

**From:** Oliver Hugh-Jones <

**Sent:** 23 December 2025 17:47

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

**Cc:** Dominic Hazlehurst <

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

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

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing in support of Dorset Council's proposed alteration to the bridleway and footpath. As someone who has worked at Chantry Farm for the past eighteen months and uses the paths daily as a dog walker, I believe the proposed route would be beneficial to all involved.

The current route takes walkers directly through a busy working farm. From my own experience, farm machinery, livestock, and ongoing operations pose health and safety risks for the public and make work on the farm less efficient. Most walkers prefer privacy and quiet enjoyment, which the existing path simply does not offer. The proposed route leads through a wildflower strip and along the woodland stream, which is significantly quieter, more scenic, and safer.

By contrast, the old bridleway is extremely poor underfoot: narrow, high-sided, and often full of water. My company has carried out work on the water supply and discovered several land drains and natural springs along that section which cannot realistically be moved. These make the ground saturated and in places almost impassable (we have photos which we are happy to supply on request), and this is also where the main stop-cock sits for six houses. I would not choose to walk this route, and I doubt many others would either, given the constant mud, bogs, and tight sections with no views.

The new permissive path, which has been used continuously for nearly two years, is entirely different. It is much drier, wider, and usually solid underfoot, offering a far safer surface for both walkers and horses. I am very comfortable sharing this path with riders, as there has been no negative impact on the ground despite regular use. The route is also more accessible for those with reduced mobility, due to its gentle gradient and firm surface.

Overall, the proposed diversion offers better views, a more enjoyable walking experience, and far greater accessibility than the old path. It avoids wet and boggy sections, keeps the public away from the operational farmyard, and takes people past the woodland stream, something the old path never allowed.

I therefore strongly support the proposed changes.

Yours faithfully,

Oliver Hugh-Jones

Oliver Hugh-Jones

Director

*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