

**From:** [Jane Doherty](#)  
**To:** [NATIONALCASEWORK](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to diversion of a length of Footpath Holmfirth 60  
**Date:** 23 September 2020 11:34:27

---

Dear Sirs

We are writing with reference to -

"DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

The Secretary of State gives notice of the proposal to make an Order under section 247 of the above Act to authorise the stopping up and diversion of a length of Footpath Holmfirth 60, at the Wolfstones Heights Farm site, at Holmfirth in the Metropolitan Borough of Kirklees.

If made, the Order would authorise the stopping up only to enable development as permitted by Kirklees Council under references 2014/62/92814/W and 2017/62/91374/W."

We wish to register our objections to the proposed public footpath diversion on the following grounds:

The order, if granted, would enable the stopping up of a long established and very well used direct public footpath between Netherthong the local landmark of Wolfstone Heights to the detriment of local walkers and the amenity of the area. This footpath has fine views of the Holme Valley and links to other footpaths from Upperthong and Holmfirth making a popular local walk.

The proposed footpath diversion takes walkers away from their objective (Wolfstone Heights), bringing them out on a metalled road, at a bend on the brow of a hill, with reduced visibility. It then requires a trek back in the opposite direction along a road with no pavement which brings pedestrians and motor vehicles into conflict.

Neither of these outcomes supports the Kirklees Local Plan or the draft Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan, both of which promote safer walking and the creation of a pleasant environment for walking. It is clearly wrong to be making pedestrians use metalled roads when a perfectly safe public footpath already exists.

There seems to be only one reason for the application to divert the public footpath and that is to increase the privacy of the adjoining properties. Neither property is significantly overlooked by the footpath. Indeed for much of its length there are walls alongside it. The increased privacy and convenience of the adjacent properties cannot be sufficient justification for stopping up a well used, safe public footpath and creating a significant diversion which would force walkers to use public roads to reach their objective. Furthermore when the people who live in the adjacent house bought the properties the public footpath existed, so they purchased them in the full knowledge of its existence. Many footpaths pass close to, and even through the gardens of houses. We have a very well used one alongside the length of our own boundary. As regular walkers ourselves we know that if every footpath which did this was to be stopped up, there would be few places to walk in the area.

I trust you will take this objection and the reasons for it into account when reaching your decision about this application.

your faithfully

Jane and Trevor Doherty