

**Comments and Objections to Proposed Diversion**Objection 1

This person has lived locally and has ridden or walked the Bridleway regularly since 1983. He or she is not specific as to where 'locally' is. If it is Hungarton, then one would assume that he or she had received the publicity about our Proposals for Diversion of the Bridleway and/or attended the Parish Meeting (minutes attached). However, our response to the Objection is as follows:

1. Convenience of use – The Objector has ignored a section of the existing route which is entered up the drive from the west through a muddy gateway and onto a grass stretch (from section B to D on the map) which is often wet in wintry weather. There is a substantial distance over the ridge and furrow on the existing route which is not as easy as on the proposed diversion. The distances have been detailed elsewhere in our Application and gradients were not considered significant by the User Groups that have been consulted, nor by those at the Parish Meeting. Gradient – the proposed route will rise from the Spinney on a gentle incline, on a flatter and more solid surface which will enable those with push chairs and mobility scooter to use. Whether being pushed or assisted, walking, running, cycling or on horseback the new 12 foot wide proposed diversion can accommodate a variety of users.
2. Public enjoyment. Again, this is not considered to be diminished. Objector 2 agrees that the scenic view is 'just as good if not better'. The proposed diversion will show Quenby Hall in an elevated position from both the south-east and south-west aspects. These views show the Hall sitting above the surrounding Ha-Ha walls which sets off the splendour of the Hall and acts like a plinth to enhance the Hall in its setting. The Hall will be framed amongst the historic Cedar and Oak trees which date back hundreds of years. These trees cannot be appreciated in the same way in their current setting and especially against the backdrop of the Hall when viewed hard up against them. A new view of the Coplow will be seen and enjoyed. A new view of the old railway line can be seen and enjoyed. The new view of the Hall from the south-west is the best one across the landscaped old quarry which is grassed and to be sown with wild flowers. Around this area we plan to position a bench. The new views of the Billesdon Coplow and disused railway line are also appreciated. Further along there will be the view of the restored Medieval garden and a site board erected to inform all of its history. Continuing on the route, we plan to position another bench to the south-west of the Hall to provide another view which can be enjoyed. The site board and benches were suggestions from Parishioners.
3. The assertion by the Objector about where 'paths more often than not go directly to an ancient feature'...etc is of no relevance in this context. And 'gravitas' which means 'seriousness' is odd.
4. The further remark about knowledge of a Right of Way on purchase is of no relevance. The criteria to be considered on the Proposed Diversion are quite clear and have been set out. As for Costs, we have paid the fee to the Authority and have been as helpful as we can by writing personally to user groups and meeting them to assist and support the process for the Council.
5. The assertion that Council Tax spending is being used to 'satisfy a single property owners' privacy fixation' is ridiculous. Anyone with any common sense will have seen how welcoming we are to local people who come to the Hall for various reasons –whether carol singing, or a WI Garden Meeting or the recent Croquet Day. We have made many friends with many people in the Village either at our home or in the Local Pub.
6. 'Rowdy'...-meaning noisy or disorderly is not an assertion that we have made. Some have abused the use of the path, but not in that way.
7. The Objector makes an assertion that the restoration of the Medieval Garden is 'fictitious'. It is genuine.
8. In the Objector's final statement, he or she states that they will take it further if the Council decides to make the Order! If an Order is made, surely this is granted after careful consideration as to the

fulfilment of the criteria and after consultation with all user groups, their satisfaction and due process being followed. This unhelpful comment rather distorts their objection and suggests they are of a personal nature.

### Objection 2

1. We have spoken with a local rider who uses the proposed diversion regularly. She was most surprised we canvassed her thoughts about the surface. She was very happy to be quoted and went on to say "I absolutely love the proposed route you have created; it offers so much more interest and the surface is far better without the mud. The drainage and undulations have been dealt with and the ground feels safer to ride on as it's got more of a grip. I am hoping to use it a lot more during the winter months which will be great as it'll keep me off the dangerous roads".
2. We regularly see horse riders using the proposed diversion as the route of choice.
3. On 5<sup>th</sup> September 2017 we met with Vicky Allen, Leicestershire & Rutland Bridleways Association, who was also representing Alex Pyper and Janette Benskin from the British Horse Society. Vicky Allen reported that she was 'very satisfied' with the work done to create a more solid surface to ride on.
4. We are not proposing to erect signs as mentioned by the Objector.

### Objection 3

This person has lived in Hungarton for a longish time and clearly has been very interested in the proposed diversion. The proposal was fully discussed at the Parish Annual Meeting in May 2017 and he or she would have been present.

1. We were pleased to attend following an invitation by the Parish Chairman Mrs Penny Faulkner and also put an entry in the Parish News as suggested so there was good attendance by Parishioners. We explained our proposals to the meeting and answered questions raised. There had been some misunderstanding about the proposed route particularly as to the gradient which some thought would be steep having only seen the small plan on the Noticeboard. So, we explained it would be gradual in both directions, and gave specific measurements. One of the older residents, who had worked the land and had suffered a stroke in recent years, had reduced mobility. He confirmed that he had no problem with the diversion after he had seen and walked part of the route down which involved walking to the bottom of the Spinney.
2. The Parishioners were interested in our proposal to reinstate what is believed to be a Medieval Moat and Fish Ponds and the terracing that we have discovered. We said that there would be a low-level fence so that walkers and riders could enjoy the views into the Spinney and that we intended to employ a Specialist Historian to assist us with the renovation.  
We detailed our proposals for the surfacing of the new Path/Bridleway, how this would meet the requirements over Ridge and Furrow Pasture and would be grass-seeded to blend in with the Pasture. Then we withdrew to leave those at the meeting to discuss the issues freely. After the meeting we were informed that our proposal had received overwhelming support and this was recorded in the Minutes,
3. We believe that the overwhelming support is because of an appreciation that the Proposed Diversion will be significantly more enjoyable and will not be significantly less convenient.
4. There are magnificent views of the surrounding hills and hollows including a view of Billesdon Coplow and down to the Old Railway which are not available from the existing route of the bridleway on top of the hill. The new view of Quenby Hall sets off the splendour of the Hall sitting above the surrounding Ha-Ha Walls acting like a plinth to enhance the Hall in its setting.
5. The abuse of the path close to the Hall is something we can detail – especially by individuals who climb up the Ha-Ha and trespass on the garden above. Sometimes the intrusion has been to take photos, sometimes even to picnic on the front or rear garden. Upsettingly, on three occasions, people refused to leave our garden after being politely asked to do so.
6. The 'Objections' also contains mere Generalisations and the Opinions of the writer.

7. The objector states that two gates have been blocked up and one gate has been relocated. They go on to say that signs have gone missing and others have been relocated in order to divert people away from the Hall. This is simply untrue. We have always worked with the Council and respected any request for access. Furthermore, we took it upon ourselves to take guidance from Nigel Dunmore to get our signage correct before erecting it.

Comments from Archaeologist Richard Clark

We can confirm that we have no intention of changing the proposed diversion. Furthermore, we believe the proposed diversion will help to keep users on the track and thus avoiding them walking off around the deserted village area (between Points F and G) as shown on the map.

This page is intentionally left blank