Document 05 - Statement containing the OMA's comments on the objections

PUBLIC PATH EXTINGUISHMENT AND DEFINTIVE MAP AND STATEMENT MODIFICATION ORDER (No. 1) 2025

PUBLIC FOOTPATH BCC/589 BRISTOL

Objector name	BCC observations
[redacted]	The footpath terminates at a dead end some 370m upstream due to a private compound on private land owned by Network Rail. Beyond the railway bridge, the industrial estate (shown in situ since 1900 on the OS maps) suggests there has been no through route along the north side of the River Avon to Netham Weir for over 100 years. Regarding the claim that the Council have deliberately allowed the route to deteriorate; the land over which the footpath is situated is privately owned. It is therefore for the private landowner to manage their land. In relation to river bank erosion, again it will be either the responsibility of the landowner or the Environment Agency. The route is no longer safe or viable for the public to use. Visibility of Brunel's railway bridge has not been possible from this location since the industrial estate was constructed in the 1900s. There is no evidence that there was a towpath at this location. The Monarch's Way was previously diverted by The Monarch's Way Association and so will not be affected by this Order. Letters to respondent, dated 13 March 2025 and 1 April 2025, attached.
Objector name	BCC observations
[redacted]	In response to the claim that the footpath forms an integral part of the River Avon Trail, the Council can confirm that the River Avon Trail was officially diverted some years ago following the rescinding, by Network Rail, of the permissive path under the bridge. The route now follows Whitby Road on the other side of the River Avon. The route is not a pedestrian corridor as it leads to a dead end. Any continuation along the riverside will be trespass across private land. The route is no longer safe given that it is unstable due to erosion. There is no evidence that the route is regularly used as a right of way. The Council confirmed that the cost to reinstate the footpath would be prohibitive. Letters to respondent, dated 13 March 2025 and 13 April 2025, attached.