

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 27 April 2026 15:12

**To:** Helen Sparks <[helen.sparks@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:helen.sparks@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Subject ROW/3363197 Dorset Council (Part of Bridleway 18, Chideock at Mill Lane To be upgraded to Restricted Byway)Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2019

Dear Helen,

Re: Subject ROW/3363197 Dorset Council (Part of Bridleway 18, Chideock at Mill Lane To be upgraded to Restricted Byway)Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2019

I acknowledge and thank you for the recent email attaching Dorset Council Statement of Reasons and comments on Objections. However, I note they call it Statement of Case.

Myself and the Community Group strongly object to the assertion that this northern Section of the bridleway 18 from pt. B. through C, D and E is 'dual recorded' in other words it is a bridleway and NOT part of the County Road. This assertion was never made going back to correspondence of 1996 and onwards on a regular basis until 2012/2015 when the ROW Department decided very suddenly that this was the case. This came exactly AFTER it was made apparent by Kitson & Trotman - solicitors for West Dorset Leisure that their Client did not have any 'vehicular access rights' over this northern stretch of the bridleway. It would make no sense on any level as Pt.B is a field - no dwelling, no farm just a field. For example when ROW decided to just with the swipe of a pen (on a laptop) make this bridleway a road marked in BLUE on the Dorset Explorer Map this was picked up by Google maps and huge lorries and cars (not associated with the Caravan Parks) were travelling down this stretch of bridlepath when they had no vehicular right to go any further after Point B. Their only option would have been to reverse all the way back to Roadstead Farm where the County Road actually begins. Fortunately after much argument ROW removed the blue line on the Dorset Explorer Map.

We have now read The Statement of Reasons and it is not clear that whilst they refer to a Report conducted by ROW that this has been given to the Inspectorate. They then refer to another Report they did after this which we have never seen any copy of. However, the facts remain the same and argument is the same, basically whether this northern stretch is 'dual purpose' and both a bridleway and a part of county road albeit NOT maintained at public expense.

We would argue with the attached documents that it is a bridleway ONLY and REMAINS a bridleway. We are concerned that our 'rebuttal report named 'Statement of Public Highway Rights at Mill Lane, Chideock' is a direct approach and rebuttal of their original Report and would make little sense if you did not have their original Report. Therefore, we will attach a copy of their original Report for clarification.

Having now read the latest 'Reasons of Case' I would point out two areas of concern. They state in 3.2. – last para – The width of the route is 3 metres. (9ft.11inches). Last evening we 'again' measured the bridlepath which in some places is 7ft4inches up to 8ft 10 inches. Only one place was 9ft and that is because the banks have been deliberately cut back by large tractor wheels crushing the ground beneath the wheels. In other places West Dorset Leisure have cut back and filled with gravel. This, we feel is a deliberate attempt to make the bridleway wider than what it actually is. Only at the start of the bridleway Pt.E is it 3 metres and that is again where tarmacdam has been laid by West Dorset Leisure. Please note that Dorset Highways Maintenance(re-surfacing) ends at Roadstead Farm. The original Concrete Road is in evidence in a few places under the tarmac that has been laid and it is obvious to all how wide the concrete path is when looking further down to Pts,C,D and B.

Another great concern was that in their 'Statement Containing Comments on the Objections' they state in answer to every question the following:

Objection: [REDACTED]: **Response: The convenience and safety of the route are not matters to be considered.**

Objection: [REDACTED] Response: **RESPONSE; SAFETY CANNOT BE CONSIDERED.**

Objection: [REDACTED] Response: **Safety, desirability and need are not factors to be considered.**

Objection: [REDACTED] Response: **Safety Matters cannot be considered.**

That this Local Council would not deem the safety of both pedestrians and in particular children a consideration is abhorrent. Previous ROW Officers as you will see from the documents attached placed great importance to the safety of the public on this bridleway and the pedestrian/vehicular conflict happening on it extremely seriously.

As I have explained before to you my adding files maybe somewhat difficult for me but I will try and attach each file with a heading to make it a little clearer what I am giving as evidence to the Inspector.

Thank you again,

Best regards,

Mrs. Lyn Crisp

*Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.*

*Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.*

*The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.*

DPC:76616c646f72



Please consider the environment before printing this email