

From: [Sheelagh Illingworth](#)
To: [NATIONALCASEWORK](#)
Subject: Holmfirth public footpath 60 at Wolfstones Road - DFT draft stopping up order - section 247, Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Date: 11 September 2020 11:26:43

NATTRAN/Y&H/S247/4337

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object to the proposed diversion of public footpath Holmfirth 60 (part) at Wolfstones Heights Farm, Wolfstones Road, Uppershong.

This application originally relied heavily on the need to divert the existing driveway in order to fulfil planning permissions and facilitate access for emergency vehicles. I have no objection whatsoever to the driveway and vehicle access being diverted but dispute this being a necessary justification for the diversion of the footpath.

I would point out that there is an existing 'walkround' stile from the current footpath/driveway onto Wolfstones Road. Surely it would be possible to leave this stile intact while stopping up the gateway to the current driveway. In this way vehicles could be diverted to the new driveway but pedestrian access to the current footpath route would remain unchanged.

It seems to me that this solution is a common sense compromise and could put an end to a lengthy and costly process. My previous objections, which I have submitted three times already, still stand and are detailed as follows:

1. I frequently walk between this path and HOL/71/20 to Uppershong. Currently this involves a short stretch of walking on Wolfstone Heights Road but the traffic visibility is good. This diversion would cause me and my dog to walk 200m uphill on a narrow, blind bend.
2. I also often use the direct route from Netherthong to the trig point at Wolfstone Heights, a local landmark, and the permissive paths through the wood beyond. Currently this merely involves crossing Wolfstone Heights Road. The proposed diversion would again force walkers to take the same dangerous stretch of road as above.
3. No walking routes or links to other footpaths would actually be improved by the proposal.
4. As the building plans do not seem to propose any new buildings which would block the existing route why does it need to be diverted?
5. The current path runs between two separate properties and does not cross any garden areas, the plans suggest this will remain the same - again why divert the path?

Sheelagh Illingworth

From: [Sheelagh Illingworth](#)
To: noel.scanlon@nsconsult.co.uk
Cc: [NATIONALCASEWORK](#)
Subject: Objection to proposed stopping up and diversion of Holmfirth Footpath 60 (NATTRAN/Y&H/S247/4337)
Date: 26 September 2020 17:38:26

Dear Mr Scanlon,

You will have gathered that I did not wish to meet you to be persuaded to withdraw my objection to this footpath diversion, I am well aware of the proposed route which your client, somewhat presumptively, built several months ago.

I am happy to discuss the matter further with the DfT should they require this.

Yours sincerely,

Sheelagh Illingworth

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.
