

From: Catriona Cook
Sent: 19 June 2022 09:29
To: Chris France <
Subject: Re: FW: Damage to Holloways

Thank you for your speedy attention to this matter. Having had time to read the application plans I am even more disturbed that I was not consulted by the planning department on the first application. I notice that there was a response from the ramblers; the BHS is a statutory consultee for any effects on the rights of way network, including footpaths, since 65% of footpaths were historically bridleways or roads.

My main concerns are:

1. vehicular use of the bridleways between Reasty car park and the land owned by the applicants. It is illegal for motors to be used over bridleways without landowner permission. Presumably they received permission from the forestry as there is a locked gate. And in this case I object strongly to a safe motor free route used by children on ponies and cycles and the elderly being turned into a road.
2. There are three unrecorded bridleways in this area, the footpath down Oak Rigg Gill, one that went up Newgate Gill (please note that the applicants Newgate Farm is actually Highdales Farm) and one down from the dead end bridleway at Springwood Heights down to Low Dales. All three are on my list of Definitive Map Modification Orders to submit.
3. The applicants appear to have a cavalier attitude towards our social history by their damage to the historical hollow ways, the changing of place names, their use of public paths as motorised access and their proposed plans for a lake and landscaping.
4. I object to the lake due to the proposed landscape changes and the consequence of the water levels stopping the road from Low Dales to Holgate becoming a long ford at some points of the year. This has happened for centuries as witnessed by the footpath running along side in the adjoining field and the word ford along the length of the road on old maps. Children and others delight in a safe bottomed ford which they can splash in on their ponies and it is an excellent first ford experience for young horses too.

The planning department have always kept me upto date with the Langdale End airstrip case so I am surprised to have been over looked with this case.

Best wishes,

Catriona

From: Ralph Earwicker
Sent: 02 May 2021 09:03
To: Jill Bastow
Subject: Newgate Farm footpaths NYM/2020/0951/FL

Good morning,

I write with reference to plans to extinguish sections of footpaths 020 and 712 and divert footpath 712 to the east. I wish to lodge my objection to this plan. I am a local resident and walk this area regularly and feel strongly that there is no reason to make such a radical change to the course of this public right of way. It is important to preserve our rural heritage. The path can follow the edge of the proposed lake and continue along the valley bottom as now.

I understand that footpath diversion applications can be assessed by a relevant planning authority on these grounds:

- it's necessary to allow development (if planning permission has been granted)
- the diversion benefits the landowner/occupier
- the diversion benefits the public
- the path is not used by the public (closure only) - these circumstances are rare and very difficult to achieve

My contention:

#1 it is not necessary to allow development, the path can follow the lakeside.

#2 it is not clear what benefit the landowner/occupier will achieve by the diversion.

Privacy cannot be an issue - the course of the path has been established for years with a series of owners/occupiers.

#3 the diversion does not benefit the public - the path follows the valley bottom from Lowdales and the proposed east diversion detracts from its topographical continuity.

#4 the path is used by the public regularly.

Thank you in advance for considering this view.

Ralph Earwicker

Southernmost Cottage
Silpho
Scarborough
YO13 0JP