Green, Janice

From:

Ken Stimson [ken@stimsonk.fsnet.co.uk]

Sent:

11 January 2008 11:32

To:

Green, Janice

Subject:

Berwick Bassett BWs 7 & 11

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status:

Red

Dear Miss Green,

The Committee of the North East Wiltshire Group of the Ramblers Association discussed this proposal to which I made preliminary comments (below). We also considered the additional information that you supplied in response to these comments.

The RA objects to the proposal. We believe that the proposed diversion is substantially less convenient than the current definitive right of way.

Yours sincerely

Ken Stimson, Footpath Secretary RA NE Wilts Group

---- Original Message ----

From: Ken Stimson

To: janicegreen@wiltshire.gov.uk

Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 9:14 PM Subject: Berwick Bassett BWs 7 & 11

Dear Miss Green,

Thank you for your letter (13 Dec 07 ref JG/PC/15) and for consulting the Ramblers Association (RA) regarding the proposed diversion of parts of Berwick Bassett bridleways Nos 7 & 11. Would you kindly acknowledge this email?

I am making these preliminary observations as a result of a site visit I made today. The committee of the North East Wiltshire Group of the RA next meets this Thursday evening 10th January. I will put this proposal for their consideration and let you know the outcome. If you are in a position to respond with additional information regarding the points below before our meeting, it may help our deliberations. I attach an annotated version of the map you sent me to illustrate the comments below:

- 1) The definitive right of way is obstructed by barbed wire fencing at four points K,L,M and N marked on the annotated map
- 2) There is a series of waymarks (either white arrows on black background or arrow with "Public Footpath") which follow the route B-K-C-A ie mostly the line of the proposed diversion.
- 3) There are waymarks at M and L pointing away from the definitive line towards the proposed diversion
- 4) At P there is a gate, that I could not open and there is no stile in the adjacent fencing to permit easy access to section DE
- 5) Also at P is a sign denoting "Public Footpath" and pointing SW along the line of the proposed diversion and not SE through the gate in the direction of the definitive bridleway
- 6) There is a post at E (maybe an old gatepost) but no visible waymark pointing NW and SW to denote the path bend.

In summary, the current right of way is obstructed and not waymarked. The proposed diversion has been waymarked with the intention of directing path users away from the definitive route. I will formally report this to Alison Stewart. Can you tell me whether WCC were aware of these problems?

In response to the points you make in your letter:

- 7) Are you able to tell me more about which wild birds are said to inhabit the area and which areas they use as cover? The RA may need to take advice on the validity of such a claim.
- 8) Liability to crop obstruction is not a valid reason or "benefit" of diverting a Right of Way. I am sure you are aware of the responsibilities of the landowner not to obstruct RoWs with crops
- 9) Both sections of the proposed diversion are significantly downhill of the current RoW. There is therefore additional and significant height loss and regain needed for traversing both sections A to D and D to F compared current arrangements. In general higher routes provide better views of the surroundings and the assertion that the diversion affords "much better" views would (I think) be difficult to sustain.

Any comments or answers to the above questions will be most welcome.

Yours sincerely

Ken Stimson, Footpath Secretary RA NE Wilts Group

