

**From:** [Georgina Boyle](#)  
**Sent:** 24 April 2023 13:55  
**To:** [Harlow, Craig](#)  
**Subject:** Re: ref; D/2011/003 CSTP6

---

Dear Craig,  
Yes, I would like to maintain my objection.  
Best regards  
Georgina

Sent from my iPhone

On 24 Apr 2023, at 13:28, Harlow, Craig <Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Georgina,

As the consultation period has expired for the order as of 17:00 on the 21<sup>st</sup> April. I am emailing to confirm whether you would like to maintain your objection to the order and I will forward that objection with the order when it is sent to the Planning Inspectorate for determination? If so I will take your objection as the contents of your email dated 13<sup>th</sup> March sent at 19:50 ( seen below). There are 3 recorded objections to the order and another pending confirmation as to their stance ( not including yours currently).

The next step now, as the order has been objected to, is for it to go before Wiltshire Council's Eastern Area Planning Committee who will vote on the recommendation Wiltshire Council attach to the order when it is forwarded to The Planning Inspectorate for determination. No matter what recommendation the committee attach to the order it must be sent to The Planning Inspectorate for determination who will determine it based on the historical documentary evidence. The planning committee will be a public meeting where up to 3 objectors may address the committee verbally for up to 3 minutes each if desired, the committee members will have copies of any objections received. It is likely this meeting will be held in Devizes in the next couple of months, I will keep you updated with further details regarding the meeting closer to the time and I have more information.

I look forward to hearing from you on the status of your objection.

Best Regards

Craig

**Craig Harlow MIPROW**

**Definitive Map Officer**

Definitive Map and Highway Records  
Wiltshire Council  
County Hall  
Trowbridge  
BA14 8JN  
<image001.png>

Direct Line: 01249 468568

Email: [craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Web: [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

<[image002.png](#)>

<[image003.gif](#)>

[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

Information relating to how Wiltshire Council will manage your data can be found at: <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/recreation-rights-of-way>

Report a problem <https://my.wiltshire.gov.uk/>

---

**From:** Harlow, Craig

**Sent:** 13 March 2023 15:33

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: ref; D/2011/003 CSTP6

You do have a right to object, objections can be made for any reasons and if any objections are received and not withdrawn, Wiltshire Council cannot confirm the order and it must be determined by the Planning Inspectorate following the process detailed in my previous email. However, objections based on safety, need, want (for or against), desire, environmental concerns, or anything other than the interpretation of the historic evidence will almost certainly be dismissed by any inspector as falling outside of matters they can consider under s.53 of the wildlife and countryside Act 1981. This point is well versed in inspectors' decisions and case law. If no objections are received or any made are withdrawn, then Wiltshire Council would confirm the order at the end of the statutory 42 day consultation period and the rights would be recorded and then the management of those rights will be a matter for the relevant team to consider.

There are powers to extinguish vehicular highways under Section 116 of the Highways Act 1980 and Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

where highways are affected by planning permission. Section 116 of the Highways Act requires an application to the Magistrates Court, and requires the road to be unnecessary or a diversion makes the new route nearer or more commodious to the public. There are significant costs for a section 116 order as it includes Magistrates Court costs, applications can be made via Wiltshire Councils legal team as the Highway Authority (Wiltshire Council) must make the application to the Magistrates. In this case however, if the orders were confirmed, the routes would be restricted byways (rather than full public vehicular highways) and as such applications can be made under S.118 of the Highways Act which facilitates the stopping up of footpaths, bridleways, and restricted byways. The legal tests to consider for a S.118 application are below:

*(1)Where it appears to a council as respects a footpath [F2, bridleway or restricted byway] in their area (other than one which is a trunk road or a special road) that it is expedient that the path or way should be stopped up on the ground that it is not needed for public use, the council may by order made by them and submitted to and confirmed by the Secretary of State, or confirmed as an unopposed order, extinguish the public right of way over the path or way.*

*An order under this section is referred to in this Act as a “public path extinguishment order”.*

*(2)The Secretary of State shall not confirm a public path extinguishment order, and a council shall not confirm such an order as an unopposed order, unless he or, as the case may be, they are satisfied that it is expedient so to do having regard to the extent (if any) to which it appears to him or, as the case may be, them that the path or way would, apart from the order, be likely to be used by the public, and having regard to the effect which the extinguishment of the right of way would have as respects land served by the path or way, account being taken of the provisions as to compensation contained in section 28 above as applied by section 121(2) below.*

Applications under s.118 are dealt with by our department and are open to public consultation and possible objections, any application will be considered against the legal tests of s.118 as set out above. Further guidance is set out at 2.2 of the following document [Rights of way advice note 9: general guidance to inspectors on public rights of way matters. - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/444444/Rights_of_way_advice_note_9_general_guidance_to_inspectors_on_public_rights_of_way_matters_-_GOV.UK_(www.gov.uk).pdf) which explains how the planning inspectorate consider such orders, if they determine an order following objections ( Wiltshire Council can confirm an order if no objections are

made or are withdrawn). The cost of an application under the Highways Act 1980 is currently £2389 plus costs (likely to be in the region of £3,000-£3,500 for a confirmed completed order). That cost is due to rise from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2023 to £2658 plus costs, if an application is signed by the applicant/s and accepted by Wiltshire Council before 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 the current costs of £2389 plus costs will be honoured. There is a backlog of Highways Act applications of approx. 18 months before an officer is assigned to a case, applications are dealt with in date order and any prioritisation of an application out of date order is down to manager discretion. It is possible to apply to extinguish more than one right of way in an application, or parts/ widths of a highways, across more than one landownership, if all affected parties agree to the application. Costs could be shared between applicants. I cannot guarantee the success of an application, but a fair consideration of the legal tests would be applied. If you were minded to pursue this course of action we can discuss this further and I can provide an application form.

In relation to your current holding objection on the order, I will contact all respondents / objectors, including yourself, to the order at the end of the consultation period after 21<sup>st</sup> April 2023 to confirm how you wish to proceed at that time.

Best Regards

Craig

**Craig Harlow MIPROW**  
**Definitive Map Officer**  
Definitive Map and Highway Records  
Wiltshire Council  
County Hall  
Trowbridge  
BA14 8JN  
<image001.png>

Direct Line: 01249 468568

Email: [craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Web: [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

<image002.png>

<image003.gif>

[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

Information relating to how Wiltshire Council will manage your data can be found at: <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/recreation-rights-of-way>

Report a problem <https://my.wiltshire.gov.uk/>

---

**From:** Georgina Boyle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 March 2023 22:38  
**To:** Harlow, Craig <[Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Re: ref; D/2011/003 CSTP6

Dear Craig,

Thank you for your reply - even though it is even more saddening. As far as I can make out I have no right to make any objection at the moment and once the order is made on historical evidence that is the end of the matter?

Please can you tell me what happened to byways that crossed motorways or dual carriageways? Is there any way I could apply to have the byway 'stopped up' on grounds of safety?

Yours sincerely,  
Georgina

P.S. I am not withdrawing my objection at the moment as I want it on record that it is dangerous.

On 13 Mar 2023, at 07:07, Harlow, Craig <[Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dear Georgina,

Thank you for your email.

I understand the concerns you raise in relation to the order that has been made regarding safety and access. The order has been made under S.53 of the wildlife and countryside Act 1981, in particular S.53(3)(c)(ii) to amend the current recorded rights on the definitive map and statement for the area. This decision is based on historic evidence that those rights exist, have not been extinguished and therefore should be recorded on the definitive map and statement. As you say the evidence is clear that the route of CSTEP6 has higher rights than those currently recorded. These are the only matters that can be considered when a surveying authority ( Wiltshire Council) make a decision and subsequent order in relation to a S.53 application, and if an order is made and objected to and ultimately determined by The Planning Inspectorate on behalf of The Secretary of State , they too are only able to consider the historical evidence and whether those rights exist. The matter being decided by the order is solely do those rights exist, the management of those rights is a separate and subsequent matter if and when an order is confirmed and those rights are recorded.

In response to some of your queries , regarding any works to be carried out ( including any works on gradients or crossings), if the order is confirmed the management of any rights that are recorded are a matter for the Countryside Access Officers and team at that time, they are the team and officers who manage the public rights of way network from a maintenance and enforcement perspective. The Countryside Access officers for the Charlton St. Peter and Wilsford area are Stephen Leonard ( [Stephen.leonard@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Stephen.leonard@wiltshire.gov.uk)) and Alison Rasey ( [alison.rasey@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:alison.rasey@wiltshire.gov.uk)).

The case referred to by Mary Gillmore (Michael Aldous FPS/AO665/6/1) is referring to separate legislation than this order at Charlton St. Peter. The case refers to a creation order , likely made under s.26 of the Highways Act 1980, rather than an order made under S.53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 which is considered for this order and only allows for historical evidence to be a material consideration.

The BHS were not the applicants for the upgrade of CSTEP6 but were the applicants for the upgrade of CSTEP2 and WILS5. Whilst I cannot speak for the BHS or the applicant for CTSP6 they are likely to be aware that safety concerns cannot form any part of a decision when a S.53 application is made to record higher rights.

I appreciate your concerns regarding the car park at The Charlton Cat, unfortunately I know of no mechanism for you to claim compensation for loss of business from Wiltshire Council because of this order. Any council's duty to consider s.53 applications and make orders to record rights is clear in law. I note the land subject to the order and through the car park is

unregistered land and is likely more supportive evidence of the route of the old road.

I have attached some guidance notes published on the matter of definitive map modification orders which may be useful to you. Also you may find the following link useful [Definitive map orders: consistency guidelines - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/definitive-map-modification-orders-consistency-guidelines).

If you would like to object to the order on the grounds of safety, I can inform you this will not be a relevant objection and once the case is forwarded to The Planning Inspectorate for determination, they are likely to inform you of this and possibly ask you to withdraw your objection on that basis. Only the interpretation of the historic evidence is a relevant consideration for the determination of this order. If objections are made and not withdrawn to the order the process will be as follows. The order will first pass through Wiltshire Council's eastern area planning committee who will vote to attach a recommendation from Wiltshire Council on the determination of the order when forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate for determination. No matter what recommendation the committee vote to attach to the order it must be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate for determination who will consider the matter based on the historical evidence alone. The Planning Inspectorate will decide to settle the matter by written representations only, a local hearing or public inquiry, any objectors to the order will be requested to submit a statement of case and proof of evidence, if a local hearing or inquiry is held, objectors would be asked to present their case at that hearing or committee. The whole process may take up to 2 years based on current timescales for cases being determined by The Planning Inspectorate.

Given the above and attached information could you please confirm if you would like me to consider your email below as an objection to the order "The Wiltshire Council Charlton St. Peter 2, 6 and Wilsford 5 Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2023" for the reasons stated in your email.

Best Regards

Craig

**Craig Harlow MIPROW**  
**Definitive Map Officer**  
Definitive Map and Highway Records  
Wiltshire Council  
County Hall  
Trowbridge  
BA14 8JN

<image002.png>

Direct Line: 01249 468568

Email: [craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Web: [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

<image003.png> <image004.gif>

[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

Information relating to how Wiltshire Council will manage your data can be found at: <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/recreation-rights-of-way>

Report a problem <https://my.wiltshire.gov.uk/>

---

**From:** Georgina Boyle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 March 2023 19:50  
**To:** Harlow, Craig <[Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** ref; D/2011/003 CSTP6

Dear Craig,

Thank you for your letters of the 16th February and 2nd March 2023.

On historical evidence there is no question that CSTP6 was more than a footpath, however historically the A342 was not a major A road with large lorries and very fast traffic, a junction with minimal visibility in either direction at the Charlton Cat which with the addition of equestrians and carriages is dangerous.

My objection to this upgrade of the footpath to a restricted byway is on the grounds of safety. Please see the attached map which shows some of the accidents along this stretch of road - the map only shows accidents with casualties, there have been many more that I have seen that are not recorded on this map. Is Wiltshire Council doing any due diligence or other consultations on the safety of this crossing? You state in your decision report on page 18 - 'The A342 is a very busy road and at this point the visibility looking west and east is very poor to cross what is a 50mph A road at this point due to bends in the road' Unfortunately looking at a map of the road it does not show the true danger of the bends and so arriving at the proposed crossing you would not be aware and by allowing this byway you would be encouraging dangerous activity.



What plans would be put in place to make this safer? The only safe solution would be a horse crossing as recommended by the PROW working group.

Mary Gillmore in her letter claims that it would fulfil a 'missing link' however there are already 3 bridleway crossings of the A342 within 2 miles of CSTP6 which are all at safe points on the road with good visibility and provide 'convenient and enjoyable' circular route for riders ( taken from Mary Gillmore attached Michael Aldous FPS/AO665/6/1) however in this instance the danger clearly outweighs any advantage of crossing at this point.

In his letter of November 2022 Alan Woodford of BHS Wiltshire states - He cannot see how a route for horses and carriages would be easily provided - He does not mention the issue of safety. Does the BHS not have any duty of care for the safety of riders, carriage drivers in encouraging them to cross a busy road with no visibility?

With regard to the practicalities - When I bought the Charlton Cat in 2014 it was with a footpath across the carpark with a width of 1.2m (as in your decision report page 55). The upgrading to a byway with a minimum width of 5m. means I lose valuable parking spaces which I need to keep my business viable. How is Wiltshire Council going to compensate my business for loss of asset?

The required works to create this byway with a suitable gradient for both horses and carriages will be extensive and I presume expensive. Has Wiltshire Council Highways done any feasibility as to value for money for the community for works, signage or a horse crossing. I will also lose significant business whilst these works are being done.

<image001.png>

I look forward to hearing from you as to what actions are being taken to ensure that this upgrade will be safe for purpose.

Yours sincerely

Georgina Boyle

---

This email originates from Wiltshire Council and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information and may be subject to Copyright or Intellectual Property rights. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email from your inbox. Any disclosure, reproduction, dissemination,

modification and distribution of the contents of the email is strictly prohibited. Email content may be monitored by Wiltshire Council to ensure compliance with its policies and procedures. No contract is intended by this email, and any personal opinions expressed in this message are those of the sender and should not be taken as representing views of Wiltshire Council. Please note Wiltshire Council utilises anti-virus scanning software but does not warrant that any e-mail or attachments are free from viruses or other defects and accepts no liability for any losses resulting from infected e-mail transmissions. Receipt of this e-mail does not imply consent to use or provide this e-mail address to any third party for any purpose. Wiltshire Council will not request the disclosure of personal financial information by means of e-mail any such request should be confirmed in writing by contacting Wiltshire Council.

<ne112.pdf>

-----

This email originates from Wiltshire Council and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information and may be subject to Copyright or Intellectual Property rights. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email from your inbox. Any disclosure, reproduction, dissemination, modification and distribution of the contents of the email is strictly prohibited. Email content may be monitored by Wiltshire Council to ensure compliance with its policies and procedures. No contract is intended by this email, and any personal opinions expressed in this message are those of the sender and should not be taken as representing views of Wiltshire Council. Please note Wiltshire Council utilises anti-virus scanning software but does not warrant that any e-mail or attachments are free from viruses or other defects and accepts no liability for any losses resulting from infected e-mail transmissions. Receipt of this e-mail does not imply consent to use or provide this e-mail address to any third party for any purpose. Wiltshire Council will not request the disclosure of personal financial information by means of e-mail any such request should be confirmed in writing by contacting Wiltshire Council.

**From:** [Gill Gadd](#)  
**Sent:** 04 May 2023 14:28  
**To:** [Harlow, Craig](#)  
**Subject:** Re: your ref: D/2011/003 and D/2021/105

---

Dear Mr Harlow,

Thank you for your reply to my objections.

I certainly do wish to leave these in place and would be grateful if they could be put forward as you describe.

With thanks,  
Gillian Gadd  
Timber Lodge  
Charlton St Peter

On Fri, Apr 21, 2023 at 10:08 AM Harlow, Craig <[Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dear Mrs Gadd ,

I acknowledge your objection to the order made to upgrade footpath CSTP6 , and part of bridleway CSTP2 to restricted byways.

Wiltshire Council are bound by the legislation when considering applications made under S.53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1980 to amend the definitive map and statement as will the Planning Inspectorate who will determine the order if objected to. Any decision-making authority is unable to consider safety matters or the need or desire for any route, the decision must be solely based on the historic documentary evidence and that is the reason the order has been made. It is likely the Planning Inspectorate ( on behalf of the Secretary of State) will request you withdraw your objection as it is not based on relevant considerations , however if it is not withdrawn it will be sent with the order to the Planning Inspectorate for determination. The Planning Inspectorate will contact objectors asking for statements of case and proofs of evidence at the time they come to determine the order, which may be by written representations , a public hearing or a public inquiry.

If any and all objections are not withdrawn then the next step will be to take the order to Wiltshire Council's Eastern Area Planning Committee. This will be to determine Wiltshire Councils' recommendation on the order when sent to the Planning Inspectorate. No matter what recommendation is decided upon it must be sent to the Planning Inspectorate who will determine the order based on the relevant tests. I will be in contact in future in regarding the date of the Planning Committee where members of the public are able to address the committee members for up to 3 minutes verbally , any written objections will be presented to the committee for their consideration.

If you have any queries regarding the process, please contact me.

Best Regards

Craig

**Craig Harlow MIPROW**  
**Definitive Map Officer**  
Definitive Map and Highway Records  
Wiltshire Council  
County Hall  
Trowbridge  
BA14 8JN



Direct Line: 01249 468568

Email: [craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Web: [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)



[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

Information relating to how Wiltshire Council will manage your data can be found at: <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/recreation-rights-of-way>

Report a problem <https://my.wiltshire.gov.uk/>

---

**From:** Gill Gadd [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 April 2023 15:43  
**To:** Harlow, Craig <[Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** your ref: D/2011/003 and D/2021/105

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mr Harlow,

I wish you to bring it to the attention of the relevant departments that I am wholeheartedly opposed to the modification of footpath Charlton St Peter 6 (CSTP6) to a restricted byway. As set out in my previous email to you, I believe this will have severe implications regarding the safety of users attempting to cross or join the A342 adjacent to the Charlton Cat (marked F on your map).

Opening up the width of the byway to allow horses and carriage users to travel up to the A342 is an act of gross irresponsibility on the part of those officials charged with the health and safety of public highway users. It may have been a useful access requirement 100 years ago when dwellings lined that particular route, but surely it is obvious that that time has passed and to introduce slow-moving or potentially fractious animals to an A road, on the section lying between blind bends, is pure insanity.

The A342 carries an increasing number of lorries and HGVs which will have a considerably longer stopping distance than a car. Even with reduced speed limits, painted crossings and warning signs (which you have given no indication will be put in place) the area of road you are proposing to allow members of the public to risk their lives on is too dangerous.

The second objection I have to the opening of CSTP6 as a 5 to 9 metre wide restricted byway is that I believe it will encourage anti-social and criminal behaviour in the village of Charlton St Peter. At present we have a single highway entrance/exit in the village and CSTP6 could well become a route in or out for an undesirable element who wish to burgle properties or outbuildings here. It is a practice which is rife at the moment and I have no doubt that the opening of an easy route out of Charlton will make it more appealing to thieves.

I also think the opening up of CSTP6 may encourage motorised vehicles such as trials motorbikes already using the plain.

Finally, the question of cost to the taxpayer must also be considered. We hear that councils are stretched; potholes in the roads are an increasing hazard and I imagine that this endeavour may remain unsurfaced as well as poorly maintained because of other more pressing concerns. Does Wiltshire Council really believe this use of resources to be value for money? Maybe we should take a vote from those of us who pay our taxes.

Yours faithfully,  
Gill Gadd  
Timber Lodge  
Charlton St Peter  
SN9 6EU

-----  
This email originates from Wiltshire Council and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information and may be subject to Copyright or Intellectual Property rights. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email from your inbox. Any disclosure, reproduction, dissemination, modification and distribution of the contents of the email is strictly prohibited. Email content may be monitored by Wiltshire Council to ensure compliance with its policies and procedures. No contract is intended by this email, and any personal opinions expressed in this message are those of the sender and should not be taken as representing views of Wiltshire Council. Please note Wiltshire Council utilises anti-virus scanning software but does not warrant that any e-mail or attachments are free from viruses or other defects and accepts no liability for any losses resulting from infected e-mail transmissions. Receipt of this e-mail does not imply consent to use or provide this e-mail address to any third party for any purpose. Wiltshire

Council will not request the disclosure of personal financial information by means of e-mail any such request should be confirmed in writing by contacting Wiltshire Council.

**From:** [Harlow, Craig](#)  
**Sent:** 24 April 2023 10:08  
**To:** [Harlow, Craig](#)

---

**From:** Tim Fowle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 April 2023 19:45  
**To:** Harlow, Craig <Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Application to upgrade bridleways Wilsford No. 5 and Charlton St Perter No. 2 to restricted byways (ref: D/2021/105)

Dear Craig

I thank you for the clarification of the DMMO Decisions that the council have reached that you sent to us on Friday, and the reasons the decisions have been made. However you seem to have misconstrued the point I was trying to make in my email of Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> April in that I object to the width of the byway as proposed and therefore I wish to clarify this as follows.

The questions I raised , particularly to the 12.2 metres (40 feet) width specified, is the point I was trying to object to, as being excessive for the proposed future use and grossly intrusive into my fields, particularly as the section further east towards the village of Charlton is NOT being upgraded due to lack of evidence for this historically.

I don't oppose the upgrading to a restricted byway but do most strongly object to the proposed width of the right of way.

The idea of upgrading only part of the byway to the proposed width is utterly ridiculous in terms of the adverse effects on my land, to no appreciable benefit, as it ceases to be a restricted byway as it nears the Charlton Cat. I do not believe that widening the byway to this width will be of any benefit to users of it.

Yours sincerely

Tim Fowle

---

**From:** Harlow, Craig [<mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 21 April 2023 10:31  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Application to upgrade bridleways Wilsford No. 5 and Charlton St Perter No. 2 to restricted byways (ref: D/2021/105)

Dear Mr Fowle,

The difference in widths is explained at section 17 of the decision report. A width of 40ft (12.2 metres) for the section of CSTP2 is set out in the 1780 Charlton Inclosure award where that route is awarded as “ not less than 40 feet”. As this award was only for the route within the parish of Charlton St. Peter this width only extends to the parish boundary. The continuation of the route in Wilsford was set out in the 1808 Wilsford Inclosure award as being 20ft (6.1 metres). As inclosure evidence is considered strong category A evidence , unless evidence was found that these widths had been extinguished then they still exist to this day and result in the change of widths at the parish boundary. Changes in status or width of rights of way at parish boundaries where different parishes claimed the rights is not uncommon.

The decision to not upgrade the section of CSTP2 you refer to is explained in the decision report from 16.19-16.23. The evidence for this section being a public road is far weaker than the other sections considered. It was not set out at the 1780 inclosure award, not shown as a clear route on the parish map of 1804, now shown as a road on the tithe map of 1841 and recorded as an occupation road ( likely a private road) and a footpath in the 1866 railway plans. Commercial maps ( of low evidential value) from 1773- 1823 are inconsistent on this section of the route, with one showing the route and others showing no route at all. Later commercial maps from 1900 show it as a bridle track. For the reasons briefly summarised here and explained in the decision report, Wiltshire Council deem on the balance of probabilities the evidence does not demonstrate this section of the route should be amended from its current recorded status of bridleway.

I acknowledge you points regarding safety but as explained previously Wiltshire Council and any decision making authority cannot take these matters into consideration when making a decision on applications made under section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1980 to amend the definitive map and statement.

Best Regards

Craig

**Craig Harlow MIPROW**  
**Definitive Map Officer**  
Definitive Map and Highway Records  
Wiltshire Council  
County Hall  
Trowbridge  
BA14 8JN

**Wiltshire Council**

Direct Line: 01249 468568

Email: [craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:craig.harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Web: [www.wiltshire.gov.uk](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)





[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

Information relating to how Wiltshire Council will manage your data can be found at: <http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/recreation-rights-of-way>

Report a problem <https://my.wiltshire.gov.uk/>

---

**From:** Tim Fowle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 April 2023 22:48  
**To:** Harlow, Craig <[Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Craig.Harlow@wiltshire.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Application to upgrade bridleways Wilsford No. 5 and Charlton St Perter No. 2 to restricted byways (ref: D/2021/105)

Dear Mr Harlow

Further to your letter of 16 February 2023 I wish to register my concerns regarding the decisions made on the Application D/2021/105 and would ask for further clarification on how the decision was made with particular reference to Wilsford 5 and Charlton St Peter 2.

These two rights of way are currently bridleways which are joined end to end and are historically the same path. To the best of my knowledge in all the maps shown within the evidence document copied to us they are shown as the same width. I am therefore at a loss to understand why the decision has been made for WILS5 to be upgraded to a width of 6.1 metres whilst CSTP2 is to become 12.2 metres wide, as per your Decision Plan 1. Can you please explain this decision.

Meanwhile, further east there is a section of bridleway CSTP2 between its junction with footpath CSTP6 leading west to its junction with the spur of CSTP2 leading to the A342 which you state in your letter will not be upgraded to a byway because there is apparently insufficient evidence to do so, despite the fact that on the historical maps this appears to be a continuation of CSTP2 coming from Wilsford. Please explain the rationale behind this decision


The spur of CSTP2 leading to the A342 at point C on the Decision Plan 1 has fallen into disuse since the late 1970s on police advice as they considered that access to the A342 at this point is suicidally dangerous. All applications to introduce a new access point to the A342 from my land were turned down by the Highways Department of your own Council due to the danger of introducing slow moving traffic into a high speed road, yet this DMMO decision to upgrade this access is doing precisely that. Please explain how this can be safe or sensible. I would add that although it is not on my land, I have the same concerns for the upgrading of CSTP6 where it meets the A342 at the Charlton Cat.

I await your response to these points as a matter of urgency.

Yours sincerely

Tim Fowle

---

 Virus-free [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

**From:** [Kerry Robinson](#)  
**Sent:** 22 March 2023 08:25  
**To:** [Harlow, Craig](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Application 2011/03 charlton starter (CSTP6)

---

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mr Harlow,

Thank you for your speedy response to my objection to the plans for upgrading CSTP6 . I will take the opportunity to address the 120 page report, and acknowledge that the law intends to ignore both the safety and environmental issues raised in the objection to such alterations of the footpath.

It is an affront that we again fail to learn from history and it's injurious errors. Even more astounding that the law intends to inflict a tort on a modern day business, its proprietor and patrons, all the road users and the individuals who intend or blindly make use of the planned 'upgraded footpath' .

I wish to maintain my objection and would like this to be added to it, if only as you point out to delay this inevitable faux pas.

Kind regards  
K. Robinson

On Tue, 21 Mar 2023 at 15:28, Kerry Robinson [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Mr Harlow,

It is with jaw dropping incredulity that I see you have plans to resurrect an access, as a byway (cstp6) which was closed some 150 years ago.

Closed for a very good reason - even in those days of horse drawn vehicles!

As a driver , and horse rider, I am raising objections on the grounds of serious safety issues. Anyone using that byway on horseback or in a horse drawn vehicle would be doing so with no regard for their horses, themselves or other road users.

Access into and across the privately owned car park, belonging to and for the use of patrons to The Charlton Cat, on the A342 is positioned at a lethal chicane. It's a double bend which regularly sees casualties in various degrees of seriousness. Cars frequently clip the opposite bank and flip on their roof landing on the opposite side of the road.

As a resident on this same highway I have in the last five years witnessed a massive increase in traffic, including huge HGV's and artics, all travelling too fast and unable to pass each other without decimating the banks on both sides of the road. Some are forced to stop while dangerously manoeuvring themselves onto the verges so they can pass each other.

I am all for you providing bridleways - but not at exit points that put both the lives of horses ( yes they have brains and can be startled) their riders , pedestrians or drivers at lethal risk. A horse hit by a car will usually be killed and often go through the vehicles windscreen, posing a not inconsiderable risk to the driver and passengers. Byways ripped up by motorbikes, quads and cars

are already near impassible for riders and walkers as it is . Common sense appears to have been abandoned in this specific planning application.

Permission for such a short sighted and unnecessary opening of cstp6 route would also enable and encourage the abuse of a private car park to a much loved local business. Perhaps you the powers that be should be held financially liable for the unavoidable damage to the future business prospects of The Charlton Cat.

I can only add that I expect more from my local authority. If you want to improve bridleways and byways in this area it would be appreciated if you focussed on those currently being made inaccessible with wire and unmanageable gates, and surfaces that have been trenched by vehicles.

Kind regards

K. Robinson