

From: [EVA SMITH](#)
To: [NATIONALCASEWORK](#)
Subject: Objection to stopping up and diversion of footpath. Ref. no. NATTRAN/Y&H/S247/4337
Date: 24 September 2020 15:01:09

Holmfirth public footpath 60 at Wolfstones Road - Department for Transport (DfT) draft stopping up order, section 247 Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Ref. no. NATTRAN/Y&H/S247/4337

Eva Smith

Dear Sir

I wish to lodge an objection to the stopping up and diversion of footpath number 60 in Holmfirth, reference number NATTRAN/Y&H/S247/4337

I have lived in the area for over 40 years and am a regular user of both the footpath, as a walker, and the road as a driver.

My objection is largely on the grounds of safety, for both walkers and drivers.

The existing footpath, which is very popular and well-used, leads from Netherthong to Wolfstones Heights, crossing a road at Wolfstones Heights Farm. It passes alongside the wall of the house occupied by the person who seeks to stop it up, coming out onto the road at the top, on the bend. Walkers at this point have good visibility of vehicles coming from both directions, and can wait just on the path to let them pass. Drivers also have good visibility of walkers emerging here. The continuation of the footpath leaves the road just opposite, on the bend. Thus walkers only have to cross the road, not walk along it.

The proposed replacement footpath is on the other side of the house, further from it. The point where this comes out onto the road is some distance below the bend. Walkers have no alternative but to walk along the road to reach the continuation of the path. If they cross the road to walk facing oncoming traffic, the drivers of oncoming vehicles will not see them because they are driving round a blind bend. If they walk up the left-hand side of the road, drivers coming behind them will need to pull out, thus possibly meeting other vehicles head-on. On both sides the grass verges are narrow and sloping. The footpath is popular with families, and children would be at particular risk on this stretch of road.

It is a busy road, being well-used by commuters travelling between Uppertong and the upper Holme Valley and Huddersfield, as a way of avoiding the very congested road through Holmfirth. Many drivers approach the bend fast, presenting a real danger for pedestrians and drivers coming towards them who have pulled out to avoid pedestrians.

My other objection is on the grounds that the change is totally unnecessary. The house wall alongside the existing path has no windows or other piercings, so there can be no complaint of intrusion into the occupants' privacy. It is a substantial stone wall, so the occupants are not subject to noise nuisance, which in any case is not a problem on country footpaths. The only reason I can see if that the owner may wish to use the existing footpath to drive vehicles such as tractors down to the fields below the house; however this is already perfectly possible, as it is a straight stretch of path, visible along its whole length, so walkers can easily stand aside and wait for a couple of minutes; I have done this myself previously, and it is no inconvenience. It seems that the owner seeks exclusive use of this short stretch of path, to the detriment of other members of the local community.

I am also displeased with the fact that the occupant has tried to pre-empt objections by already creating the new path, which gives the impression to walkers who do not live in the area that it is the true path; I speak from experience of recently meeting and talking with some walkers holidaying locally.

Eva Smith

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