

From: geoff barnett [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 October 2018 17:11
To: William Jackson
Subject: Re: PROPOSED DIVERSION OF PUBLIC BRIDLEWAYS D6 AND D43 AT QUENBY HALL, HUNGARTON

Dear Mr Jackson,

Here are my comments on the proposed diversion of public bridleways D6 and D43 at Quenby Hall, Hungarton.

I live locally and I have regularly walked and ridden these bridleways since 1983.

I object to the proposed diversion on the following grounds:

1. Convenience of use. From Hungarton, the RoW presently approaches Quenby Hall on a tarmac gently rising surface, passes close to the Hall on the flat, then passes towards Cold Newton on a firm dirt driveway that is also generally flat. If granted, then difficulty of walking the new route, particularly in winter, will be substantially greater and the new route will be significantly longer.
2. Public enjoyment of the present RoW. The proposed new route is in a hollow and does not command the grand approach view of Quenby Hall that the present RoW enjoys. Nor would the proposed new route afford the panoramic views that the present RoW enjoys. *Further, footpaths and bridleways in England and Wales will more often than not go directly to an ancient feature, be it a long established farmhouse or a grand ancient hall. In this respect they bear a historical weight that should not be lightly discarded. The proposed new route has no such gravitas.*
3. The applicants knew these RoW existed when they bought the property. Caveat Emptor. It is not for the Council Tax payers to bear the cost of diverting RoW, to please the purchaser of a property who knew full well that they were there when they made that purchase. The proposed changes would cost thousands of pounds in legal, administrative and physical implementation fees. This is a very poor expenditure of Council Tax payers money to satisfy a single property owner's privacy fixation. For goodness sake, let's step back a little here and get this into perspective; Quenby Hall is in the middle of extensive parkland, relatively speaking it is already a very private place to live.
4. I do not buy that users of this path are rowdy types. I have decades of experience of using this RoW.
5. I think that the restoration of the italianate garden is a weak and probably fictitious ground put forward by the applicants. Certainly if restored I would think that the feature would bear very little risk of damage from the clued in and country-wise users that this RoW attracts.
6. Your present official waymarking of this RoW is in error. It should be as per the Definitive Map, but in fact the present official yellow waymark posts (as opposed to the applicants' lookalike posts), pass along the southern elevated wall boundary of the Hall. *Simply waymark the middle part of the RoW properly and the applicant has more of the privacy that she/he seeks.*
7. I advise it would be my intention to object to the proposal should the Council decide to make the Order.

Yours sincerely,

Geoffrey Barnett

Keyham

This page is intentionally left blank