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| **Order Decision** |
| Hearing Held on 7 September 2021  Site visit made on 2 September 2021 |
| **by C Beeby BA (Hons) MIPROW** |
| **an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs** |
| **Decision date: 7 December 2021** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Order Ref: ROW/3254980** |
| * This Order is made under Section 53 (2) (b) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (the 1981 Act) and is known as the Oxfordshire County Council Addition of Restricted Byway No 20 (including the Upgrading of Footpath No 9 (Parts)) Parish of Chalgrove Modification Order 2019. |
| * The Order is dated 19 December 2019 and proposes to modify the Definitive Map and Statement for the area by the recording of Restricted Byway 20 between High Street and St Mary’s Church, Chalgrove as shown in the Order plan and described in the Order Schedule. |
| * There were 22 objections and 7 representations outstanding when Oxfordshire County Council submitted the Order to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation. |
| **Summary of Decision: The Order is confirmed subject to the modifications set out in the Formal Decision.** |
|  |

Preliminary Matters

1. I determined the Order by means of an online hearing due to Covid-19 pandemic issues.
2. I made an unaccompanied site visit in advance of the hearing. At this I was able to inspect the Order route and relevant surrounding features. At the close of the event, no-one requested that I make a further inspection.
3. In writing this decision I have found it convenient to refer to points marked on the Order Plan. I therefore attach a copy of this plan.
4. The Order contains matters which will be corrected by modifications, as my decision is to confirm the Order. I sought the comments of the parties on these at the hearing.
5. Part 1 (Modification of Definitive Map) of the Order Schedule seeks to both add and upgrade section B-C (i.e. the section of path appears in both the “path to be added” and “path to be upgraded” tables). However, reference to section B-C should only appear in the “upgraded” table, as the section is already a recorded public footpath. It is consequently necessary to modify the Order by the removal of the description of Section B-C from the “added” table. This has necessitated the provision of measurements for the sections A-B and C-D-E by the Council, and additionally the amendment of the total length of path to be added.
6. The Order contains conflicting Ordnance Survey Grid References (OSGRs) in respect of Point C. It is therefore necessary to standardise these throughout the Order, based on updated information from the Council.
7. It is necessary to amend the new statement section of Part 2 (Modification of Definitive Statement) in respect of the “Description” column for Restricted Byway 20 in light of the new measurements provided by the Council.
8. The same row (Restricted Byway 20) in that table omits reference to section D-F, which would also be part of Public Footpath 9 subsumed within Restricted Byway 20, in the “Remarks” column. Thus, the addition of OSGRs in respect of section D-F is necessary.

The Main Issues

1. Oxfordshire County Council made the Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) under Section 53(2)(b) of the 1981 Act on the basis of events specified in sub-sections 53(3)(c)(i), 53(3)(c)(ii) and 53(3)(c)(iii). As a result, the main issues are whether the discovery by the Council of evidence (when considered with all other evidence available) is sufficient to show:

* that a restricted byway which is not shown in the map and statement subsists over land in the area to which the map relates.
* that a highway shown in the map and statement as a highway of a particular description ought to be there shown as a highway of a different description.
* that any other particulars contained in the map and statement require modification.

1. User Evidence Forms (UEFs) are submitted in support of the application. As a result, the statutory requirements of Section 31 of the Highways Act 1980 (the 1980 Act) are relevant. This sets out that where a way has been enjoyed by the public as of right and without interruption for a full period of twenty years, the way is to be deemed to have been dedicated as a highway unless there is sufficient evidence that there was no intention during that period to dedicate it. The period of twenty years referred to is to be calculated retrospectively from the date when the right of the public to use the way was brought into question.
2. The standard of proof for confirmation of a DMMO is the balance of probability.

Reasons

***Background***

1. The Order route runs past The Crown public house and along the western edge of the recreation ground before reaching the churchyard. A “spur” leaves the route near the tennis courts and meets a bridge over the brook. Documentary and user evidence has been submitted in support of the Order.

***Documentary Evidence***

*Jeffery’s Map 1766-7*

1. A route appears in the vicinity of the Order route. Buildings appear along it.

*Davis’s Map 1797*

1. Features on the copy supplied are too faint to accurately interpret.

*Magdalen College Map 1822*

1. The route is shown leading to the church and a building. The spur leads only to the brook, where no bridge is marked; the route does not continue beyond it. A blue colouring at the centre of the route between approximately points C and D matches that used for the brook and a pond within the modern recreation ground, suggesting the presence of water. The route is numbered 180. This is described in the book of reference as “Frog Lane”. It and the High Street are recorded under the heading “Common, Roads and Lanes”.
2. The northern part of the definitive Public Footpath 9 is shown as a path of a much narrower width than the Order route.

*Bryant’s Map 1823-4*

1. Features on the copy supplied are too faint to accurately interpret.

*Canal Plan 1828*

1. The section of route D-F is marked parcel number 218 on the plan. This is described in the book of reference as “The Lane”. No owners or occupiers are recorded for the parcel. The canal and associated infrastructure were not built.

*Chalgrove Tithe Award 1840*

1. The map shows the route as separated from the village street by a dashed line and numbered 2134. It is coloured in the same way as High Street and Church Lane. A bridge appears to be shown across the brook at the end of the spur. No route is depicted south of the brook or through the church yard, so that the route is a cul-de-sac at both points E and F.
2. Parcel 2134 is not recorded in the award as titheable, and is within the column “Commonable Lands, Driftways and Wastes”. Its name is Frog Lane and a measurement is recorded for it. High Street (2133) is recorded as a street. The award also records routes named “way”, “footway”, “green highway”, “road”, “highway”, “driftway”, “road” and “lane”.

*Chalgrove Inclosure Award and Map 1843*

1. The Order route lies within an area of the village which is excluded from the Award. Thus, the route is not described in the Award. Nevertheless, the excluded area is shown by a similar level of detail and features are shown in a similar manner to the inclosed area.
2. The Award contains sections titled “public carriage roads and highways” and “public bridle roads and footpaths and private roads”. The types of route set out include “public carriage road and highway”, “public footpath”, “private road” and “private carriage and occupation road and public footpath”.
3. The Order route is shown shaded sienna with grey edging on the map, as public roads are. Public footpaths Nos 4 and 5 are set out to the south of the brook within the inclosed area. These are shown apparently unshaded, and by a narrower line style than the Order route. The footpaths are described in the Award as leading to/from Frogmore Lane.
4. A private road which meets the footpaths’ junction is shown by a slightly wider line style than the footpaths, but significantly narrower than the Order route, and uncoloured. A private road to the north of Chalgrove is shown in a similar fashion to this.

*Magdalen College Map 1848*

1. The route is shown numbered and coloured sienna, as High Street is. It leads to the churchyard and an adjacent building. A bridge may be shown at the end of the spur across the brook, however no route appears to lead from it. The pond within the modern recreation ground is marked.
2. As on the 1822 map the northern part of the definitive Public Footpath 9 is shown as a path of a much narrower width than the Order route.

*Ordnance Survey Maps 1881, 1887, 1900, 1922, 1959*

1. The Order route appears on the 1881 map, with lines within its central section. A path through the churchyard connects the route with Church Lane.
2. The Order route is shown between double solid lines on the 1887 map, with adjacent buildings where it nears the church.
3. The route is shown between double solid lines on the 1900 and 1922 maps, with lines within its central section. A path through the churchyard connects the route with Church Lane. A footbridge is marked where the spur meets the brook.
4. The 1959 map depicts the section D-E between double solid lines. Approximately sections B-C-D-F of the Order route are shown by blue markings depicting water, with an adjacent description of “Ford”.

*Bartholomew’s Maps (half inch to one mile) 1902, 1920, 1941*

1. All three maps depict the approximate Order route forming part of a continuous route additionally comprising a path through the churchyard and Church Lane. A crossing is marked where the spur meets the brook. The route is shown uncoloured between double solid lines, in the same way as the Definitive Public Footpath 9 and lanes in the area.

*Magdalen College Map 1908*

1. The route is shown between double solid lines and appears uncoloured. The base mapping shows a foot bridge across the brook. Lines appear within the central section of the route.

*Finance Act 1910*

1. The National Archives Office copy shows most of the route excluded from surrounding land parcels. The spur D-F is not, however. That is part of parcel no. 75.
2. Parcel 75 is described in the Field Book as “House Buildings and Land” owned by Magdalen College. Under “charges, easements and restrictions affecting market value of Fee Simple” the words “cartway 71” or “cartway 21” appear. 71 is the number of the Order route’s parcel on the background OS mapping. A deduction from the tax of £25 for “public rights of way or user” is recorded in respect of parcel 75. Definitive public footpaths 9 and 10 cross parcel 75 on the background mapping, so this deduction could refer to them.
3. The Local Records Office Finance Act map shows most of the route excluded from surrounding land parcels. As with the National Archives map, the spur D-F is part of parcel no. 75. No deductions for public rights of way or user are recorded in respect of this parcel. However, no deductions in this regard are recorded anywhere in Chalgrove parish.

*Deed of Exchange 1950*

1. The deed relates to the transfer of the recreation ground. The route is shown adjacent to the parcel in question. The pond within the modern recreation ground is marked on the base mapping. Lines appear within the central section of the route. A foot bridge is marked where the spur meets the brook.

*Recreation Ground byelaws 1955*

1. These state that the recreation ground is known as “Ponditch”. They set out that “a person shall not except in the exercise of any lawful right or privilege bring or cause to be brought onto the ground any barrow, truck, machine or vehicle” other than bikes, wheelchairs and pushchairs.

*Conveyance 1957* *Joynson Holland - Monck*

1. This relates to land around the Order route. It includes a plan on which the route is marked. Land parcels 66 and 67 lie near the church. They are described as “Grass” and “Derelict cottage and garden”. The presence of a route across the churchyard marked by double dashes results in the Order route and Church Lane forming a continuous route. Lines appear within the route’s central section, which are consistent with those marked on earlier maps. No bridge is shown across the brook.

*Parish Council records, 1969 and 1973*

1. A letter from the parish clerk to agents for Mr E Monk in 1969 states that “the area you refer to which you say is being used as a tip is what is known as The Old Ford which was the roadway to the church… water has been allowed to enter this part through neglect over the years….this is being reclaimed as part of an overall improvement to the recreation ground”.
2. A minute from a parish council meeting in 1973 states in respect of Frogmore Lane that “A letter had been received…complaining of the fence erected in this area and would like to see it removed and the Lane made up by some form of surfacing put on. Chairman reminded the Council that this ‘Lane’ had never been a right of way and the reason for putting a fence across was to stop vehicles using the Recreation Ground and illegal dumping in the area”.

*Village Green registration*

1. The central section of the Order route crosses the western edge of a registered village green, VG 38, which is used as a recreation ground. Its registration was finalised on 1 October 1970.

*Chalgrove – An Oxfordshire Village (Chalgrove History Group, 1990)*

1. This refers to Frogmore Lane as one of Chalgrove’s oldest rights of way.

*Statutory Declaration, 1995 – E Monck and 2014 – M & Y Knight*

1. These refer to the use of the lane to access private land and therefore they are of minimal relevance to the determination of the Order.

*Oxfordshire Village Book (Oxfordshire Federation of WI, 1999)*

1. This states that flooding has historically occurred at Chalgrove.

*Barentin’s Manor – Report of Archaeological Excavation (Page, Atherton and Hardy, 2005)*

1. This refers to Frogmore Lane as one of the oldest rights of way in the village.

*Footsteps through Chalgrove, 2008 – Chalgrove Local History Group*

1. The document refers to Frogmore Lane as an ancient lane. It states that “archaeological excavations conducted in Hardings Field alongside Frogmore revealed the site of a medieval, moated manor house and outbuildings. When the mill downstream was converted from mid-shot to over-shot in 1871 this low-lying area became vulnerable to flooding”.

*Title Register and Plans, 2013*

1. These record the parish council’s ownership of the village hall and surrounding area since 2013.

*Property Chamber, Land Registration Division First-Tier Tribunal decision 2015*

1. This relates to a claimed right of way by prescription, along section A-B-C-D-F of the Order route. The document states that approximately section C-D of the Order route was known at the time as “Old Ford”. The decision names approximately section D-E as “Frog/Frogmore Lane”, and approximately section D-F as “The Baulk”.
2. The decision states that a resident recollects that the “Old Ford” had parts always under water from 1956 until some time in the 1960s, when it was drained. By 1977 the Old Ford had been filled in and the ground had been levelled. Another witness stated that the Old Ford was covered with water all year round. The Parish Council stated that minutes in 1966 recorded the intention of the county council to clear old trees and rubbish, leaving young trees surrounding the old ford, and to fill in the swamp. The tribunal decision comments that “the evidence is that there was no user between 1911 and about 1970 because Old Ford was blocked by a fence at the north end and was water logged so as not to be passable”. This refers to the exercise of any private right of way.
3. The tribunal decision found that there was insufficient vehicular use to give rise to a private right. It found that the parish council had fitted a padlocked gate on the route in August 1991, thus assuming physical control of vehicular access to the area. Use with horses was objected to by the parish council and hence was by force.

*Chalgrove – The Cartographic Evidence (Shepherd, 2015)*

1. The document offers a landscape history of the village. However, the majority of the sources relied on are not before me. As a result, I do not attach any particular weight to the document’s conclusions in reaching my determination.

*Victoria County History – Chalgrove*

1. The extracts provided from this document supply some background information on the village’s history. However, they do not assist in reaching my determination.

***User Evidence***

1. Two User Evidence Forms are submitted in support of the application. One shows use of the Order route between the High Street and a field off the spur, over the period 1994-2000. Use was on foot, on horseback and by car. Use was for the purposes of equestrian use of a pony which lived in the field.
2. The second form is completed by a user who was also a declarant for one of the statutory declarations. His use was therefore partially to access his field which lay off the route, although use for walks is also recorded.

***Reasoning***

1. The Order route is not recorded in the Tithe documents as titheable. Nevertheless, Tithe documents were not intended to establish or record rights of way. There are a number of reasons why land might not have been subject to tithe, in addition to the possibility of it being highway land. The Order route is referred to as a lane which forms commonable land, a driftway or waste. The route is named “Frog Lane” and the description “lane” suggests that, of the three descriptions, the route may have been considered to be a driftway, which would have been a logical use if the fields beyond it were used for keeping stock. However, as both public and private roads were not tithable, the map does not provide evidence as to whether the Order route was considered public or private.
2. The inclosure award does not relate to the land crossed by the Order route, and therefore it does not describe the route, and had no legal effect on it. Nevertheless, the inclosure map would have resulted from a survey of the land concerned. The route is depicted on the map as a pre-existing way, and is also referred to in the award as Frogmore Lane. Whether the way was deemed to provide access to the church is unclear on the inclosure map, although such access appears possible according to the Tithe map.
3. Modern-day public roads within both the inclosed and excluded areas of the inclosure map are generally shown to have a greater width and a different colouring than private roads. The Order route is depicted in the same way as the public roads.
4. Two public footpaths are set out in the inclosure award to lead to or from Frogmore Lane. The paths meet south of the brook, and therefore pedestrian use of a through route using the two would have been possible without the use of the Order route.
5. A private road is set out between plot 86 (which holds a cottage and garden) and the junction of the footpaths on the south side of the brook. The Order route meets the brook to the north of this point. Access between plot 86 and the highway by carriages would not have been possible without also making use of the Order route.
6. However, other routes within the award, whether public or private, are described variously by terms such as “carriage road” and “footpath”, which indicate the nature of the intended use. Such an indication is not given for the private road. At that time horseback was a significant mode of everyday travel. As bridle roads are described as “roads” in the section title it is possible that the “highest” rights set out over the private road were equestrian only. The highest rights could equally have been vehicular, but without the overt description generally used in the award (and noting that a “private carriage and occupation road” is set out elsewhere) this remains equivocal.
7. Nevertheless, the shading and line width used on the inclosure map in respect of the Order route are more illuminating in terms of its reputed status. The route’s depiction in a different manner from public footpaths suggests a route over which “higher” rights than footpath were considered to exist. It is shown in the same way as the village and wider highway network which still exists today. The inclosure evidence consequently confirms the physical existence of the Order route at the time, and provides supporting evidence of the reputation of the way as a highway.
8. The Magdalen College maps were produced for the purpose of recording land ownership rather than highways. Nevertheless, the two hand-drawn maps were made for the same landowner over a period of ownership spanning almost thirty years. They were evidently produced with some care, as they reflect features shown on other maps from the period, and the latter map has been updated where features have changed. The college was the local owner of a substantial area of land surrounding the route over a significant period of time. Therefore its maps are likely to have drawn on a reasonably good local knowledge, which is reflected in the maps’ level of accuracy. Thus, I give some weight to the ability of the Magdalen College maps to provide evidence of the reputed status of the Order route.
9. The route was considered to be common, road or lane at the time of the 1822 Magdalen College map. It is shaded in the same way as public roads on the 1848 map. On both maps the majority of the route is shown as a much wider way than the section of Public Footpath 9 which is shown. The route is shown as part of a network which corresponds with modern highways. These maps consequently provide evidence of the physical existence of the way at the time and some limited evidence of reputation as a highway.
10. The majority of the Order route is excluded from surrounding land parcels on the National Archives Finance Act 1910 map. This exclusion suggests that the adjoining landowners considered these sections to be public. Routes shown in this way usually correspond to known public vehicular highways.
11. The spur to the brook is included within land parcel no. 75. The inclusion of the spur within the parcel could suggest that landowners at the time had a different view of the section D-F.
12. However, the words “cartway 71” or “cartway 21” appear in the National Archives Field Book entry for parcel no.75, under the heading “Charges, easements and restrictions affecting market value of fee simple”. 71 is the number of the Order route’s parcel on the background mapping. Thus, the reference appears most likely to relate to section D-F of the route, and no other interpretation is suggested. The cartway description is followed by the apparent notes “3 PF Pts”. £25.00 is later deducted from the site’s value for *public rights of way or user*.
13. The entry for adjacent land parcel no. 38 in the same document records “4 FPs” in the charges and easements section, and £25.00 is later similarly deducted for public rights of way or user.
14. It is unclear why section D-F of the route was treated differently from A-E in the Finance Act documents. This may result from differing ownership. Nevertheless, a consistent approach is taken for both land parcel nos 75 and 38 in terms of the recording of public ways in the charge, easement or restriction sections and the subsequent deductions from the site’s value due to the presence of these.
15. The description “cartway” is used to distinguish the route from the public footpaths also recorded as “charges, easements and restrictions”. Deductions based on the existence of public rights are then made in respect of it. These are not rights of common, or easements, because separate sections exist for the recording of such matters. Thus, it is likely that the spur D-F was considered to be a public cartway over land parcel 75, which affected its value at the time.
16. The Finance Act’s primary purpose was not the identification of highways and there may be other reasons for the exclusion of the route. Nevertheless, the Order route is also depicted in the same way as the highway network on several items of evidence prior to 1910, and evidence which would contradict this status is not before me. Thus, on the balance of probability, the totality of the evidence prior to and including the Finance Act 1910 documents demonstrates that the route was established as a vehicular public right of way of some age by 1910.
17. It was submitted at the hearing that the presence of water over part of the route had rendered it impassable until the early twentieth century. The Magdalen College map of 1822 suggests the presence of water between approximately points C and D by a blue colouring which is additionally used for the brook and pond. Lines are drawn over a similar area on the Ordnance Survey (OS) maps of 1881 and 1900. A ford is marked on the OS map of 1922. The OS map of 1959 labels the ford and shows a watercourse alongside and partially within the route, in the same area.
18. The Tribunal decision found that there was no user between 1911 and about 1970 because the Old Ford was blocked by a fence at the north end and was waterlogged so as not to be passable. The 1969 parish clerk’s letter also supports the presence of water over the route at that date.
19. Nevertheless, a range of evidence suggests that the Order route has historically been a way. Early maps show it forming access to buildings and the church. It is shaded in the same tone as highways on the inclosure map and the Magdalen College 1848 map. The area is not subject to tithe, and the name “lane” is used in the Tithe and inclosure documents. Most of the route is excluded from surrounding parcels on Finance Act mapping. It is depicted as part of a network of ways on the Bartholomew’s and OS mapping. The name ford used on two twentieth century OS maps suggests an area of water which, at the time of those surveys, was considered traversable, even if this were, for example, only on a seasonal basis.
20. Overall, then, some of the evidence suggests the presence of water over the central section of the route during both the 19th and 20th centuries. However, there is additionally significant evidence of reputation as a way. The water is likely to have been seasonal at times, as its evidential depiction is intermittent. Even when present it did not always prevent use of the way, as there are references to a ford.
21. The principle “once a highway, always a highway” means that once a public right of way has come into existence it continues to exist indefinitely, unless brought to an end by the use of a statutory provision. Matters which have no effect on the pre-existence of the public right include the physical obstruction of a route. Thus, even if the way had not been passable for the entire period referred to in the tribunal decision (1911-1970), this could nonetheless still be consistent with the pre-existence of the public rights identified above.
22. It is submitted that there was no access across the brook at Point F until a bridge was built in the 1980s. Nevertheless, the Tithe documents, the 1848 Magdalen College map, the Bartholomew maps and the latest Magdalen College map all appear to show a bridge across the brook. Furthermore, the footpaths shown on the Enclosure Map would not have been recorded leading to Frogmore Lane if a crossing of the brook were not present. Moreover, the brook itself could historically have formed a point of public attraction, allowing for use of the Order route even if access across the brook was not available for some periods. Therefore, whilst there is some historic evidence of a crossing, a lack of access across the brook at any previous point does not affect the weight which I attach to the submitted evidence.
23. The Order route’s width is derived from the 2nd edition OS Map of 1898. The evidence prior to that date depicts the route’s physical boundaries in a relatively consistent manner. Significant variations in width are generally shown to exist along the route throughout the period. These accord with the route’s depiction on the 1898 map to a sufficient degree to be able to rely on that document in determining the widths to be as shown in the Order.
24. Whilst parts of the Order route are currently recorded as a public footpath, the evidence is on balance supportive of the route being a historic vehicular highway. Public rights for mechanically propelled vehicles were extinguished by virtue of Section 67 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, as none of the exceptions to extinguishment therein apply. Thus, the restricted byway status recorded in the Order is appropriate.
25. As I have found that a vehicular public right of way existed along the Order route by 1910 it is not necessary to consider the user evidence submitted in support of the Order further.

**Other Matters**

1. It was submitted at the hearing that the provisions of Section 26 of the 1980 Act should be taken into account in determining the Order. However, that section relates to the creation of a public right of way. In this decision I am required to consider whether a public right of way already exists, in accordance with the provisions of the 1981 Act. Thus, the provisions of Section 26 do not apply to my determination of the matter before me.
2. There is nothing before me to support the suggestion that the submitted documentary evidence was previously considered when the definitive map and statement were originally drawn up. Therefore the basis for this decision results from the discovery of evidence as set out in Section 53(3)(c) of the 1981 Act.
3. Whilst I acknowledge concerns raised regarding the effect of the route on road safety, land uses in the vicinity and car parking availability, I cannot give these concerns weight in reaching my decision as they lie outside the criteria set out within the relevant legislation.

Conclusions

1. Having regard to these and all other matters raised at the hearing and in the written representations I conclude that the Order should be confirmed subject to modifications that do not require advertising.

**Formal Decision**

1. I confirm the Order subject to the following modifications:

Within Part 1 of the Schedule:

* By the deletion (from “Description of path or way to be added”) of the words “280 metres” and their substitution with the words “58 metres to SU 6366 9685 (point B) and then from point C (SU 6363 9682) south-south-west for approximately 173 metres”.
* By the deletion (from “Description of path or way to be added”) of the words “410 metres” and their substitution with “361 metres”.
* By the deletion (from “Description of path or way to be upgraded”) of “SU 6365 9683” and its substitution with “SU 6363 9682”.

Within Part 2 of the Schedule:

* By the deletion from the “Description” column for Restricted Byway 20 (in “A new statement for Chalgrove to be added”) of “280 metres” and its substitution with “268 metres”.
* By the deletion from the “Remarks” column for Restricted Byway 20 (in “A new statement for Chalgrove to be added”) of “SU 6365 9685” and its substitution with “SU 6363 9682 and from SU 6358 9666 to SU 6355 9663”.
* By the deletion from the “Description” column for Footpath 21 (in “A new statement for Chalgrove to be added”) of “SU 6365 9683” and its substitution with “SU 6363 9682”.
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