

**EXTRACTS FROM TWENTY OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO THE PUBLIC
CONSULTATION ISSUED ON 25 SEPTEMBER 2009**

(1) The local Member for Tisbury comments:

"[Footpath 65] – Those people who know about footpaths say it would be very sad if this route were to be lost, apparently some 7 years ago a similar application was made and it was REFUSED. The same arguments apply and therefore this request should be refused. Personally I think it would be sad if this old route were to be lost to the present ramblers and future generations. I doubt whether the reasons for changing the route, which we have not seen, comply with the requirements of the Act."

"[Footpath 69] – ...I cannot see any reason for changing this footpath."

(2) An objector comments:

"Thank you for sending me these proposals, which I find unacceptable, particularly any diversion of FP 65 after it enters the grounds of New Wardour Castle, passing the newly built Wardour Court...the path has always been known locally as the Rookery Path to the Temple Garden by the West Wing of the mansion. It gave access to All Saints Chapel in the West Wing, to local people walking from Donhead, for two centuries. The diversion proposed is almost twice as long and has less interest and amenity than the existing right of way, which I have used for 50 years."

(3) Tisbury Parish Council comment:

"There is little concern with the proposed diversion of footpath 69; however, Footpath 65 is a completely different matter. This footpath has been used for generations of people from the Donhead area going to the Chapel at Wardour Castle and should not be diverted. It gives walkers access to the gardens to the west of New Wardour Castle that includes ancient statuary and views of the historic and rare quincunx – a circle of trees seeded in Victorian times. The proposed diversion is a much less interesting route. Diversions, it was agreed by all, should be for substantial reasons and not just for convenience of particular parties."

(4) The Footpath Officer to Tisbury Parish Council, comments:

"The diversion to footpath 69 is only a slight deviation from the original, therefore have no objections to this. Footpath 65 was historically used by people from the Donhead area to attend the Chapel at New Wardour Castle and should therefore be retained. It also gives walkers access to the gardens to the west of Wardour Castle which includes ancient atatory [sic] and also views of the historic and quite rare quincunx; i.e. circle of trees seeded in Victorian times so that they come up as one. The proposed diversion is also a much less interesting route."

(5) Objectors comment:

“My wife and I use this footpath [65] almost daily as we live in Wardour not far from New Wardour Castle. We use the footpath to visit friends who live on the estate, to walk our dog and to visit the castle and the chapel. I understand that this footpath has been in common use since the chapel was built in the late 1700’s and the network of paths around Wardour was used by local residents to attend the chapel services. It is one of the great charms of living in this community that there are such paths and that they can be freely used to access historic sites such as the New Wardour Castle and it’s chapel. It would be a real travesty if centuries of free access was curtailed...The proposed diversion to the north of Wardour Court not only runs through a rather unattractive strip of wood but also ends up in a carpark [sic] and storage area with many unsightly recycling bins. The present path allows the lovely views of the parkland and the western approaches to New Wardour Castle and eventually passes through the very beautiful Temple Garden. All this will be lost if the diversion takes [sic] place and it will double the distance from the park boundary to the chapel.”

(6) An objector comments:

“I wish to object to the proposals, especially the diversion of FP 65, which I and my family have walked regularly for over 40 years and I still do so almost weekly. I can see no reason whatever for diverting it.”

(7) An objector comments:

“I strongly object to this [diversion] happening. This footpath [65] has been in place for hundreds of years and was a direct route for Catholics from The Donheads to Wardour Chapel, and is steeped in history. I personally walk this way...several times a week as it is such a beautiful walk.”

(8) An objector comments:

“I would like to lodge an objection to the proposed Diversion of the ancient footpath [65]...As a family we have used that foot path for many years without causing any damage.which [sic] I believe mainly local people have likewise, mainly to enable [sic] to get to church services at wardour chapel.”

(9) An objector comments:

“I do not agree with either proposed diversion of the footpaths...I use the footpath [65] at least twice a week, and my wife and children use it frequently as well. If the footpath were to be diverted...it would be a much longer and less convenient route. “

(10) An objector comments:

“I have been walking footpaths 65 and 69 on a regular basis for over forty years with my sister and brother-in-law...and can see no reason for any diversion.”

(11) An objector comments:

“I have walked the paths around New Wardour Castle as we knew it in 50’s ever since I was eight years old....I hear the path [65]...is going to be diverted. This will mean walkers have a longer route, and far less panoramic views of the parkland to the SE.”

(12) An objector comments:

“I grew up in this area and often use this footpath when walking my dog and baby, the area is so beautiful and has so much history. It would be an incredible injustice to the area for the footpath [65] to be diverted away from the old Rookery which was originally the footpath from The Donheads to the Chapel at Wardour...So many places of AONB stature are being lost to the wilds and forgotten unnecessarily [sic]...such areas should be available for all to enjoy.”

(13) Objectors comment:

“We understand that there has been a proposal to divert the footpath [65]...My wife and I would be unhappy for such a diversion to be approved – we regularly walk along this path, normally on a circular route which we make from our home...”

(14) An objector comments:

“I wish to object to the proposal to divert the footpath [65]...I have used this path since 1948 and the proposed diversion would considerably lessen the pleasure of using it in future.”

(15) An objector comments:

“I am writing to object to the proposed diversion of the footpath [65]...I have been a frequent user of this footpath, since I came to live in this area in 1988. As treasurer of the Tisbury Footpath Club, I have described this route, for the booklet of local walks, connecting Old Wardour Castle with New Wardour to Donhead St Andrew, focussing on the historical interest, including the Temple Garden. I believe it would be a loss to walkers visiting the area to lose the opportunity not to be able [sic] to glimpse this magical spot...I believe the loss of this ancient route to walkers from being able to experience places of beauty and historical interest such as the Temple Garden, should be avoided when new sanitising buildings such as Wardour Court have already deprived walkers of a romantic and atmospheric experience.”

(16) Objectors comment:

“We would like to object to a proposed diversion of the local footpath [65]...We live close to this area and use this footpath almost every day on our daily walks. It is an old path with beautiful views and is one of the reasons we moved to this area in the first place. Diverting it would mean confining walkers to a much more boring enclosed path which is twice as long.”

(17) An objector comments:

"...this path [65] has been used for many, many years, (I myself use it every day, come rain or shine!)...I do hope that you will be able to keep our much loved footpath just where it is, as it is very much appreciated each and every time that it is walked – as I am sure, if you have been that way through the Temple Garden, you will understand."

(18) An objector comments:

"I was brought up in Wardour and request that you reject the request for a diversion. Currently walkers can view the Park and the Temple Gardens as they follow the historic route of the 'Rookery Path' as they go between Old Wardour and Westfield – as well as the Chapel – and this diversion would break the link with the past."

(19) Objectors comment:

"The old 'Rookery Path' which traverses the Temple Garden at Wardour Castle [65] is a jewel in the rights of way crown. As a footpath, it is as old as All Saints Chapel, to which it has provided a route from the Donheads for well over 200 years. Not only is it scenically beautiful but also one of the most long-established traditional routes in this parish...The footpath network around Wardour Castle, including the long-distance path, is of priceless value and it is of my opinion, my wife's and many others with whom we have discussed this matter, that only the most paramount reasons...should be considered to be sufficient to compromise it."

(20) An objector comments:

"The path [65] is a long-established means of access from Westfield Farm and cottages to the RC Chapel at Wardour Castle. To divert it as requested would greatly increase the walking distance from the stile at the entrance of the wood to the Chapel. As someone who has been living in Wardour since 1947 I strongly object to a quite unnecessary diversion of the path."