

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Robin Smithyman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 June 2021 15:25  
**To:** Hayward, Rowena; Aldridge, Steven  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed Lea Castle Farm Quarry and Restoration - Public Access Routes

Dear Rowena,

Please find a response in blue to the remaining clarification points

Thank you

Regards

Robin

---

**From:** "Hayward, Rowena" <Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk>  
**Date:** Monday, 14 June 2021 at 13:36  
**To:** "Aldridge, Steven" <SAldridge@worcestershire.gov.uk>, Robin Smithyman <robin@keddLtd.co.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Lea Castle Farm Quarry and Restoration - Public Access Routes

Dear Robin

Sorry for the delay in replying.

I have looked at the proposals and in general they seem fine. However I would like to raise the following points/questions:

- It is unclear whether the new proposed bridleway is planned to exit onto the road at the south western most corner. In this location the gap in the wall is narrow and the footway is very narrow. We would not support an exit point for the bridleway at this location and it should remain for just the footpath. [Based upon your previous comments we agree that the footway is narrow and the exit point could be a hazard. We confirm that no bridleway access is proposed at this location.](#)
- Although we are happy to accept some additional bridleways in the area the additional north – south route in the middle right of the site seems to be a duplicate of that around the edge and would not add any extra benefit to the network. We would not be keen to accept this extra route. However if the site owners wish to keep this as a permissive route rather than a bridleway on the definitive map we would have no issue with that. [Your point is noted and agreed in respect of this route. The landowners are content that this route would be in place as a permissive route.](#)
- It would be of benefit to the wider community, if the new bridleways are to be dedicated, for a footpath only connection to be provided to the new network from at the south east corner of the site to be provided (with a kissing gate) to facilitate access from the housing areas in north Kidderminster. Unfortunately this location would not be suitable for horses due to traffic levels, hence footpath only. [This is confirmed and agreed](#)
- It should be noted that we would be asking for 3-5 metres in width for all upgraded and new bridleways. [Yes thank you, this has been taken into account and is agreed.](#)

[We are content that if required these aspects would form part of any conditional requirements.](#)

Kind Regards

**Rowena Hayward**

Mapping Manager

Public Rights of Way Team

Economy and Infrastructure

Worcestershire County Council

The Countryside Centre, Worcester Woods Country Park,

Wildwood Drive, Worcester, WR5 2LG

**Tel:** 01905 846288

**Email:** [Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk)



---

**From:** Robin Smithyman [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 30 April 2021 09:48

**To:** Hayward, Rowena <[Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Aldridge, Steven <[SAldridge@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:SAldridge@worcestershire.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Re: Proposed Lea Castle Farm Quarry and Restoration - Public Access Routes

Dear Rowena,

Thank you for your time to discuss yesterday.

Please see below clarification in (blue) in respect of your comments on Public Rights of Way together with the accompanying plans attached.

The proposals now only relate to Public Rights of Way to land within the planning application boundary.

I would be grateful if you could consider and suggest any other thoughts before I formally respond to Steve.

Please do not hesitate to give me a call if you have any queries.

Regards

Robin



*Robin Smithyman*

*Director*

*Fox Studio, King Street, Much Wenlock, Shropshire TF13 6BL*

[REDACTED]

This message is intended only for the use of the person(s) ("the Intended Recipient") to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential within the meaning of applicable law. Therefore, any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message or any of its content by any other person may constitute a breach of civil or criminal law and is strictly prohibited. If you are not the Intended Recipient, please contact the sender as soon as possible.

---

**From:** "Hayward, Rowena" <[Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk)>

**Date:** Monday, 4 January 2021 at 10:54

**To:** "Aldridge, Steven" <[SAldridge@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:SAldridge@worcestershire.gov.uk)>

**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 regards to the conveyor crossing seems reasonable. I would add the caveat however that if it is felt that additional screening is needed following feedback from users once the conveyor is operational then we would ask that this remains a possibility.

In respect of the proposed temporary below ground conveyor, it is confirmed that if additional surround screening is required by users once constructed, that the applicant would instigate such screening via changes to the proposed mitigation temporary seeded soil bunds and/or agricultural straw bales.

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

The proposed upgrade of footpaths WC-622 and WC-623 to a bridleway.

- The route has steps at both ends which would be unsuitable for horses at the Lea Lane ends this is a significant rise in level.
- I have concerns about horses accessing onto the wolverley road at the southern end of footpath WC-622 as the road is very busy and fast moving and has only a narrow footway.
- The gap in the brick wall at this point is not currently wide enough for horses.
- 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.
- Any upgrade of these routes will request full agreement from the landowner and I am not clear if this land is owned by the quarry site.
- 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.
- 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.

It is noted that it may be more suitable to look at alternative routes within the planning application boundary to provide achievable benefits to the network. As such we attach a copy of Drawing No KD.LCF.033A and 034A which propose a new section of bridleway adjacent (to the east) of Public Footpath WC 622. This could be a dedicated route or permissive, managed and maintained by the landowner and enforceable by an appropriate planning condition. As with the current proposal this land is under the control of the applicant. It is confirmed that the required 3m width and

associated bridleway specifications will be established for this and all new section of bridleways and that the current section of Public Footpath WC -622 will remain in place and in use.

The proposed upgrade of footpath WC-624 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 bridleway.

Given the above we would still wish to upgrade this section of PROW to a bridleway. Again, it could be dedicated or permissive, managed and maintained by the landowner.

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.

Yes, it is confirmed that this would be a permissive route managed and maintained by the landowner and enforceable by an appropriate planning condition.

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 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 land 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.

The scheme has been designed in a holistic manner, combining both benefits to the PROW network and general amenity. As such, I understand your comment in respect of what is potentially a dedicated route. As such, if one of the routes was dedicated, the landowner confirms that the other could be a permissive route secured and maintained under an appropriate planning condition.

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 and of benefit to the network. [Please see above proposed clarification.](#)

Kind Regards

**Rowena Hayward**

Mapping Manager

Public Rights of Way Team

Economy and Infrastructure

Worcestershire County Council

The Countryside Centre, Worcester Woods Country Park,

Wildwood Drive, Worcester, WR5 2LG

Tel: 01905 846288

Email: [Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:Rhayward@worcestershire.gov.uk)



*If you have a query regarding Coronavirus please refer to Public Health England guidance and/or call NHS 111 which has a dedicated Coronavirus helpline.*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/coronavirus-covid-19-uk-government-response>



\*\*\*\*\*

**Confidentiality Notice**

This message and any attachments are private and confidential and may be subject to legal privilege and copyright. If you are not the intended recipient please do not publish or copy it to anyone else. Please contact us by using the reply facility in your email software and then remove it from your system.

**Disclaimer**

Although this email and attachments have been scanned for viruses and malware, Worcestershire County Council accepts no liability for any loss or damage arising from the receipt or use of this communication.

**Monitoring of Email**

Worcestershire County Council may monitor traffic data and the content of email for lawful business purposes.

\*\*\*\*\*