

**From:** James Bramble <  
**Sent:** 22 December 2025 13:02  
**To:** Sparks, Helen <[helen.sparks@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:helen.sparks@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Letter of Support: Ref: ROW/3350303 and ROW/3350304

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

#### **Letter of Support: Ref: ROW/3350303 and ROW/3350304**

Dear Sirs,

I am writing as a local resident and regular walker to express my full support for the proposed diversion that combines the currently unused bridleway and existing footpath onto the established permissive route running behind the stables and along the woodland stream at Chantry Farm, Beaminster, DT8 3SB.

I have been using this permissive path frequently with my family for the past 18 months, and it has become our preferred route for walking, family time and accessing the upper part of the valley. In my view, this route is significantly more convenient, safer and far more enjoyable than the old footpath or bridleway.

#### **Convenience, Safety and Public Enjoyment**

The permissive path is wide, dry, flatter underfoot and far more accessible. These qualities matter greatly to me, particularly when walking with young children. The path offers open views, natural light and a pleasant woodland stream, all of which enhance public enjoyment of the walk as a whole.

By contrast, the original bridleway is high sided, narrow, dark and consistently wet, functioning effectively as a sunken gully and watercourse. Even if fully excavated and reopened, it would remain muddy, difficult for people to pass each other and unsafe for both walkers and horses. As a parent, I would not feel comfortable letting my children

use it, especially where it emerges suddenly onto a steep farm track used by vehicles, which creates a serious safety risk.

The existing footpath also presents challenges, particularly the section below Point P, which is extremely wet and in parts virtually impassable.

### **Farmyard Avoidance and Respect for Privacy**

The proposed route sensibly avoids the farmyard, which benefits both the landowners and the public. Walking directly past private gardens, open garages, livestock handling areas and working farm buildings does not support quiet enjoyment for either residents or walkers. The permissive path provides a calmer, more rural experience, free from farm machinery, livestock management and mud.

### **Compatibility with Horses**

Sharing the permissive route with horses has never posed any difficulty. Its width, firm surface and good visibility make it far safer than meeting horses in a tight, enclosed and slippery bridleway trench. In almost two years of shared use, I have seen no ground damage or conflict.

### **Likelihood of Use**

I would not choose to use the old bridleway even if reopened, due to its condition, safety concerns and lack of enjoyment.

I would not use the current footpath below Point P when wet, as it is often impassable.

I would continue using the new diverted route, and so would my family and visiting friends, as it is the best, safest and most pleasant option.

### **Conclusion**

In my opinion, the proposed diversion:

1. Is not substantially less convenient. In fact, it is more convenient.
2. Improves public enjoyment of the route as a whole.

3. Reflects how the public is already choosing to use the land, with the permissive path having been in constant and successful use for 18 months.

For all these reasons, I strongly support Dorset Council's proposal and respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate to confirm the order.

Thank you for considering this representation.

Yours faithfully,

James Bramble

**James Bramble**

---

---

*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**