

APPENDIX B

City of Sheffield Public Path Diversion Order (parts of public footpaths STO\2A and STO\3 at Stocksbridge Steels, Stocksbridge, Sheffield S36) 2020

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER OPINION
<p>Mr D Pickersgill – Secretary of Stocksbridge Walkers are Welcome.</p> <p>Ms W Ward – Stocksbridge resident</p> <p>Ms L Bruce – Stocksbridge resident.</p> <p>Mr A Ward – Stocksbridge resident</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 117</p>	<p>The formal notice has a major and significant error. The map claims that the bridleway which was re-laid in the summer of 2015 is ‘to be created’ – this is incorrect. It has existed as a pathway for many years.</p> <p>The aim of this Diversion Order is to close a long-established route through the steelworks. This route has been in existence since before 1810, well before the growth of the steelworks</p> <p>Stocksbridge Steelworks has a long history. However, it currently employs fewer people than at any time in the last 100 years. If a right-of-way has been possible since the steelworks encroached upon Bramall Lane, there seems no reason to suddenly close this long-established route. In the longer term, will the steelworks still exist in a few decades? If this is the case, it is likely to have a smaller footprint.</p> <p>This route should be retained. There is no urgent reason to close this long-established inclusive route: one which provides a circular walk on Hunshef Bank (without attempting to cross the by-pass), an opportunity to see both wonderful countryside and the industrial impact.</p>	<p>The term ‘created’ in the plan key refers to the legal process that will create public rights between points C to D and E to F and not the physical construction of the route, which was indeed built/improved in 2015.</p> <p>The argument for diverting the original path is that it meets the test, as required under Section 119 of the Highways Act 1980, that it is expedient to the landowner and that the alternative to be provided is substantially as convenient to the public as the existing path.</p> <p>Buildings along the subject route have recently been brought back into service. Consequently, this has resulted in increased traffic movements in the area. At times this involves the loading and unloading, by forklift truck, of large HGV vehicles. The applicant is seeking diversion on the grounds of security and privacy, and speculation on the long-term future of this site should not be an argument for not diverting the footpath.</p> <p>This refers to a ‘circular walk’ from point A to C then back to A via points D,E and F, as shown on the Order plan included as Appendix A. Whilst it is true that the closure will remove this ‘circular walk’ parts of that route (the sections constructed in 2015) are ‘permissive’ paths with no formal legal status and could theoretically be closed by the landowner without notice.</p> <p>The countryside and industrial impact can be viewed safely from the proposed new route.</p>

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER OPINION
<p>Mr D Pickersgill – Secretary of Stocksbridge Walkers are Welcome.</p> <p>Ms W Ward – Stocksbridge resident</p> <p>Ms L Bruce – Stocksbridge resident.</p> <p>Mr A Ward – Stocksbridge resident</p> <p>Ms A Wright – Stocksbridge resident</p>	<p>In current times, the 2015 path is proving too narrow to easily allow social distancing whereas the route through the steelworks, a much wider route easily allows such distancing. The path through the steelworks should be open at all times, especially in times such as these.</p> <p>I use it as part of a round walk along Hunshelf, and to walk into Stocksbridge from the Smithy Moor area, where I live.</p> <p>In cold and windy weather, it is more sheltered than the new path along the top.</p> <p>There is also less of a climb when carrying shopping.</p>	<p>The subject part of footpath STO/3 (along the private road through the works) only has a legal width of 1.2 metres. Currently there are no physical restrictions preventing users from using any part of the private road. However, should they choose to, the landowner could segregate the footpath from the private road (with a fence, for example), giving users a very much narrower available width, which was nevertheless legally acceptable. The proposed alternative route will have a minimum legal width of 3.5m, increasing to 5.5m in some places, once converted to a Public Bridleway.</p> <p>The provision of the new sections of footpath will ensure that this longer walk (a round walk taking in Underbank Lane, Bramall Lane, Hunshelf Road and Manchester Road) is still possible.</p> <p>Due to the lack of buildings the new route is more open and in parts less sheltered on both sides. However, Officers feel that the shelter from cold and wind afforded by the buildings alongside the existing route is really quite limited, and note that the proposed new route is free from motorised traffic, and thus considered a safer option overall.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the new route is higher and, in part, steeper than the existing route through the works, but given that any walker accessing from the east will already have undertaken a very steep climb (around 500m in length) up Hunshelf Road, or Underbank Lane if coming from the west, it is not considered by Officers to be substantially less convenient, and due to the nature of Stockbridge's topography it is certainly not unique to walkers in this area.</p>