

**From:** Richard Pinney

**Sent:** 09 December 2025 11:29

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

**Cc:** Dominic Hazlehurst

**Subject:** RE: ROW/3350303 & ROW/3350304 Letter supporting new routes

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

Dear Sirs,

I have been made aware of proposed diversions for the bridleways 79 & 80 from Chantry Lane to Beaminster Down.

As a user of this route on foot and on a horse, I am hugely in favour of the new routes which are much safer, easier and more enjoyable to use.

Having been brought up in the Beaminster area since 1961, I have a long experience of this route and recall we used to ride to see Dr Lake at Chantry Farm from Buckham down. Since then the old routes 79 & 80 have become steadily over grown and unusable. The proposed new paths are open accessible and have much better going (with less mud, water and fewer rocks and boulders) making it easier for all to use but importantly to for horses and people pass one another safely. I would use the the new paths much more frequently if they became established rights of way.

It is worth noting that the old path is in places a safety hazard especially on horseback. Large stones, collapsed banks and overhead trees make it almost impassable without dismounting. Even on foot I find it a struggle at times. Space to pass other users, especially those with dogs is far better in the open areas offered by the new paths. Further, there is no enjoyment of the views from the 'sunken road' part of the old route. The best bit of that route is the sights from the hill. It also feels a bit of an unnecessary imposition riding through the farmyard at point C on your plan. It would be far better to go through the field to the west side of the buildings and keep out of the way of the hazards and any stock in the yard. Farm machinery and horses are not a good combination and the situation should be avoided. There is a simple diversion offered around the yard (J to P on the Plan) that poses no disadvantages.

Finally, I understand the case made to preserve the ancient byways in the county. But in this case they will not be lost; they will remain in situ. To make the old lane safe and useable would in effect ruin its ancient quality and the necessary improvements required would be counter productive. I see no point in preventing better alternatives from being implemented in favour of keeping the old routes for prosperity. The new proposals not only make the route up the hill safer and more usable for more people, it also saves the historic paths from having the required improvements imposed to bring them up to the standard required for public safety.

I therefore urge you to approve the applications for the diversions to both paths 79 & 80 as a practical and pragmatic solution as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully

GR Pinney

*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