

Sat 06/07/2019 20:23

I would like to object to the proposed diversion to public footpath Holmfirth 60 (part) at Wolfstones Heights Farm.

My reasons for objecting are:

1. The existing footpath follows an ancient and the best route between Netherthong and Wolfstones Heights and the proposed diversion in no way improves the right of way as is suggested in the Reason Statement. It seems obvious that the route change is designed to take users, of the right of way, as far away as possible from the development and to hide them from the development and the development from them. i.e. purely to increase privacy. The design of the garage and other features would appear to be a deliberate attempt to create an excuse for the 'need' for a change, and could have been designed not to impede the present route.
2. While we all expect a certain level of privacy the present route has far less impact on those living in the development than the average pavement does on any village, town or city. The footpath was known about when the property was purchased and any development should have taken the route into account. Not deliberately sought to change it.

Responses to Supporting Statement for the Diversion

1. The statement suggest the Trig point is "relatively recently constructed". This is hardly the case since it is likely to have been there for at least 70 years. The route to the Trig point has been walked, in all probability since its construction and there is, in addition, now a memorial structure there as well. Many people visit on a summers evening and at weekends.
2. With the newly constructed access driveway there is no reason why walkers and cars (or other vehicles) should cause an increased risk to pedestrians. Even if vehicles continue to use the present drive this should not cause a problem. Pedestrians and vehicles have both used the track from the time of horse and carts, through to the occasional tractor or other farm machinery and more recently the odd car. There is no reason sensible behaviour by all should not avert any problems.
3. The statement refers to the construction being "well advanced". This is because the applicant has continued with the construction, of the features that they say necessitate the diversion, even though they knew that objections had been made. Another attempt to force the diversion through.
4. The pedestrian surveys are really irrelevant since they do not take account of summer evening use, one of the main times many local footpaths are used, nor do they compare with other similar rural footpaths. My own observations and the wear of connecting footpaths would suggest this path is one of the more heavily used rural footpaths in the area.
5. Also since this is a footpath, cycle and equestrian use has no bearing. Neither should be using it!

With Thanks,
Rob Kersey