

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.
Date: 01 January 2025 10:35:43

Dear [REDACTED] this is a formal objection for your proposals on the rights of way at whitehall farm. I think these proposals benefit the land owner at the detremnt to the general public and certainly to many user groups.I would like to arrange a meeting with you to discuss corncerns which already exist regarding diversions and planing. Can you please advise me on date look forward to meeting you [REDACTED]

On Monday, December 23, 2024, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Dear,

>

>

>

> Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ. NGR: 311615 173243

>

>

>

> A meeting of the Council's Planning Sub-Committee – PROW, will be held on 22nd January 2025 at 10am. A report will be presented to the Committee seeking authority for the making of five orders which would make changes to the public rights of way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, Wenvoe.

>

>

>

> The committee meeting is being held as a remote meeting only.

>

>

>

> If you wish to view the meeting only, as opposed to participating in it, then you can view the livestream on YouTube, please contact my colleague [REDACTED], [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for the link. [REDACTED]

>

>

>

> If you wish to speak at the meeting, please register to speak via the Council's web site https://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/en/our_council/Council-Structure/Public-Participation-at-Council-Meetings.aspx , a procedural note relating to the format of the meeting and a guide to public speaking at the meeting is also available.

>

>

>

> The report will be available on the Council's website from 5pm on the 8th January 2024 – https://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/en/our_council/Council-Structure/minutes,_agendas_and_reports/minutes,_agendas_and_reports.aspx

>

>

>

> Please don't hesitate to contact me regarding this matter.

>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Re: Re: RE: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.
Date: 07 January 2025 08:39:40

Hi [REDACTED]

You mentioned in your e mail that you are new to this role, so this timeline may be helpful to you. My family have lived in Twynirodyn since the early 19th century and this is from my personal knowledge and my understanding of the events leading to the present proposals.

In the early 1980's [REDACTED] diverted footpath 26b, onto the track leading from Cart Road 52 to Bryn Lodge because it was not convenient for his 'pick your own strawberries' business. [REDACTED] was a longtime family friend and I occasionally helped out on the strawberry farm during student holidays. In June 1982, I discussed the loss of 26b with [REDACTED], and he informed me that no one needed FP26b as one could freely walk up and down the track leading from CR52 to Bryn Lodge. I think that we were still South Glamorgan Council then, and I very much doubt that [REDACTED] had taken any legal steps to formally extinguish or divert to footpath.

Prior to [REDACTED] purchasing Whitehall and throughout the time that [REDACTED] lived at Whitehall, motorised vehicles used CR52; indeed the volume of traffic was such that the Council painted and maintained stop/give way road markings at the point CR52 meets St Lythans Road, directly opposite what was the continuation of CR52, leading to the Downs, which was adopted as a highway many years ago. These can still be seen. I suspect that they were painted and maintained by South Glamorgan Council but maintenance was allowed to lapse by VofG Council. When the 'pick your own' fruit farm and then Christmas tree farm was operating from Whitehall, cars drove up Cart Road 52 from Pound Lane and down it from Saint Lythans Road. Following the closure of the Christmas tree venture, personally, I can only remember encountering vehicles driving in one direction from Pound Lane towards Whitehall, and then in both directions between Whitehall and St Lythans Road, but for more than 20 years it has been an ungated/unobstructed open highway/byway open to all vehicles (BOAT).

August 2016, [REDACTED] sadly passed away.

Spring 2019, rumours were swirling that a potential purchaser of Whitehall House was proposing to make Cart Road 52 a private road by erecting gates at its junctions with Saint Lythans Road and Pound Lane. Many in the villages were concerned by this, particularly those who used the Cart Road for access to their properties. (In the event that sale collapsed).

March 2019, I entered discussions with the solicitors representing the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate (FSM), and thereafter the trustees directly. I attended a site visit with a trustee to discuss various tracks in Twynirodyn and we walked, amongst other tracks, CR52 and the track leading off CR52 to Bryn Lodge. I provided the trustees with a copy of the various documents my Grandfather and Father had collated over the years, including handwritten attested deeds for Whitehall, and the trustee provided me with the information I recited in my previous email.

April 2019, I entered discussions with [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] regarding the status of CR52 and FPs 26a and 26b. [REDACTED] reconfirmed, in writing, that the initial parish survey undertaken in 1951 indicated the existence of CR52 as a byway and FP 26 in its entirety; VofG has correspondence on file showing objections to the recording of CR52 and FP 26b and a decision was made to remove them at the draft stage. However, this decision was overturned and CR52 and FP26 are listed on the Definitive Statement. We discussed the fact that the entirety of CR52 was used by cars and tractors and noted that the an old section of CR52 which ran from Saint Lythans Road to the Downs was now an adopted highway. I provided him with a photograph of the road markings at the point where CR52 meets St Lythans Road.

June 2020, A gate and stile are erected blocking access across CR 52 and 'private road' notices begin appearing on cars parked along the road. I encountered a distressed horse rider with a disability who had been forced dismount in order to open the gate blocking CR52, but could not remount without difficulty.

A bridle path sign appears on the section of CR52 from Whitehall toward Pound Lane. Footpath signs appear on the section of CR52 from Whitehall to St Lythans Road. [REDACTED] says that he has received numerous complaints and will contact the landowner(s). A different make shift stile appears across CR52, and the newly erected signs are removed.

March 2021, 'no footpath' signs appear on the track which runs from CR52 to Bryn Lodge (diverted FP26b).

May 2021, the steps onto the stiles are removed from FP26a and wooden notices are nailed to the stiles making them difficult to climb over. Live wire signs erected. Site visit carried out with [REDACTED] and we walk FP26a, CR52, FP25 and track leading to/from Bryn Lodge. [REDACTED] confirms that the landowners have not sought the VofG's permission to make any changes to CR52, FP25 or FP26a and that he will contact the landowners. We discuss the fact that FP26a is not on the definitive statement.

June 2021, FP56 is diverted near Whitehall, also tree blocking FP56. I contact [REDACTED] and he confirms permission has not been sought to divert and/or block FP56.

July 2021, residents reliant upon access along CR 52 contact me because they have received news that Whitehall intend to erect a gate along CR52, where it meets St Lythans Road. On their behalf, I contact the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate and they confirm that they have neither been asked nor given permission for a gate(s) to be erected across CR52.

November 2021, Barbed wire appears across the stile at the Whitehall end of FP25, and this is blocked. FP25, FP56 and CR52 now fully/partially blocked and/or permanently or temporarily diverted. [REDACTED] advises that no formal applications to divert or block have been made. [REDACTED] agrees to visit Whitehall the following week to discuss the obstructions and ensure diversion applications and/or temporary closure orders are put in place, should they be appropriate. [REDACTED] informs me that the Council intends to make it very clear to the landowner(s) that any temporary or permanent blockages or diversions cannot be implemented until the appropriate process, including, if necessary, public consultation, is complete.

Following a further site visit, [REDACTED] advises that FP56 is unsafe due to lack of maintenance and repairs to the adjoining barn and that Whitehall have been asked to carry out urgent repairs. According to [REDACTED], Whitehall indicate that they do not want the ongoing responsibility for maintaining FP56, and are anxious to absolve themselves of any responsibility for contributing to the ongoing repairs and maintenance of CR52. They also cite security and privacy issues. [REDACTED] further advises that a temporary closure order will be sought for a section of FP56 affected by building work on the unsafe adjoining barn. He asks Whitehall to erect an alternative stile giving access to FP25.

December 2021, [REDACTED] resigns.

January 2022, Temporary closure and diversion signs appear on FP25 and FP56. The closure order states that it is to prevent danger to pedestrians while demolition and reconstruction work is carried out for a period from 14 February, for a maximum period of 6 months, or until works completed, whichever is the earlier. Expired August 2022 at the latest, but FP56 and FP25 remain blocked and diverted even now.

February 2022, According to VofG, as part of ongoing negotiations with Whitehall they issue 'proposals to make changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the area of Whitehall farm.' The crux of the negotiations is ownership of CR52 and changing its status as a byway open to all vehicles to a bridleway, with liability for its repair and maintenance moving from the Wenvoe Castle Estate, Whitehall, Bryn Lodge and other properties along its route to the Vale of Glamorgan Council; extinguishing FP56 and creating a bridlepath along its (diverted) route, with liability for its maintenance and repair etc., moving from Whitehall to the Council and the permanent diversion of FP25 from its historic route across the centre line of the field to the side of the track (FP26b) leading from CR52 to Bryn Lodge. Interested parties have 21 days to respond.

I contact [REDACTED], as I am concerned that the 21 day deadline does not fall in line with the cycle of the Community Council meetings nor publication of What's On. I suggest a Community meeting.

Significant works begin in the field crossed by FP25. [REDACTED] of Whitehall informs me that he is connecting to a water main and applying to have overhead power lines moved.

invites Wenvoe Community Council, the British Horse Society and me to attend a site visit. BHS () and I attend but a representative from the Community Council does not. As we walk FP25, FP56 and CR52, informs us that Whitehall will only agree to FP56 becoming a bridlepath if the VofG agree to take over responsibility for it, AND agree to downgrade CR52 from byway (BOAT) or restricted byway to bridleway, AND the permanent diversions of FP56 and FP25. BHS are very supportive of the proposals, but I have some reservations particularly regarding the safety of walkers versus cyclists and horses on the steep sections of FP56. Also, I question whether the Wenvoe Castle Estate will agree to downgrade CR 52 from byway open to all vehicles to bridlepath and/or give up their rights without payment. I also see no justification for the permanent diversion of FP25. advises that Whitehall will only accept the entire package, so that if permanent diversions are not agreed there will be no bridlepath(s). We discuss the use of FP30 (Tarrws Lane to Orchid Field) and Orchid Field by horse riders and cyclists and the impact on other FPs if walkers stop using FP56 because they wish to avoid cyclists and horse riders. We discuss an alternative option of leaving FP56 as a footpath and instead adopting FP30 as a bridleway and negotiating access as a bridleway through the newly landscaped Whitehall Quarry, and then out onto/near the Quarrymen's memorial track which gives easy access to the Downs etc. At my request the consultation period is extended to 31 March to allow Wenvoe Community Council and What's On to publicise the proposals and canvas opinions from residents. Wenvoe Community Council minute their objection to the VofG's proposal regarding FP56.

August/September 2022. , Owner of Whitehall is co opted as a Community Councillor.

November 2022, I express concern that although there has not been a Community meeting to discuss the proposals, has been allowed to address the Community Council (Minutes of meeting held on 29 September 2022, paragraph 11). owns/has a beneficial interest in some of the land which is the subject of the proposals, and, in my opinion, he may gain financially, if the proposals are passed, yet from the published Minutes, it does not appear that he formally declared an interest in accordance with the Community Council's code of conduct. I suggest that a written narrative of Freeman's report to the Community Council should be published and it should state whether he presented this narrative as a private individual or as a Community Councillor. I argue that residents of the villages and other interested parties such as BHS, Ramblers, Valeways etc., should have the opportunity to address the Community Council. Planning sub committee-PROW fixed for 16 November cancelled due to high volume of work with Council's Legal section.

July 2024, small area of woodland at Bryn Lodge end of FP 25 destroyed.

My understanding is that CR52, FP56 and FP 25 remain blocked/diverted although no closure/diversion order is currently in place.

Contemporaneous communications suggest that everything done between the time took ownership of Whitehall and November 2021, was done without prior permission being sought from the VofG Council. Since then, the VofG Council have worked with Whitehall to attempt to find a workable resolution. However FPs 25 and 56 and CR 53 remain unlawfully obstructed and/or diverted.

Some of the proposals sought may benefit certain users/potential users, cyclists, horseriders etc., but this may be to the detriment of other users; however the main beneficiaries are arguably the owners of Whitehall as they pass liability and financial responsibility for FP56 to the VofG and divert it away from their property; restrict traffic on CR52,BOAT (which they do not own) and have VofG Council bear the cost of resurfacing a pot holed, badly maintained track, which in practical terms will become their private driveway with bridlepath along it, albeit blocked by gates at various points, and block entirely FP25, which is a lovely ancient footpath across an open field to a small hill and into woodland (recently destroyed by Whitehall), and replaced with the diverted track/permissive path, which corrals people far off the original track, along a gravel track between barbed wire, taken over by the Great Glamorgan Way.

I apologise for the wordiness, but hope you will find this helpful.

Kind regards,

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, January 7th 2025, 07:47

Subject: Re: Re: RE: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.

Hi [REDACTED]

These are the contact details for the solicitors acting for the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate.

[REDACTED]
Solicitor and Partner

Direct Line: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]

I also have the trustees direct contact details, but I am reluctant to pass this on without his permission.

According to the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate, Cart Road 52 from Upper House to St Lythans Road, although unregistered, is owned by the Wenvoe Castle Estate. The Wenvoe Castle Estate granted rights of access to Bryn Lodge, Whitehall (I have a very fragile, hand written attested copy of the original deeds), and the property on the left of the road further along from Whitehall.

In March 2019, I entered discussions with the solicitors representing the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate (FSM), and thereafter the trustees directly. I attended a site visit with a trustee to discuss various tracks in Twynyrodyn and we walked, amongst other tracks, CR52 and the track leading off CR52 to Bryn Lodge.

During the site visit, [REDACTED], one of the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate told me that when they sold a small section of Wenvoe Woods recently, they also granted a right of access along Cart Road 52 and a right to store logs etc., on it.

For background information, the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate remain actively involved in the management of the rights of way over their land (particularly after the hard fought battle over footpath 24). Indeed, the trustees regularly submit a declaration to the VofG Council. This consists of a map and statement showing the ways they admit to already being dedicated as public rights of way. Alongside this map a statutory declaration that no additional ways have been dedicated since the initial deposit of the map may be made. This is then sufficient to establish that it was not the owner's intentions to dedicate during the period between the date of deposit and the date of the previous statutory declaration.

The trustees wanted £10,000 for the purchase of the short track that runs at the back of Hill Terrace, Twynrodyn, CF56BH, so I very much doubt that they will gift a well used Cart Road/Byway Open to All Traffic to the Vale.

If it would be helpful to have a site visit, please let me know and I will happily walk what we can of the tracks with you.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 6th 2025, 14:01

Subject: Re: RE: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.

Dear [REDACTED]

FP25 remains obstructed, closed and diverted. FP 56 is also obstructed and diverted. The landowner did not reopen them following expiry of the closure orders in August 2022.

Are you saying the the current closure and diversion of FP 25 and the current obstruction and diversion of FP 56 are unlawful? If so, what steps will the Council take against the landowner?

Also Cart Road 52, which is a byway open to all traffic has been obstructed with a gate and stile. I have the contact details for the owners of the Cart Road, the trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate, if you need them. How can the sub committee meeting proceed in January if you have not consulted the Wenvoe Castle Estate?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 6th 2025, 12:36

Subject: RE: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for the email. The temporary diversion you refer to was concluded some time ago, this was before my time in post,

although I believe this was during the construction of the new route as part of improvement scheme with the Great Glamorgan Way project.

Pound Lane is currently unregistered on Land Registry as you have mentioned, but I will check with colleagues if a landowner has been identified, although this is the usual means we would use.

The sub-committee meeting is part of the statutory process and is not connected to the community council, although the community council have been previously consulted for these proposals.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

e-mail / e-bost: dahunt@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk

Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)

[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English / Croesewir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 January 2025 12:45
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your email.

What is the current status of the blockages and diversions on FP25 and FP 56?

In January 2022, temporary closure and diversion signs appeared on FP25 and FP56. The closure order stated that it is to prevent danger to pedestrians while demolition and reconstruction work is

carried out for a period from 14 February, for a maximum period of 6 months, or until works completed, whichever is the earlier. Therefore this order expired on August 2022 at the latest, but FP56 and FP25 remain blocked and diverted.

Also, has the Council established who has legal ownership of Cart Road 52? The trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate, have always maintained that they are the owners, although I understand that title of the cart road is not registered with the Land Registry.

I am concerned that the publication of the proposed changes and the sub committee meeting does not fall within the regular cycle of Wenvoe Community Council meetings and/or publication of Wenvoe What's On. Is there any possibility to postpone the sub committee meeting to allow residents and other interested parties more time to consider the proposals?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]

To:

Sent: Monday, December 23rd 2024, 14:08

Subject: Notification of sub-committee meeting - Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ.

Dear,

Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, St Lythans Road, St. Lythans, CF5 6BQ. NGR: 311615 173243

A meeting of the Council's Planning Sub-Committee – PROW, will be held on 22nd January 2025 at 10am. A report will be presented to the Committee seeking authority for the making of five orders which would make changes to the public rights of way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, Wenvoe.

The committee meeting is being held as a remote meeting only.

If you wish to view the meeting only, as opposed to participating in it, then you can view the livestream on YouTube, please contact my colleague [REDACTED] for the link.

If you wish to speak at the meeting, please register to

speak via the Council's web site

https://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/en/our_council/Council-Structure/Public-Participation-at-Council-Meetings.aspx

, a procedural note relating to the format of the meeting and a guide to public speaking at the meeting is also available.

The report will be available on the Council's website from 5pm on the 8th January 2024 –

https://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/en/our_council/Council-Structure/minutes_agendas_and_reports/minutes_agendas_and_reports.aspx

Please don't hesitate to contact me regarding this matter.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk

Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)

[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English /
Croesewir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Godfrey, Russell E \(Cllr\)](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Proposed changes to public rights of way Whitehall farm
Date: 16 January 2025 11:41:17

Dear Cllr Godfrey,

Thank you for your email.

I acknowledge receipt and I will add this to the written representations for the PROW meeting on 22nd.

[REDACTED] FYI.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.
Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)
[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English / Croesewir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg.

From: Godfrey, Russell E (Cllr) <regodfrey@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 January 2025 10:21
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed changes to public rights of way Whitehall farm

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing to you with regards to the above application, which is on the agenda of sub committee on 22nd January.

I fully support this application, for the following reasons :

It will provide safe route over a wide area for Horse riders, off road cyclists, and walkers, that have been agreed with local landowners, which only be a positive step forward for those who like to enjoy the countryside in the Vale of Glamorgan.

Best regards

Russell

Russell Godfrey
Councillor
Elected Member - Wenvoe Ward
Vale of Glamorgan Council / Cyngor Bro Morgannwg
mob / sym: [REDACTED]
e-mail / e-bost: regodfrey@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.
Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)
[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English / Croesewir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Support for PROW changes Whitehall
Date: 16 January 2025 20:00:21

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Hi,

I would like to express my support to the goals of the Great Glamorgan Way initiative. Having been brought up in Wenvoe as a horse rider and dog walker I was delighted to see the proposed plans to improve access for all users, provide an all weather surface and improve pathway connectivity. I now live in the city but still regularly visit Wenvoe with my young family to visit my parents and regularly walk the Wenvoe pathways away from the noise of Port road. Whilst walking in Wenvoe I have educated my children on protecting the environment for local wildlife and livestock, and one of my frustrations when enjoying the countryside is seeing other users not abiding by the Countryside Code or being mindful of local wildlife and livestock in the area. Due to this I fully support the proposed design of the pathways to aid in protecting the area. As well as providing local landowners with improved privacy and security for their livestock.

As a woman who often walks alone with my dog I welcome the changes as an enhancement in safety for lone walkers, as well as reducing the risk of dogs going missing as their ability to roam into the woodland area would be reduced which would also help to protect the wildlife and local livestock from those dogs with a high predator drive.

Recently I have admired the improvements that have been made to the bridle path, particularly the end closest to Whitehall farm where I have noticed dead trees and overhanging branches have been trimmed back or removed therefore improving public safety. I only wish that other landowners would take the same care and consideration for others that enjoy the areas around their property.

I really hope that the benefits of moving forward with these plans aren't squashed by those who are opposed to change.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Pound lane multi use pathways
Date: 16 January 2025 23:19:08

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Sent from Outlook for iOS

Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 6:32 pm
To:
Subject: Pathways Pound Lane

Dear [REDACTED]

I would like to log my support for the goals of the Great Glamorgan way (GGW) initiative. [REDACTED] I believe the proposed plans would greatly benefit the public by providing clearer pathways that would be accessible to a larger demographic than the current pathways.

The current pathways are not always in a condition that is safe to walk on, I often avoid parts of the walks following periods of heavy rain due to having to navigate slippery footpaths and styles. The proposed all-weather surface would allow a variety of users with mixed mobility to enjoy the countryside in the area all year round which I believe positively impacts a person's wellbeing. Providing distinct pathways will also offer some protection to the local wildlife and livestock in the area. I particularly enjoy spotting pheasants and foxes which are often disturbed by curious dogs or rambles who have lost the footpath.

[REDACTED], I understand the landowners supporting this change to help to safeguard their livestock as well as their privacy and security. I have had many conversations with the landowners about the proposed GGW and the adoption of the bridle way and felt excited by their passion to improve the area, especially as unlike some landowners they have researched the local area and given consideration to all users of pathways whilst seeking to maintain the natural beauty that Wenvoe has to offer. Myself and my family are very grateful that in a mostly individualist society that these landowners have invested their time in exploring the area and seeking ways to improve it in the most ethical and environmentally supportive way. I find it upsetting to think that people would oppose such a positive change that will allow a larger demographic to access and benefit from a beautiful area.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Countryside Access Wenvoe.
Date: 16 January 2025 20:40:15

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

Dear [REDACTED].

I am contacting you concerning the foot paths in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm.

As a local resident having walked these routes for more than 40 years I am dismayed at the changes being made.

The FP52 has become very difficult in walking over irregular large stones.

There is a gate obstruction on the route at Whitehall Farm. I understand permission for this has not been given by the landowner.

The path up to this gate is now unattractive after the clearing of a lot of the vegetation including woodland.

The diverted path to Bryn Lodge is bordered by a lane on one side and wire fence on the other. It is now a narrow fenced in path.

FP56 was temporarily diverted, but this appears to be permanent. Altering it to a bridleway to allow horses seems like a very unsafe idea.

These matters are of public interest but I have seen no posters or information displayed other than on social media. I know of no meeting with the local community.

I do not consider these changes to be in the interest of the community or will they make it more accessible. It will no longer be a such pleasant walk and will have negative effect on the community's enjoyment.

Protection of our historical routes and environment are important.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached an objection for above mentioned Sub Committee. I would be grateful if you would make sure it is presented. I have also embedded it below in case you have problems opening it.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

19 January 2025

Public Rights of Way Sub Committee, Wednesday, 22 January 2025. Environmental and Regeneration Propose Changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, Wenvoe.

We would like to object to the proposed changes to the Various footpaths, bridal ways , BOAT's etc around St Lythans Road, Whitehall Farm, Bryn Lodge, Burdons Lane and Wenvoe woods.

We both grew up in Wenvoe and attended the old school which is now the community centre and my husband's family were tenant farmers for the estate for just short of 300 years and lived in the vicinity for longer. These lanes and footpaths were used extensively and Pound Lane to Whitehall Farm was used by vehicles on a regular basis. The problem with this lane has only arisen since Whitehall Farm changed hands some years back and the new owner blocked access by erecting a gate and leaving a narrow, muddy trail past the farm which was illegal. The proposed changes will not benefit anyone except the landowners. We have had sight of the email of objection sent to you by [REDACTED] and agree with all that [REDACTED] says and endorse it. Despite having grown rapidly over several decades Wenvoe still has parts of the old village left and we would like those parts to be kept for safe use by everyone.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

[Redacted]
Sent: 21 January 2025 09:04

[Redacted]
Subject: Fwd: PROW meeting 22nd January 2025

| [Redacted]

----- Forwarded message -----

[Redacted]
Date: Sun, 19 Jan 2025 at 17:34
Subject: PROW meeting 22nd January 2025
To: [Redacted]

Dear [Redacted]

Thank you for your letter of the 20th of December 2024 regarding the above meeting. We accessed the relevant papers when they became available on the evening of the 8th of January. We were surprised that various people had already had the opportunity to comment. As an adjacent landowner, no such opportunity had been afforded to us. We have already been disadvantaged by this scheme with extensive damage to the access track to our property caused by the contractor who worked on that part of The Great Glamorgan Way that is proposed to replace footpath 25. We also still have a cattle grid full of debris from the work.

We have concerns about the ownership of the cart track and footpath 56. Both were excluded in the transfer of land from Wenvoe Estates on the sale of Whitehall Farm to [REDACTED] in 1971. We moved into Bryn Lodge on the 1st of May 1996. Enquiries made by our solicitor of South Glamorgan Highways Department said that the cart track had been closed to the public by writ of ad quod damnum and inquisition in 1765 by the Wenvoe Castle Estate and that it was therefore deleted from the definitive map. After we moved into the property we were concerned by the drainage of surface water from the metalled roads at the St. Lythans end. By this time the Vale of Glamorgan Council had been created. I and [REDACTED] met with a senior person from the Highways department of the Vale of Glamorgan. He said that the Vale had taken over the responsibility for the road from Cardiff and that it was classified as a cart track and that they only had a responsibility to maintain it as a cart track. They did however accept responsibility for the drainage of water and dug a drainage ditch from St Lythans Road down towards Whitehall Farm. They put a drainage pipe under the track to Bryn Lodge that emptied into the field through which footpath 25 runs. The intention was to feed into a pond at the low point of that field.

I think before proceeding with the current projects, it is vital to be certain of the ownership of the Cart Track, FP 56 and also the road known as Bryn Lane which runs from Burdons Hill to Bryn Lodge. The Wenvoe Estates seem to have left a lot of loose ends during their disposal of various parcels of land!

We obviously still have unresolved issues with the path that passes through our land (FP 17). I note that this now appears on the latest Ordnance Survey map as a public footpath. It was not on previous editions. This appears to have resulted in a large increase in walkers who have no connection with the local area. We still have concerns as to how The Great Glamorgan Way may impact our privacy.

We are happy to discuss any of the above matters further, in person or by phone.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Public Rights of Way Sub Committee

Wednesday, 22 January 2025

Environment and Regeneration

Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, Wenvoe

[REDACTED] Vale of Glamorgan ask the Public Rights of Way Sub Committee not to approve the proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall for the following reasons:-

1. **Local knowledge.** My family have lived and worked in Twyn yr odyn and Wenvoe since the early to mid 19th century. My Great Great Grandparents worked for the Wenvoe Castle Estate, were farm labourers on various Wenvoe Estate small holdings and quarrymen in the local quarries. I have personal and historic family knowledge of the Cart Road and Footpaths being discussed today. I walk these routes multiple times a week.

Cart Road 52.

2. **Housekeeping.**
 - a. What attempts, if any, have been made by the Vale of Glamorgan Council to identify the Owners of Cart Road 52?
 - b. Have the Vale of Glamorgan Council investigated the ownership claim made by the Trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate?
 - c. Have the Vale of Glamorgan Council identified the current status of Cart Road 52? Is it a highway maintainable at public expense ('HMPE'), a highway not maintainable at public expense ('not HMPE'), a byway open to all traffic ('BOAT'), a restricted byway, or a private road?
 - (i) It is accepted that the section of Cart Road 52, which extends from Saint Lythans Road to St Lythans Downs, is an Highway Maintainable at Public Expense.
 - (ii) A 'Regulated Local Authority Search Commercial' prepared for Devonalds Solicitors (Bridgend) in November 2019 ([Whitehall farm \(LA Survey\) 6132498.pdf](#)) reports the section of Cart Road 52 that gives access to Whitehall House from Saint Lythans Road as, 'access to property USRN40000000216 Type Road not HMPE' (emphasis added).
 - (iii) The former South Glamorgan Council and the Vale of Glamorgan Council used to paint and maintain 'give way' road markings at the junction of Cart Road 52 and Saint Lythans Road. (See Google Maps capture from September 2009 ([St Lythans Lane Junction.pdf](#))). This routine maintenance seems to have been overlooked and/or lapsed recently, but the remains of the old 'give way' road markings are still visible.
 - (iv) The Council also dug trenches along Cart Road 52, to improve drainage and prevent flooding.
 - (v) Local opinion, based upon historical knowledge and past and recent use, is that Cart Road 52 from Pound Lane to Saint Lythans Road is either an 'Highway not maintainable at public expense' or a 'Byway Open to All Traffic' ('BOAT').
 - (vi) In April 2019, Gwyn Teague, Public Rights of Way Officer, Vale of Glamorgan Council informed me that the initial parish survey undertaken in 1951, indicated the existence of Cart Road 52 as a byway open to all traffic; that the Vale of Glamorgan Council has correspondence on file showing objections made to the recording of Cart Road 52 on the definitive map by the Wenvoe Castle Estate, but that the objection was overruled; that Cart

Road 52 is listed on the Definitive Statement, but due to a Council oversight it was not transferred to the Definitive Map. Has the sub committee being given access to this evidence? Given that the absence of Cart Road 52 from the Definitive Map is an admitted and documented Council mistake, or oversight, why has the Vale of Glamorgan Council not make good this mistake, by seeking an amendment to the Definitive Map?

3. Legislation.

- (i) Paragraph 1.1 of the 'Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm, Wenvoe', ('the Report') refers to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act ('NERC') 2006 extinguishing vehicular rights. However, 'NERC' contains a number of exceptions, which arguable apply to Cart Road 52, for example section 67(2) (a) excepts ways that have been lawfully used more by motor vehicles than by other users in the five years preceding 2 May 2006; section 67(2) (e) excepts from extinguishment ways that had been in long use by mechanically propelled vehicles before 1930. Why have these exceptions not been considered by the Vale of Glamorgan Council?
- (ii) Local opinion suggests that it is strongly arguable that Cart Road 52 is owned by the Trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate, in which case, they are legally able to permit motorised vehicles to use the Cart Road and only they can seek to prevent users from journeying along the Cart Road. There is no suggestions whatsoever that the current Trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate intend to obstruct and or seek to regulate the use by any users of Cart Road 52. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that the use of section 26 of the Highways Act 1980 is not appropriate. Indeed, there is nothing to suggest that the public's right to use the Cart Road needs to be protected by the Authority.

4. Historically, Cart Road 52 was the main trade road serving the various properties, estate offices and small holdings owned by Wenvoe Castle Estate. It was travelled by mechanically propelled vehicles, such as steam rollers and tractors, Wenvoe Castle Estate employees, farm labourers, quarrymen to attend work, local trades people such as shopkeepers, the wheelwright, blacksmith, coffin maker and undertaker, together with local people travelling between Barry, Wenvoe, Twyn yr odyn, Saint Lythans, the Saint Lythans Downs and Cardiff. It was the main route villagers took to attend the local Churches and Chapels and to visit the local public houses, particularly when different Councils had different prohibition rules. From the 1930s motor cars frequented the Cart Road as a direct route between Twyn yr odyn and St Lythans and Wenvoe. During the 1980s large sections of the community drove up and down Cart Road 52 in order to visit the then owner of Whitehall, [REDACTED] 'pick your own' fruit and Christmas tree fields.

5. 'If it ain't broke, don't fix it'. Cart Road 52 has been freely used by local people since at least the early 19th century; they travelled on foot, by bicycle, on horseback and by horse and cart. Additionally Cart Road 52 has been used by motor propelled vehicles, motorised vehicles, steam rollers, tractors, trucks and cars for one hundred years or more. Throughout my lifetime, I have witnessed Cart Road 52 being regularly and routinely shared by motorised vehicles, cyclists, horse riders and walkers. Motor vehicles use it to quickly travel between St Lythans/Twyn yr odyn and Wenvoe and to avoid the traffic jams along Old Port Road and Port Road. To my knowledge, there has never been a collision or incident involving the various types of users.

6. What is the rationale for seeking to regulate and/or change the status of Cart Road 52 now?

- (i) 'The Report' states, 'Executive Summary, (bullet point 4) The creation Order proposed to provide a bridleway between St Lythans Road and Pound Lane, Wenvoe is a standalone proposal however each of the concurrent Orders relating to Footpath No.25 and No.56 is contingent upon the success of the St Lythans to Pound Lane.' Despite requests, the Vale of Glamorgan Council have failed to explain why the standalone proposals are contingent upon each other. I respectfully request that the sub committee seek an explanation.
- (ii) At least throughout my Grandfather's lifetime (date of birth 1898), my Father's lifetime (date of birth 1922) and my lifetime, access and egress along Cart Road 52 between Pound Lane and Saint Lythans Road was unchallenged and unobstructed, whether travelling by foot, horseback, bicycle or motorised vehicle.
- (iii) On or about 2019, Whitehall was purchased by the present new owners. The Deeds of Transfer from the Wenvoe Castle Estate to the former owners of Whitehall, [REDACTED] clearly exclude Cart Road 52 from the conveyance and I understand that the new owners do not (currently) seek to claim ownership of Cart Road 52.
- (iv) However, on or about June 2020 the new owners of Whitehall began leaving notes on cars parked along Cart Road 52, reading, 'Private Road, no parking' (between points C to D of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'); 'footpath' signs were posted on the section of Cart Road 52 from Whitehall towards Pound Lane (points C to D of Appendix 3 of 'the Report') and from Whitehall to Saint Lythans Road (points B to A of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'), and Cart Road 52 was obstructed and blocked by the erection of a gate and stile directly in front of Whitehall (at Point B on Appendix 3 of 'the Report').
- (v) When challenged the new owners of Whitehall cited a need for privacy, security and to keep their dog enclosed. The owners of Whitehall neither requested nor sought permission or agreement from the Trustees of the Wenvoe Castle Estate or as far as I am aware the other landowners who used Cart Road 52 for access to their properties, fields or woodlands.
- (vi) Despite local protests, the Cart Road 52 which has served the community for perhaps 200 years or more remains unlawfully obstructed at point B of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'.
- (vii) The Sub committee will note from page 3, paragraph 1.2 of 'the Report' that , '..... at the point where the proposed bridleway passes Whitehall Farm, the proposed route of the bridleway leaves the track and passes over the verge between the track and the adjacent field (points B to C of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'). This provides the opportunity for the landowner of White Farm to fence and gate the section of track that passes his home. Any access issues that this may cause between adjacent landowners is a private matter'. (sic). Why are the Vale of Glamorgan Council encouraging and facilitating the owners of Whitehall's desire and intent to unlawfully obstruct, trespass over and section off a section of Cart Road 52, which is not and never has been in their ownership? This is causing great harm and inconvenience to the actual landowner, other landowners with fields and properties along the Cart Road, and the local community. It is undoubtedly spoiling the public's enjoyment of using the Cart Road as it has traditionally been enjoyed.
- (viii) Furthermore, if, as stated in 'the Report' the diverted section of Cart Road 52 traverses a field actually owned by Whitehall, will this section be a permissive right of way, thus allowing the owners of Whitehall to close it on a whim?

7. **Winners and losers?** 'The Report' recommends the proposed changes, stating that they 'are in the public interest providing a network accessible to a broader range of users.'

- (i) In paragraph 2.6, i) 'The Report' states 'the new bridleway would provide a substantial benefit to walkers, cyclists and horse riders in the local community', but fails to identify the 'substantial benefit'. I submit that those who use Cart Road 52 will gain very little, if any, additional benefit in their use of Cart Road 52 if it becomes a bridleway. Cart Road 52 has been shared by a variety of users for centuries and to my knowledge no safety concerns have been raised to date. I submit that the proposed bridleway offers no greater convenience and that there will be no improvement in users' enjoyment of the route.
- (ii) If the proposal is approved, although those who use motorised vehicles, tractors etc., will no longer be able to drive between Pound Lane and Saint Lythans Road or vice versa (points A to D of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'), landowners with land and/or properties along the track will continue to be able to drive along the Cart Road, although they may only be able to access their land and/or properties from Saint Lythans Road rather than Pound Lane or vice versa because of the unlawful obstruction at Point B of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'. The bridleway will not be vehicle free; it will still be shared by walkers, horse riders, cyclists and motorised vehicles and therefore the enjoyment of the public and residents in the area will not be improved.
- (iii) If the proposal is approved, many walkers who join the Valeways walks or Millennium trail from Twyn yr odynd and/or visitors to the Quarrymen's Memorial at Twyn yr odynd, will not be able to park, as they currently do, along Cart Road 52 (between Points C and D of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'). Nor will visitors to the local Shoots or Hunts be able to park along the Cart Road. The proposal therefore is less convenient and reduces the enjoyment of the public and residents in the area.
- (iv) It is my understanding that at present, whether as an 'highway not maintainable at public expense' or a 'byway open to all traffic', restricted byway or private road, the cost of maintaining Cart Road 52 falls to Whitehall and other properties fronting the Cart Road. I appreciate that there is considerable advantage to these landowners in passing legal and financial responsibility for Cart Road 52 to the Vale of Glamorgan Council, but I question whether this is a reasonable or appropriate use of tax payers' funds and whether any identified benefit to the public or local community justifies the expense.
- (v) In paragraph 2.6 i) 'the Report' states that the new bridleway will be 'an integral link in the Great Glamorgan Way promoted route, providing a resource to people from further afield.' The Great Glamorgan Way is described in paragraph 5.1 of 'the Report' as 'a circular horse riding and cycling route'. However, as conceded in paragraph 1.5 of 'the Report', the proposed section of the Great Glamorgan Way (unlawfully diverted) Footpath 25 (Points C to B of Appendix 5A of 'the Report'), runs from Cart Road 52 to Bryn Lodge, 0.1 miles, and then reaches a '**dead end**' (at Point B of Appendix 5A of 'the Report'), because the footpath which traverses Bryn Lodge land (marked 'Path (um) on Appendix 3 of 'the Report') is a (permissive) footpath only, not a bridleway, and Footpath 17 which runs from Bryn Lodge passes Burdenshill Farm and continues towards Wenvoe Castle Golf Club is also a footpath, with Private Road signs etc., erected and enforced by [REDACTED]. It may be that Cart Road 52 and Footpath 25 (as diverted or otherwise) will eventually form part of a Great Glamorgan Way circular route, but at present they do not. Future plans for the Great Glamorgan Way are not referred in 'the Report' and therefore should not be considered and taken into account by the sub committee when considering these proposals.
- (vi) **Comment.** If this proposal is approved by the sub committee, I ask that they insist that the Vale of Glamorgan Council require that the owners of Whitehall remove the gate and stile currently unlawfully obstructing Cart Road 52 at Point B of Appendix 3 of 'the Report', so that the proposed bridleway can follow the historical route of the Cart Road (unfortunately

this is not clearly shown on any of the Appendices to 'the Report', but hopefully it can be pointed out to the sub committee at the meeting). This will avoid the need for the bridleway to deviate off the section of the Cart Road (starting at point B of Appendix 3 of 'the Report') presently trespassed upon by the owners of Whitehall, onto land actually owned by Whitehall and thus avoid the need for any part of the proposed bridleway to be a permissive route. This is a negotiation that should take place between the landowner, the owners of Whitehall who unlawfully erected the obstructing gate and stile and the Vale of Glamorgan Council now. If the Vale of Glamorgan Council wish to downgrade Cart Road 52 to a bridleway, and the path of that proposed bridleway is unlawfully obstructed, this is not a private matter, it is a public matter for the Council to address with the landowner and the offending party.

Footpath 56

8. **Background.** Footpath 56 was unlawfully blocked at point B of Appendix 4A of 'the Report' and diverted (as shown between points B, C, D to E of Appendix 4A of 'the Report'), by the new owners of Whitehall on or about June 2021. There was local outcry and numerous complaints were made to the Vale of Glamorgan Council. Following a site visit and an inspection of a barn (near point B of Appendix 4B of 'the Report') in February 2022, the Vale of Glamorgan Council, made a Closure and Diversion Order in respect of Footpath 56, which came into force on 14 February 2022. This was stated to be in order 'to prevent dangers to pedestrians while demolition & reconstruction work is carried out.' ([NOM-Temp-Footpath-Wenvoe-No-2556.pdf](#)) The Order was 'for a maximum period of six Months or until the works are completed whichever is the earlier.' The Order expired on or about August 2022; it was not renewed and the owners of Whitehall did not apply for a diversion order, and yet Footpath remains obstructed and diverted, as described above. Save for a period of 6 months in 2022, Footpath 56 has been unlawfully obstructed and diverted by the landowner since June 2021. To my untrained eye no demolition and/or reconstruction work whatsoever has taken place to improve the safety of the former barn. The local community questions why, despite repeated requests from walkers and walking groups, the Vale of Glamorgan Council have failed to take enforcement action against the owners of Whitehall.
9. Footpath 56 runs from the corner of Walston Road/Tarrws Lane to Whitehall (Points A to B of Appendix 4B of 'the Report'), crosses and/or joins Cart Road 52 (at Point B of Appendix 4B of 'the Report') and/or joins Footpath 25 (at Point B of Appendix 5B of 'the Report'). Footpath 56 is a narrow track, running alongside the quarry face (see Appendix 4B of 'the Report'), with steep inclines blind bends. It is difficult to imagine how it can be safely and cost effectively converted to a bridleway.

10. Winners and losers?

- i. As a walker I would be extremely fearful of using Footpath 56 if it becomes a bridleway, as the steep incline and sharp bends makes it likely the cyclists will descend the track unseen and at speed and horses may slip and/or react dangerously to other users such as cyclists, pushchair users and dogs. Indeed the proposed diversion/different alignment incorporates even more inclines and blind corners (Points B, C, D to E of Appendix 4A of 'the Report').
- ii. Paragraph 2.7 of 'the Report' states that a bridleway will provide 'a much needed off road link onto the broader network'. The proposed bridleway will be only approximately 0.1 of a mile in length (Points A to E of Appendix 4A of 'the Report'). Moreover, from the Tarrws

Lane end of Footpath 56 (Point A of Appendix 4B of 'the Report') it is less than 0.4 miles to the Pound Lane end of Cart Road 52 (Point A of Appendix 3 of 'the Report'), which is already accessible to cyclists and horse riders in the local community and which already provides an 'off road link onto the broader network.'

- iii. Walkers, (nor indeed Cyclists, horse riders and others, if a decision is made to convert Footpath 56 from a footpath to a bridleway) gain absolutely no benefit from Footpath 56 being diverted away from Whitehall. In fact an existing flat section of the path (between Point B of Appendix 4A of 'the Report' and Point B of Appendix 4B of 'the Report') becomes another section of steep incline and blind bends (between Points B and E of Appendix 4A of 'the Report').
- iv. According to the Response to 01c listed in 'the Report', 'the proposed bridleway ...is available as a permissive route only', so it could be removed by the landowners at will. How can this be argued to be for the benefit, enjoyment or convenience of the public and residents in the area?
- v. Presently the owners of Whitehall are responsible for the maintenance of Footpath 56. I submit that it is neither in the interest of the local communities nor wider public interest, for a landowner who has unlawfully obstructed and diverted an ancient, well establish and well used footpath for more than three years, to seemingly be rewarded, by having a footpath diverted away from his property and furthermore be allowed to offload the costs of its maintenance to the Vale of Glamorgan Council.
- vi. I suggest that the costs involved in creating, maintaining and managing a safe bridleway to replace Footpath 52, outweigh any assumed benefits to the local community and/or cyclists and horse riders from the wider community.

11. Alternative options. If a bridlepath is deemed necessary, I suggest that the sub committee refer this issue back to the Marcus Goldsworthy, so that alternative, more cost effective and safer options are considered. For example, Footpath 30 (Appendix 1 of 'the Report'), which begins at the same point at Walston Road/Tarrws Lane as Footpath 56 (Point A of Appendix 4A of 'the Report') could be adopted as a bridleway. This could either exit onto the old quarry access road (just before Footpath 31, Appendix 1 of 'the Report') , or perhaps the Vale of Glamorgan Council could come to an arrangement with Cemex/Breedon to continue a bridlepath through the newly landscaped quarry (just before Footpath 31, Appendix 1 of 'the Report'), exiting near the Quarrymen's memorial on Footpath 69 (Appendix 1 of 'the Report'). An alternative that may be more controversial, would be create a bridleway over the entire length of Footpath 30, exiting in front of Hill Terrace. This would be a straight, level route, with no blind bends etc., and all users would be able to easily see each other from a clear distance and share the route safely. Furthermore, significant sections of Footpath 30 cross land already in the ownership of the Vale of Glamorgan Council.

Footpath 25.

12. Background. Unfortunately, on or about November 2021, Footpath 25 was unlawfully obstructed and blocked (at Point B of Appendix 5B of 'the Report') by the new owners of Whitehall; barbed wire was placed across the stile at the Whitehall end making it dangerous and unusable.

13. The owners of Whitehall inform that they intend to join a water main and apply for overhead power lines to be moved and therefore will shift the path of footpath 25 from, more or less, the centre line of the field to the side of the field (Points B to A of Appendix 5B of 'the Report'). Again there is a general public outcry and numerous complaints to the Vale of Glamorgan Council.
14. Following a site visit in February 2022, the Vale of Glamorgan Council, made a Closure and Diversion Order which came into force on 14 February 2022, in respect of Footpath 25 (alongside the Footpath 56 Order). The reason for the specific closure and diversion of Footpath 25 is not stated in the Order. ([NOM-Temp-Footpath-Wenvoe-No-2556.pdf](#)) The Order was 'for a maximum period of six Months or until the works are completed whichever is the earlier.' The Order expired on or about August 2022; it was not renewed and the owners of Whitehall did not apply for a diversion order, and yet Footpath 25 remains obstructed (between Points B and A of Appendix 5B of 'the Report' and diverted (as shown on Appendix 5A of 'the Report'). Save for a period of 6 months in 2022, Footpath 25 has been unlawfully obstructed and diverted by the landowner since November 2021. The local community questions why, despite repeated requests from walkers and walking groups, the Vale of Glamorgan Council have failed to take enforcement action against the owners of Whitehall. The local community also questions why it is necessary to divert Footpath 25. There is no justification for such a diversion.
15. Paragraph 1.5 of 'the Report' states that 'Footpath No. 25 is a continuation of Footpath No. 56'. Historically this is not correct. Footpath 56 was a footpath used by quarrymen when the quarries were operational. Footpaths 25 (and 26b, which was unlawfully diverted from its original path in the early 1980s onto the 'Track' marked on Appendix 5B of 'the Report') were footpaths used to access Bryn Lodge, the former hunting lodge of the Wenvoe Castle Estate (before the access road (marked 'Track' on Appendix 5B of 'the Report') between Cart Road 52 and Bryn Lodge was built)). There is no reason for footpath 56 and 25 to be aligned; the former served the quarries and the latter Bryn Lodge. Both independently join and cross Cart Road 52.
16. **Winner and losers?**
 - i. Footpath 25 is a beautiful footpath which, as can be seen from Appendix 5B of 'the Report', exits Cart Road 52 at Point B of Appendix 5B of 'the Report', directly in front of Whitehall, crosses an open field, reaches a small hill with views and enters a small area of woodland before reaching the permissive footpath through Bryn Lodge (marked 'Path (um)' on Appendix 3 of 'the Report'). It is described in the Response to objection 4 of 'the Report' as an 'extended view'. It is a popular and well used path. The area of woodland has recently been almost completely destroyed.
 - ii. The (already constructed) proposed diverted track (Appendix 5A of 'the Report') is narrow, at the edge of the field, over rough scalplings, uncomfortable for walkers and unsuitable for horses and cyclists and enclosed between fences topped with barbed wire. In terms of enjoyment, there is no comparison between Footpath 25 and the proposed (and already constructed) diverted route. The former is through an open field in the countryside, the latter is akin to a prison walkway.
 - iii. As a result of objections to the proposed diversion of Footpath 25 and/or the unpleasantness of the (already constructed) proposed diverted Footpath 25, even more people in the local community and those from further afield are choosing to avoid the diverted route and walk instead along the track (marked 'track' on Appendix 5B of 'the Report') which leads from Cart Road 52 and ends at Bryn Lodge. In effect, this means that the 'track' is now replacing unlawfully closed and diverted Footpath 26b and unlawfully closed and diverted Footpath 25. This is a direct consequence of the proposed diversion and grossly unfair to the owners of Bryn Lodge for whom the 'track' is the only vehicular access road to their home.

- iv. The proposed diverted footpath shown on Appendix 5A of 'the Report' is a 'permissive' path only and could be taken away by the owners of Whitehall at any time.
- v. The newly constructed, fenced in, diverted path shown on Appendix 5A of 'the Report' is so narrow, that there is insufficient room for walkers, horse riders and cyclists to safely pass.
- vi. The true route of Footpath 25 (as shown on Appendix 5B of 'the Report') is directly in the sight line of Whitehall. Shunting it to the side of the field, gives the owners of Whitehall a clear view/sight line and the possibility of developing the land. However, I suggest that the loss of enjoyment to walkers far outweighs the benefits to the landowners.
- vii. As stated in paragraph 7(v) above, the Great Glamorgan Way is described in paragraph 5.1 of 'the Report' as 'a circular horse riding and cycling route'. However, as conceded in paragraph 1.5 of 'the Report', the proposed Footpath 25 section of the Great Glamorgan Way, runs from Cart Road 52 to Bryn Lodge, 0.1 miles, and then reaches a 'dead end' at Point B of Appendix 5A of 'the Report', because the footpath which traverses Bryn Lodge land is a (permissive) footpath only (marked 'Path (um)' on Appendix 3 of 'the Report'), not a bridleway, and footpath 17 which runs from Bryn Lodge and passes Burdenshill Farm towards Wenvoe Castle Golf Club is also a footpath, not a bridleway with Private Road signs etc., erected and strictly enforced by [REDACTED]. It may be that Cart Road 52 and Footpath 25 (as diverted or otherwise) will eventually form part of a Great Glamorgan Way circular route, but at present they do not. Future plans for the Great Glamorgan Way are not referred in 'the Report' and therefore should not be considered and taken into account by the sub committee when considering these proposals, as the public have not been allowed an opportunity to comment on them.
- viii. However, promoting the unlawfully diverted Footpath 25 as part of the Great Glamorgan Way and impliedly encouraging cyclists and horse riders to use it, will inevitably cause some issues for the elderly owners of Bryn Lodge, who have owned their property for almost 30 years. The elderly owners of Bryn Lodge have already faced verbal abuse, criminal damage and threats of physical abuse from aggressive riders and cyclists, already insisting that they have a right to use the permissive footpath which crosses Bryn Lodge land. One can be certain that if this proposal is approved, even more riders/cyclists will attempt to forcefully continue their journeys onto Footpath 17, through the garden of Bryn Lodge, leaving the elderly owners of Bryn Lodge, as the first line of defence, at significant risk of harm. The permissive footpath is within about a metre of Bryn Lodge's front window. Any demands for more land, privacy and security etc., by the new owners of Whitehall should not outweigh the safety, well-being, privacy and security of the long standing owners of Bryn Lodge. Furthermore, I would strongly suggest, having been warned of the dangers faced by the owners of Bryn Lodge, exacerbated by these recent proposals of the Vale of Glamorgan Council and the ongoing unlawful diversion of Footpath 25, the Vale of Glamorgan Council are under a duty of care towards the owners of Bryn Lodge.
- ix. Presently the owners of Whitehall are responsible for the maintenance of Footpath 25. I submit that it is neither in the interest of the local communities nor wider public interest, for a landowner who has unlawfully obstructed and diverted an ancient, well established and well used footpath for more than three years, to seemingly be rewarded by having a footpath diverted out of the sight line of his property, and furthermore be allowed to offload the costs of its maintenance to the Vale of Glamorgan Council.
- x. **Comment.** If this proposal is approved, I respectfully ask the Committee to consider and implement plans to protect the owners of Bryn Lodge, so that they may safely use the 'track' from Cart Road 52 to Bryn Lodge to access their property AND most importantly to ensure,

as far as is reasonably possible, that they are not regularly confronted with cyclists and/or horse riders trespassing through their garden.

Conclusion

17. I submit that there are obvious and significant financial and other benefits to the owners of Whitehall if these proposals, or indeed any part of these proposals are approved, and suggest that the sub committee should be extremely wary of rewarding a landowner who, in my opinion, has abused the system by unlawfully blocking, obstructing and diverting footpaths for a significant period of time, to the detriment and chagrin of the local community and users of footpaths 25, 56 and Cart Road 52 from the wider community, and landowners with fields and/or property in the vicinity of Whitehall .
18. Furthermore, the proposals are costly. There are very limited identifiable, tangible benefits to any users of Cart Road 52 or Footpaths 25 and 56. There are also valid safety concerns. The proposed changes are not more convenient and indeed reduce, rather than increase the enjoyment of the public and residents in the area. The 'permissive' sections of the proposals are a major concern to users' long term enjoyment of the routes.
19. Moreover, we already have well loved, well-trodden, historic footpaths and a Cart Road which has been open to and enjoyed by motorists, horse riders, cyclists and walkers for generations. The only difference in recent years is that an errant landowner has chosen to unlawfully obstruct and divert the footpaths. However, the Vale of Glamorgan Council has existing powers to resolve these issues, for example, by commencing enforcement proceedings as requested by many in the local community; that is what will significantly and immediately improve the convenience and enjoyment of the footpaths for the public and local residents.
20. Currently, Cart Road 52 is unlawfully blocked, but as 'the Report' states that is 'a private matter for discussion between those affected.' These proposals, as they stand, will not result in the removal in the unlawful obstruction of Cart Road 52, rather they will sanction the unlawful obstruction and reward the offending, trespassing party.

21. **Footnote.** No notices have been posted in the vicinity of the proposed changes advertising these proposals to users of the Cart Road or Footpaths. Furthermore, a request to defer the sub committee meeting to allow local residents to discuss the proposals and raise concerns at the next Wenvoe Community Council meeting, which takes place on 23 January 2025, has been rejected by the Vale of Glamorgan Council. The Council also rejected an invitation made by Vale Councillor Jonathan Bird and recently repeated by Vale Councillor Russell Godfrey to attend a meeting with the local community and other interested parties, such as Valeways, British Horse Society and Wenvoe Wheelers to discuss the proposals.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my objections.

 19 January 2025

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear PROW Committee,

Please see this letter as support of the proposed changes and upgrades of the PROW at Whitehall. I have been a horse owner and rider for 50 years, riding and walking the area of Wenvoe, Whitehall, Burdonshill, St Lythans, Twyn-Yr-Odyn, Dyffryn and Wrinstone for the past 26 years. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The route from St Lythans Road to Pound Lane has always been used as a bridleway, a scenic safe route away from traffic, therefore we see no issue in this remaining one officially. In fact the horse community can not understand why its only now that its getting designated as a bridleway as it's a very well-known popular one.

The east west route from Walston to Whitehall a hill and currently overgrown alongside the old quarry has been used by horses from time to time, so is suitable when cleared as planned. This will make a good safe link without the need to use the roads and provide a good riding loop with the other bridleways.

The horse community is aware and very supportive of the further permissive routes being worked on by the Great Glamorgan Way which I know of from my involvement in the local meetings. There is a strange disconnect between Whitehall and Burdonshill where you can ride on both but there is a section in the middle that you cannot, so you have a blind route east to west, forcing horses to use Old Port Road and St Lythans Road which is a narrow blind-bend highway at 60mph. The further planned east west permissive route through Wenvoe Wood Burdonshill connected to the Walston Whitehall sections would prevent the need for horses on these dangerous roads and provide short or long routes for all walkers, cyclists and riders to enjoy.

The horse community is very accustomed to sharing these routes with cyclists, walkers and dog-walkers as they have done so for years without issue. The horse riders are looking forward to the completion of the Great Glamorgan Way through this area.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Letter of support regarding Proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm

Dear Planning Sub-Committee – PROW,

I fully support the goals of the Great Glamorgan Way (GGW) initiative in providing access for all groups/types of users and the connectivity not just locally but a network for users from the broader areas. The outdated footpaths in the area which are narrow mud tracks across fields, with styles to climb over restricted their use as to the time of year and also the fitness of the user. The new routes being 3 to 4 times wider, with an all-weather surface, accessible gates and creation of habitat connectivity along their sides provides enjoyment and safety to a greater quantity and type of user. We have seen a good increase of users of the route as is evident in the picture.



Their design and location also provide good clarity as to the route of the PROW providing Security, Safety and Privacy to both the users and landowners. They also alleviate the instances of accidental trespass, arguments between owners and users and livestock issues (dogs in fields of livestock or livestock troubling users), things that are not pleasant for both the user and the landowner. A user

has a single instance and issue for a few minutes as they pass but the landowner has the cumulative effects of them all day and every day of the year.

This increase in ease of use and enjoyment has brought many comments of approval from the users as they pass by and we have got to know a lot more people, which we have found to be an enjoyable thing ourselves. The initiative and its wider proliferation via presentations and discussions to the local groups and landowners has been welcomed by the majority of users, cyclists and horse riders, although there have been a couple of diehard walkers that seem to be against change in general, or patience for change to happen and then see the results and do not want to share the countryside with other types of users, a very selfish and narrow minded approach I feel, when the change is to improve access to the countryside for all and not just a few. We have thousands of users per year of all groups/types from this and the wider community and it's a shame to ruin that for a couple of diehards.

Evidence of its success is that three more landowners now have engaged the GGW team offering large swathes of their land for public use to provide even further connectivity and enjoyment for all, this I see as a huge badge of approval, as historically the opposite was the case.

Regarding the bridleway from Pound Lane to St Lythans Road and its official adoption and placement on the definitive map as such. This has been used as a bridleway for well over 100 years being enjoyed by walkers, cyclist and horses. I have known it and enjoyed it during the 56 years of my time in the area and people of the village have always called it the bridleway. The formal recognition of this through these orders give certainty to its future for these users and comfort knowing it is part of an approved network.

Kindest Regards



Hi [REDACTED]

I received the below message over the weekend Best regards [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern

I would like to express my support of the goals of the Great Glamorgan Way (GGW) initiative which I feel would be of great benefit to the area and the public. I have family living in Wenvoe and grew up in the area and enjoy returning. Now having a young family of my own we often walk the area and enjoy being in nature and observing local birds, wildlife and farm animals, whilst also teaching my children to respect the local area. Particularly, the importance of remaining on designated pathways to help retain the natural beauty and minimise the disruption to local wildlife. We have seen pheasants, rabbits and foxes near the current paths and in the woodland which I think would be better protected from roaming ramblers and dogs if there were clear pathways in place as the GGW proposes.

As a runner I enjoy circular routes and think the improved connectivity would help aid route planning for users and provide an easier route to follow as the current paths are disjointed in places. The all weather surface would also be welcomed to help to reduce risk of injury to users especially after spells of bad weather.

I appreciate those who have given time to researching and preparing the goals and plan for GGW for themselves and others to enjoy. Seeing others taking care and consideration in the area has been lovely to witness and has resulted in much improvements particularly the quarry path access and bridle path.

Having reviewed the proposed pathways I am pleased to see nothing is being taken away and if anything the slight redirection of the pathways improves connections of current footpaths as well as benefitting landowners surrounding these areas by improving their privacy.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]