If the owners were to clear the area of thicket and nettles close to the edge of their land bordering Hedingham Castle, as they will presumably have to do anyway should the footpath be rerouted, then they could of course harvest the hay that would grow in the two extra metres that would be turned into productive pasture and the hay harvested from that opened up area would more than compensate for the small amount lost as a result of an eighteen inch path existing where historically it always has done.

So, we believe that this request to move the route of the footpath has nothing to do with the production of hay and much more to do with fencing in the dog walkers.

If the owners of the land are happy to lose two metres of land then why not simply create a two metre wide fenced corridor where the footpath currently exists with a gap at the lower part to allow the owners access to the far part of the field when they wish to cut and remove the hay?

The proposed alternative route for the path is far from ideal as towards the top of it there is quite a steep drop down.

This would have an impact on who could use the path safely, as many who do so are getting on in years and trying to get up and down that section would be too much for them especially in winter conditions. That would probably include ourselves as we are now in our seventies.

Much of the proposed route, as I have already indicated, is very overgrown with thicket and nettles, not to mention the heavy tree overhang from the Hedingham Castle side.

The new route would therefore require regular maintenance to keep it open whereas the existing route requires no maintenance at all.

The existing path is a light and airy walk, especially on a nice sunny day down a pleasant open pasture. The proposed new route would be overhung with trees and almost certainly for most of its length, be somewhat dingy, damp and slippery (in winter.)

From our experience of walking our dog it is necessary on occasions when passing other dog walkers, some of whom have more than one dog, to give the animals a wide berth to pass each other, this would of course be impossible in a two meter fenced area.

We would possibly not attach such importance as this on the majority off sparsely used local footpaths, however the Magna Carta path up and down Scotch Pastures is unquestionably by far the most used of all of the footpaths around Castle Hedingham, particularly by dog walkers.

Additionally, if land owners think they can get ancient rights of way rerouted, providing flimsy reasons for doing so, as in this case, then a decision to allow the Magna Carta walk to be rerouted will set a precedent which may well end up in a flood of similar unworthy applications.

Taking all of this into consideration, there can certainly be no doubt that the rerouting of the path will have a substantial negative effect on the walk down Scotch Pastures as a whole and in particular for older people who might not be able to safely manage it at all. Similarly many dog walkers would worry about the consequences of not having sufficient room to pass other dogs safely.

As I have previously mentioned, my wife and I have lived in Rushley Green for over eighteen years and nothing has even come close to producing the amount of indignation in the local community as this rerouting proposal has. There are even rumblings of legal challenges should the route be moved for anything other than compelling and very necessary reasons, of which of course there are none.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Brenda J Gandy

84

[redacted]

20 August 2022

Mr Alan Roscoe
Definitive Map Service
Essex County Council
Seax House
Victoria Road South
CHELMSFORD
CM1 1QH

Ref: Public Path Diversion Order 2022 Footpath 25 Castle Hedingham

Dear Sir,

We write to object to the proposed diversion of footpath 25 in Castle Hedingham.

1. The present footpath forms part of a well-used and historic circular route previously enjoyed by several generations of villagers and visitors

2. The present footpath route on open, well drained grassland allows for outstanding and open views across the village, castle and neighbouring countryside

4. The proposed replacement route is situated against the low-lying edge of the field bordered by an established plantation on low-lying and slowly drained land which will necessarily impede access during bad weather

5. The proposed replacement route, due to its low-lying and obscured position, will deprive walkers of those wide, open views currently enjoyed by so many

6. The present proposal runs counter to the ECC's Green Essex Strategy 2019 one of whose stated objectives is "to increase use and inclusivity of green infrastructure across all social groups and abilities".

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Clifford Caesar
Jennifer Elizabeth Caesar

Post marks to follow

[redacted]

9th August 2022

Alan Roscoe,
Definitive Map Service,
Essex county Council,
County Hall,
Seax House, 2nd Floor
Victoria Road South
Chelmsford CM1 1QH

Dear Mr Roscoe,

Public footpath Diversion Order 2022
Scotch Pastures, Footpath 25 Castle Hedingham

I refer to the above and wish to oppose the diversion of the footpath as described in the order. I would like to lay out here my reasons for opposition.

1. The existing route is an ancient path which has provided a through-route to the village for centuries, features as part of the historic Magna Carta Way. I would like to understand the reason for changing the existing path which descends gently to Hoe Lane at the bottom of the footpath.

2. The proposed diversion takes a line directly to the left of the access gateway which is a very steep slope towards the valley of the adjoining wood. This would preclude access to many (older people, wheelchair and pushchair users) for whom the slope would be hazardous.

3. The proposed path would follow the edge of the field along the ditch between the field and the rise into the castle woods. This is rough ground which becomes boggy in winter and, unless constantly maintained will pose a hazard to walkers

4. The proximity of the woods also presents a hazard from fallen trees. In recent years there have been many instances where large trees have fallen from the castle woods into Scotch Pastures across the line of the proposed redirection. There is a risk to walkers from falling trees which could not happen on the existing path. When trees do fall (and this is an inevitability) the path would become blocked until removal of the obstruction.

   In reference to points 2 ,3 and 4 points above, the proposed redirection would not be consistent with The Highways Act 1980 section 119(6) which states "The path will not be substantially less convenient to the public in consequence of the diversion.

5. This is a very beautiful path and the current route afford the public the ability to appreciate the countryside which has been sympathetically maintained until now. The proposed fenced in route would negate this possibility. Please refer again to The Highways Act 1980 which states: "consideration should be given to public enjoyment of the path or way as a whole."

6. Social distancing: Although we are optimistic that the worst of the pandemic may be over, there is still a need for social distancing, and the ability to distance animals under control. While this is achievable under current conditions this would not be possible along a 2-metre path. Maintenance of the path by the landowner would need to be enforceable.

   When considering points 5 and 6 above please refer again to The Highways Act 1980 which states: "consideration should be given to public enjoyment of the path or way as a whole."

7. Reason for the change: This is an ancient pathway which has served, in balance, as an agricultural resource and a pleasant public footpath. As the applicant has grown end harvested Hay successfully for the last two years, I am at a loss to understand why there is now a need for a diversion. I am concerned that this change is a precursor to further applications for development in the future.

8. Finally, as a life-long inhabitant of Castle Hedingham, with family connections spanning the last century, the village and its heritage are part of my make-up and that is also true for many other village inhabitants. This is land that my family and I have enjoyed since childhood and many village memories derive from Scotch Pastures almost as a village resource even though it has always been privately owned, previously as part of the castle land and subsequently in the ownership of the Doe family, erstwhile custodians on behalf of the castle even before it was transferred into their ownership. There has never been a need to restrict access to the field. It does not seem right that the current owners who bought the property in 2019 should be able to change something so fundamental without any real reason.

I ask you to consider each of these points and look forward to you confirmation that you have received and reviewed them.

Yours Sincerely

[redacted]

Daniel Harpur

[redacted]

22nd August 2022

Dear Sir

Re Public Path Diversion Order 2022, Footpath 25, Castle Hedingham

I am writing to object to the application to divert the above footpath in Scotch Pasture, Castle Hedingham for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed diversion will make the footpath inaccessible for disabled users, elderly walkers (of which there are many who use this regularly) and wheelchair/mobility scooters or pushchairs due to the steep incline of the new path. The steep slope at the top part of the path will also be extremely slippery and dangerous in freezing or wet weather. I have three dogs and walking down a steep slope in such conditions would be dangerous and very difficult.

2. The new footpath will run alongside a heavily wooded area on the edges of Hedingham Castle estate which has many overhanging branches and large trees directly alongside the route of the new footpath. These trees have not received any attention for many, many years and some of them are diseased and dying. On two occasions very recently, one happening just last week whilst we were walking in Scotch Pasture a large branch fell to the ground directly beside the route of the new footpath. This would be extremely dangerous for anyone walking in this area. At the time this occurred there was only a very slight breeze and so this could happen in any weather conditions creating a hazard/high risk of danger to health but especially so in high winds.

3. The original footpath has been in existence for hundreds of years in the current location and is a historic focal point for people living in the village who enjoy walking this historic route regularly. Tourists and other incoming walkers enjoy this historic route on a daily basis. There appears to be no valid reason for changing its current location to the new route.

(continued ....)

4. The proposed new route for the footpath is in an area of Scotch Pasture which is prone to flooding, particularly the area of proposed footpath running along the bottom into the corner and upwards which will make the footpath inaccessible/very difficult to negotiate in heavy rain. At present there is only a small area right at the bottom which you need to walk around to get up the footpath but diverting along the bottom will make this right along the flood area.

5. If the new route is allowed I assume this will be a fenced-in area meaning that it will be extremely difficult for me to walk my dogs up this long field as I do at the moment on almost a daily basis. I have three reactive rescue dogs and if I am half way up the footpath and another walker enters the top I will be forced to walk all the way back down the footpath to an area wide enough to keep a safe distance away from other walkers.

For the above reasons I very strongly object to the proposed change of route.

Yours sincerely

Diana L. Botting.

Diana L Botting

Mr Alan Roscoe

Definitive Map Service

Essex County Council

Seax House

Victoria Road South

Chelmsford

CM1 1QH

Anne Martin [redacted]
20 Aug 2022 at 09:35:07
Anne Martin [redacted]

21:55

Castle Hedingham, A...

Mr Alan Roscoe

Definitive Map Service

Essex County Council

Seax House

Victoria Road South

Chelmsford, CM1 1QH

Dear Mr Roscoe

Re Public Path Diversion Order 2022, Footpath 25, Castle Hedingham

I'm writing to object to the proposed diversion of this footpath for the following reasons -

1) The proposed diversion routes along a steep hill which will be difficult for elderly or disabled walkers.) It could be dangerous!
2) Being at the bottom of the hill the proposed diversion will be much more susceptible to flooding and excessive mud
3) I see no reason for the diversion. Is it because the landowner wants to build on the current footpath? If so surely this should be disclosed

Proposed moving of footpath
Scotch Posture Castle Hedingham

Yours faithfully

Anne Martin
[redacted]

4. this footpath is part of our heritage.

Doug Martin

address as above.
Residents for 45 years.

90

[redacted]

Wednesday 24th August 2022

Dear Sir,
I am writing regarding the proposed change to footpath 25 across the centre of Scotch Pastures in Castle Hedingham. This footpath has existed in situ for hundreds of years and is part of the historic Magna Carta trail, it has been used to access the centre of the village from the Rosemary Lane area by the community without issue. The current route of the footpath is the most direct and accessible route across the fields of Scotch Pastures and I feel there is no pressing reason for it to be moved. If it is relocated and fenced in it will become inaccessible for older and disabled members of the community, this will also make it less pleasant for dog walkers as there will not be sufficient room for users to avoid each other.
If this change goes ahead a large proportion of the elderly population (as well as those in wheelchairs or with prams) of the village will become disadvantaged for the wishes of one family – this goes against the ECC Green Essex Strategy objective to 'Increase use and inclusivity of green infrastructure across all social groups and abilities'.
Yours sincerely,

[redacted]
Hilda and Geoffrey Whiting.

[redacted]

10 August 2022

Mr Alan Roscoe
Definitive Map Service
Essex County Council
Seax House, 2nd Floor
Victoria Road South
Chelmsford CM1 1QH

Dear Mr Roscoe

Footpath 25, Castle Hedingham

I wish to object to the proposed diversion of the above footpath on the following grounds:

- From the top of the present footpath at Rosemary Lane and walking downhill, one has the benefit of a wide view of the village ahead and of sweeping views of the countryside. These views would largely be hidden from the proposed footpath due to it being alongside woods containing some large overhanging trees and bushes.
- Part of the proposed footpath towards the Rosemary Lane end has a steep incline at an angle greater than the present footpath, which would make it more difficult for some people.
- The proposed footpath would be subject to encroachment by the trees and bushes which would abutt it. This would narrow the footpath and hinder walking along it without regular trimming. This would particularly be the case if the owner of the land erects a fence separating the footpath from the other land owned by him/her . Other footpaths around the village often suffer from a lack of attention in cutting back growth, making them sometimes impossible to walk along and I cannot see that there would be any difference with the proposed footpath.
- The existing footpath across Scotch pasture is one of the most regularly used footpaths in Castle Hedingham due to its proximity to the village and ease of access, and the above points would affect many people, both from the village and further afield.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

I F Cruse

27th August, 2022

[redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Mr Pearce,

I am writing this letter in objection to the proposed diversion of footpath 25 at Castle Hedingham.

I have lived in Rushley Green all my life (68 years), as has my mother & grandmother. Shats constant use by us all since the early 1900's.

I remember as a young child coming home from primary school, the climb up Scotch pastures was like climbing Everest, & the stile at the top looked a million miles away.

The proposed diversion will be even steeper, & more slippery & dangerous when wet, as it will be under the trees. A lot of elderly people from the village use this path on a regular basis, & won't be able to do so readily if it is moved. I know one lady with a son in a wheelchair, & it will be totally inaccessable to her. She uses it regularly at the moment.

The new owners of Rushley Green Farm don't, in my opinion have any logical reason to move

the path. If they had stock which were being constantly worried by dogs I would support it, but they don't, & have no intention of doing so.

Most dogs & pass the top of Scotch pastures, & over the years have witnessed hundreds of people using the path, & on the whole the majority of users stick to the designated track. This is obvious when you look at the wear & tear on the ground.

I do hope you won't allow this diversion to take place, as I think it would set a president that paths can be moved on a whim. Footpath 25 has been in its current place for several hundred years. I have a map dated 1922 which was surveyed in 1875, and shows the path in exactly its current position. Moving it would be eroding part of village history, so I hope common sense will prevail, & the path stay in its current place for generations of the future to enjoy

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]

Re: Public Path Diversion
Order 2022
Footpath 35
in the Hedingham

Dear Sir,

The path across Scots Pasture is an ancient established route used currently by many people, offering a pleasant, sunny and practical approach to Rosemary Lane and/or the village.

We strongly object to the proposed path diversion, it is completely inappropriate for the following reasons:—

- The steeper, more acute-angled slope which will be required to climb to the top gate will constructively prevent those with push chairs, wheelchairs, many elderly and those people with various health issues from reaching Rosemary Lane.
- The proposed path is in the shadiest, wettest area of the field. Little or no winter sun will reach it to dry the inevitable, ensuing mud bath. The overhead trees will drip onto the track. It could almost be described as "marshy" in the winter.
- The fenced path leaves little, comfortable space for dogs and their owners to manoeuvre past each other, particularly for those with several animals.

We can confidently say that few will enjoy the proposed route if adopted. It will cause considerable inconvenience to the many users of this popular footpath.

Keep the original and best!

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

95

Postmark 24-08-22

[redacted]

24-8-22

Dear Sir,

I am writing to object to the proposed diversion of this footpath. I have lived in the village all my 82 years and have walked the footpath very many times as we were farming first at Rosemary Farm and then Pannells Ash Farm. I would find the proposed path very difficult as I now need a walking stick and the steep hill would be very difficult for me. We are all wondering why the change of route is necessary.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Post MARK 10 AUGUST

[redacted]

9th August 2022

Alan Roscoe,
Definitive Map Service,
Essex county Council,
County Hall,
Seax House, 2nd Floor
Victoria Road South
Chelmsford CM1 1QH

Dear Mr Roscoe,

Public footpath Diversion Order 2022
Scotch Pastures, Footpath 25 Castle Hedingham

I refer to the above and wish to oppose the diversion of the footpath as described in the order. I would like to lay out here my reasons for opposition.

1. The existing route is an ancient path which has provided a through-route to the village for centuries, features as part of the historic Magna Carta Way. I would like to understand the reason for changing the existing path which descends gently to Hoe Lane at the bottom of the footpath.

2. The proposed diversion takes a line directly to the left of the access gateway which is a very steep slope towards the valley of the adjoining wood. This would preclude access to many (older people, wheelchair and pushchair users) for whom the slope would be hazardous.

3. The proposed path would follow the edge of the field along the ditch between the field and the rise into the castle woods. This is rough ground which becomes boggy in winter and, unless constantly maintained will pose a hazard to walkers

4. The proximity of the woods also presents a hazard from fallen trees. In recent years there have been many instances where large trees have fallen from the castle woods into Scotch Pastures across the line of the proposed redirection. There is a risk to walkers from falling trees which could not happen on the existing path. When trees do fall (and this is an inevitability) the path would become blocked until removal of the obstruction.

   In reference to points 2 ,3 and 4 points above, the proposed redirection would not be consistent with The Highways Act 1980 section 119(6) which states "The path will not be substantially less convenient to the public in consequence of the diversion.