Network Rail added to this, stating that the motor sport events may lead to rail services being suspended on affected lines during the period of the race / time trial which could have wider socio-economic impacts.
10. Conwy County Borough Council shared concerns about conflicts of interest between the capital infrastructure investment programmes of both local authorities and utility companies and the motor sport events. Although motor sport events are of limited duration, the timing of such events can be critical to fit in with national or international race calendars. As such, they may clash with capital infrastructure projects, which frequently have long, uninterruptable timescales for completion.
11. South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership question whether the organisers of an event would have a right to charge for space on the public highway if they were to erect grandstand seating on the highway and charge to use this facility.
12. Lancashire County Council responded stating that the current requirement under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for Secretary of State Approval for repeat closures under Section 16A-C would need to be amended.
13. Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council stated that there might be conflicts with the Equalities and Disability Discrimination Act that would need to be addressed should the outlines proposals go ahead.

**Government response**

1. The government notes the policy impacts which could arise if motor events are held on public highways closed for the purpose. They will vary according to the individual nature of the proposed event and will be a factor in the consideration of whether particular events are held, and what form they might take.
2. The point about the inclusion of any casualty figures in the statutory road casualty statistics is dealt with in the response in Chapter 3.18.
3. We will look further into the question of whether the organisers of an event would have the right to charge for space on the public highway if they were to erect grandstand seating on the highway and charge to use this facility.
4. We have concluded that we will not seek to amend the proposals for more than one closure of a length of road in a year, for the reasons set out in the response to question 2 in Section 3.16.

**Question 11**

1. Question 11 asked “Are you aware of any further evidence on the monetary impact of the policy proposal?”
2. Overall, 156 responses were received in answer to this question. Of these responses, 26 were from organisations including local authorities and police forces and 130 of the responses to this question were from members of the public.
3. The majority of the members of the public who answered this question felt strongly that the motor sports events would have a considerable economic benefit to local economies. They cite a number ways including hotel usage, catering facility take up and general purchases. The general opinion of those who answered was that if events move closer to the public then it is likely that the local economies will benefit by a growth in numbers and expenditure and also a closer integration with the community as a whole in terms of where the money is spent.
4. Westminster City Council responded to this question with concerns relating to the monetary impact on local businesses. From their experience of closing major roads for sporting events that attract large numbers of spectators, such as the London Marathon, Ride London and for London 2012, the Olympic and Paralympic Games, they suggest that retail, in particular, suffers as additional visitors attend to watch the event rather than visit shops. As a result, retailers can actually suffer from a reduction in business. This potential economic downside would need to be addressed through the proposed ‘viability’ test accompanying motor sport events.
5. Cheshire West and Chester Council appreciate that the events could generate extra income to Local Authorities and that there could be a potential increase in tourism for local areas, however this needs to balance against the cost of a road traffic collision involving a fatality. Hertfordshire County Council added to this stating that there would be high costs related to local authority officer time dealing with enquiries and applications for events.
6. Powys County Council noted that there could be considerable costs in road maintenance, highway inspections, sign and street furniture removal and reinstatement, public consultation and environmental assessments which would prove expensive. Transport for London shared these concerns adding that, dependent upon the route, there could be consequent costs incurred as the result of parking bay suspension and vehicle relocation. They suggest that a survey of routes before and after events could be used to identify recoverable costs.
7. Hampshire County Council noted that there may be costs relating to the clearance of post event litter and debris. This may need to be done with strict time constraints due to the reopening of the road networks and could therefore have greater cost implications.
8. The Dorset Local Access Forum responded expressing concerns that members of the public exercising their rights of access to the countryside make a significant contribution to the local economy and they may be deterred by motor sports events taking place. This could result in a reduction in potential revenue earned locally from conventional access users.
9. It was felt by some members of the public who responded that the over-subscription of current events can mean that they have become restrictively expensive. By localising and increasing the quantity of events, it will lead to the sport becoming affordable and well supported.

**Government Response**

1. The Government notes the responses on the monetary impact of the proposals, both positive and negative. These will vary according to the individual circumstances of the event, and will be a factor in the consideration of which events are held.
2. Cost recovery is already a feature of motor sport events. Local authorities sometimes levy charges associated with the closure of roads for the sorts of motor events which are currently allowed, and any special provision for infrastructure, or compensation for damage, would be the responsibility of the organiser.

Annex A: List of organisations who responded to the consultation

|  |
| --- |
| * ADEPT
 |
| * Association of Chief Police Officers
 |
| * Association of Eastern Motor Clubs
 |
| * Borough of Poole
 |
| * Braintree District Council
 |
| * British Cycling
 |
| * British Horse Society
 |
| * Buckinghamshire County Council
 |
| * Byways and Bridleways Trust
 |
| * Cheshire West and Chester Council
 |
| * Conwy County Borough Council
 |
| * Derbyshire Police
 |
| * Devon Countryside Access Forum (DCAF)
 |
| * Dorset Local Access Forum
 |
| * East Herts Council
 |
| * East Lindsey District Council
 |
| * Exmoor Local Access Forum
 |
| * Gloucestershire County Council
 |
| * Gloucestershire Local access forum
 |
| * Hammersmith and Fulham Council
 |
| * Hampshire County Council
 |
| * Hertfordshire County Council
 |
| * Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
 |
| * Institute of Public Rights of Way and Access Management
 |
| * International Organisation of Professional Drivers Limited
 |
| * King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
 |
| * Lancashire County Council
 |
| * Leeds city Council
 |
| * Lincolnshire County Council, Highways and Traffic
 |
| * Locks Heath Classic Car Club
 |
| * London Borough of Waltham Forest
 |
| * Motor Sports Association
 |
| * Mull Car Club Ltd
 |
| * Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
 |
| * Network Rail
 |
| * North Yorkshire Police
 |
| * Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
 |
| * Other organisations of significance who have responded to the consultation:
 |
| * Police Scotland Road Policing
 |
| * Powys County Council
 |
| * Ramblers Association
 |
| * Redcar and Cleveland Council
 |
| * Rights of Way review Committee
 |
| * Scottish Government
 |
| * Sefton Council
 |
| * South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership’s
 |
| * Sport and Recreational Alliance
 |
| * Sports Grounds Safety Authority
 |
| * Tendring District Council
 |
| * The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
 |
| * Torbay Council Highway Authority
 |
| * Transport for London
 |
| * Westminster City Council
 |

* Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group- The group constitutes the nominated Traffic Managers from local authorities in the Yorkshire and Humberside Region including:
	+ Sheffield City Council
	+ Doncaster Council
	+ Rotherham Borough Council
	+ Barnsley Council
	+ Leeds City Council
	+ Bradford Council
	+ Kirklees Council
	+ Calderdale Council
	+ York City Council
	+ North Yorkshire Council
	+ East Riding Council
	+ Wakefield Council
	+ Hull City Council
	+ North Lincolnshire Council
	+ North East Lincolnshire Council