

[REDACTED]

From: Hayward, Rowena
Sent: 04 January 2021 10:54
To: Aldridge, Steven
Subject: Proposed Lea Castle Quarry

Dear Stephen

I have considered the additional information provided in relation to the proposed Lea Castle Quarry site.

The additional information with regard to the conveyor crossing seems reasonable. I would add the caveat however that if it is felt that additional screenings are needed following feedback from users once the conveyor is operational then we would ask that this remains a possibility.

As regards the upgrades and changes to the footpaths and bridleways on the site I have the following queries:

The proposed upgrade of footpaths WC622 and WC623 to a bridleway.

- x The route has steps at both ends which would be unsuitable for horses at the Lea Lane end. This is a significant rise in level.
- x I have concerns about horses accessing onto the Wolverley road at the southern end of footpath WC622 as the road is very busy and fast moving and has only a narrow footway.
- x The gap in the brick wall at this point is not currently wide enough for horses.
- x The northern end of path does not currently follow the definitive line but exits through the brick wall opposite Lea House and we believe this to be an informal rerouting of long standing. The exit at this point is not wide enough for horses.
- x Any upgrade of these routes will require full agreement from the landowner and I am not clear if this land is owned by the quarry site.
- x In order for the current route to be upgraded to a bridleway the width will need to be 3m at a minimum and possibly wider if the area is enclosed. This width is not currently possible along much of the route.
- x It may be more suitable to look at alternative routes which could be dedicated rather than a try to upgrade the existing route. This would need to have a definitive benefit to the network for us to be keen to accept the dedication.

The proposed upgrade of footpath WC624 to a bridleway.

If the bridleways above are not to be upgraded it is not clear that there would be a benefit to the network in upgrading this when it will be a dead end route. If suitable links are provided and as long as the landowner is in agreement then I see no issue with this dedication as a bridleway.

The new spur to the pocket park

This would be of benefit to the pocket park users only and would have no significant benefit to the network and would be more appropriate to be maintained as part of the pocket park rather than dedicated as a bridleway.

Additional Bridleways provided.

We would be willing to accept the dedication of some additional bridleways within the site however some of the routes appear to be more in line with public open space rather than linking routes. I understand that a footpath link is suggested from the Wolverhampton Road/Wolverley Road to access the site and reconstructed and on its eastern edge. If this link was provided then the outermost circular route is a clear improvement to the network. However the additional north south link within the site would appear to be an open space feature rather than a clear network improvement and would be more appropriately dealt with as a route provided within the site by those who will continue to maintain it rather than dedicated as a path on the definitive map. We would also suggest that the link from the road would not be suitable for horses due to the amount of traffic using the road, narrow footpath and the lack of bridleway on links from this point.

We would therefore feel that we would not be able to support all the amendments proposed by the public rights of way plan at this point. However we would not be against the principle of additional dedications but feel these would need some amendments to ensure new routes are workable the