



Objections and Representations to The Order

Details Of Objections (and responses where appropriate)

British Horse Society

Point 1. “The proposed diversion at point C is 327 metres from the current entrance to the Bridleway which we consider to be unreasonable and not commodious or enjoyable.”

Point C is on the same stretch of carriageway as the existing route and offers far easier access through a wide unregulated break in the hedgerow as opposed to a sharp concrete incline leading to a commercial yard. It is unclear from the objection how this is in any way less commodious or enjoyable.

Point 2. “Options for an alternative access to the Bridleway close to the existing entrance should be fully explored.”

The application route is expedient in the interests of the owner (as stated in the order) in as much as it addresses issues with the current route and affords an acceptable alternative. The viability of a ‘behind the hedge’ route was considered but as the route does not connect with any other Bridleways at either end, users would still have to negotiate a carriageway on leaving the path and such an option would offer no major benefit.

Point 3. “The section of Grove Lane which would need to be used for access to the proposed diversion is unsafe with no verges for refuge, which would be exacerbated if a gate were reinstated at point C.”

Although not total, there are section of verge along Grove Lane. The provision of verges for equine road users (or pedestrians) is not a prerequisite and in this instance is not considered necessary or desirable. Grove Lane is not the sole point of access to the existing bridleway and the 'other end' of the route at Holly Lane is similarly laid out. The diversion of the route should have no discernible impact on any assessment of risk by users choosing to access the carriageway on leaving the right of way. There is no provision in the Order for a gate at point C.

Open Spaces Society

Point 1. “The proposed route is not substantially as convenient.”

The proposed route is approximately 20 metres shorter than the existing one and removes the need to negotiate a commercial yard (potentially riding a horse).

Point 2. “The exit onto Grove Lane is not conducive to the safety of (users).”

The existing route exits onto exactly the same stretch of carriageway with the same prevailing circumstances.

Point 3. “The plan M4638DJU2024 quotes limitations, the Bridle gates at point D and point E what is the purpose of these gates when gaps would be more appropriate?”

The limitations in question govern the Northern and Southern access points to a field which is being brought into use for the keeping of horses.

Dave Massey

Point 1. “The new route was entirely chosen by the landowner, Mr Paul Archer who has no equine connections and chose the path entirely for his own convenience of his commercial venture and future expansion of his enterprise that blocked the original path.”

The application route is expedient in the interests of the owner (as stated in the order) in as much as it addresses issues with the current route and affords an acceptable alternative.

Point 2. “There has been placed a footpath, not bridlepath, post in the hedge to indicate the route.”

At the moment the proposed route is 'advisory only' and should not be waymarked. Although a marker post was placed in error, there is no signage attached to suggest it is a right of way. The advisory nature of the route is clearly advertised at the entrance to the existing one.

Point 3. “The amended route joins Grove Lane at a dangerous position, on a blind bend, both for riders, horses and vehicles. Grove Lane is a busy derestricted D class lane that will become much busier when the continuing Langley Sutton Coldfield housing development is completed. Grove Lane will become a major access route to Jnct. 9 of M42 and M6 toll. There was a very recent traffic flow survey carried out on Grove Lane.”

It is difficult to counter the speculative assumptions regarding any increased traffic as a result of nearby developments. Appendix XX shows the view from the point where the proposed route meets Holly Lane and clearly shows that that it is not a 'blind bend' as claimed. Warwickshire Police were consulted and confirmed that there had been no injury road traffic collisions or collisions involving horses (with or without rider) in the last 5 years.

Peter Norris

“Not substantially as convenient”

Neither the proposed nor existing routes afford access to any other bridleways. Walkers are able to access footpaths M5 and M7 using the existing route but both require the user to traverse the D373 Grove Lane at present, and the proposed route would merely sustain that status quo. Mr Norris uses the phrase 'great connectivity' with regard to Ryefield Lane, but that road is also a carriageway with the same 60mph limit as Grove Lane, so it is unclear what point is being made. Any increased inconvenience to users as a result of diversion is not apparent and any increased risk similarly so. The argument ignores the fact that users of the proposed diversion would not have to negotiate a busy commercial yard.

Alison Burgoyne

Point 1. “As a horse owner/rider the proposed 'new' access point where it will come out at point C on Grove Lane is completely unsuitable and dangerous. There is not a clear line of sight for either horse riders or motorists when exiting from the field onto the road, the field is lower and with the obstruction of the hedge and the way the road bends away it makes it impossible to have clear access/exit. As you are also aware this road is a national speed limit, which is utterly ridiculous, but only adds to the danger. “

Point 2. “The other consideration is with all the additional development going on around the local area, traffic volume is only going to increase. There are several horse riders in Wishaw and whilst I haven't spoken to everyone, the vast majority are of the same opinion that they would not use the bridleway as is planned currently.”

The complainant was spoken to, and it was explained that the Order could not be contingent on the prevailing speed limit on the carriageway particularly where the existing route intersects on exactly the same stretch of carriageway with the same speed limit or any actual or the potential outcomes proposed planning developments. Enquiries were made with Warwickshire Police who confirmed that there had been no recordable road traffic collisions on the affected stretch in the last five years. A site visit was undertaken, and it was apparent that the objector's perception of 'line of sight' were not apparent (see appendix xx).

Indications of Support

The Ramblers

“This is a very welcome proposal as M463 has been unusable for as long as I can remember due to no access being available at either end. My Group is happy to support the proposed diversion.”

Objector's Details

1. Wendy Bannerman on behalf of British Horse Society
2. Jack Jennings on behalf of Open Spaces Society
3. Dave Massey
4. Peter Norris
5. Alison Burgoyne