



Proposal to amend the Definitive Map of public rights of way in the Much Hadham area

At its meeting on 6 October 2026, Much Hadham Parish Council resolved to support, in principle, the proposals for the concurrent Creation and Extinguishment Orders described in the letter of 15 September from HCC's Countryside and Rights of Way Service.

However, several areas of uncertainty / concern have been expressed to the Council by residents, which we would wish to draw to your attention:

1. The new path will be 3m wide, formed of tar and chippings according to the planning approval. How will users of electric scooters, motorcycles and similarly inappropriate vehicles be discouraged from using it to create a short cut between Tower Hill and Oudle Lane?
2. What will become of the remaining "stubs" of FP22 not incorporated into the new path? It is understood that the A-D path behind the almshouses to the school gate (and, indeed, beyond) is used by the tenants to maintain their rear boundaries, as required in their tenancy agreements. Similarly, the path between Oudle Lane (point E) and the other school gate (north) is used by residents whose properties border the path for maintenance and rear access too. Will these stubs remain accessible even though a public right of way has been extinguished?
3. What are the school's proposals for future use of the two gates on FP22? Will they be permanently closed so that all children will access the school from the main entrance on Tower Hill?

[In which case, the new path would not provide the same level of access to the school that some current users of FP22 enjoy and, in that sense, when considering the requirements of s118 (5) Highways Act 1980, the creation of the new path would not provide an alternative to the full extent of the current path. However, this is balanced by, inter alia, the expediency of allowing the school to fulfil its safeguarding responsibilities more efficiently. HCC needs to be careful in how it presents this argument if it is to overcome objections.]

There is a widespread understanding of the school's safeguarding responsibilities, and it is not intended that, in raising these questions, the residents or Council are suggesting that safeguarding protections be compromised. It is also accepted that the school should not be burdened with the additional resourcing requirements currently required as a consequence of FP22 crossing its site.

It is more a case of trying to understand the practical impact of the proposals and ensuring that potentially unintended consequences are identified sooner rather than later.