

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

The Definitive Map and Statement of Public Rights of Way in Cumbria

To: Cumbria County Council
The Courts, English Street
Carlisle CA3 8NA

I, Dr Peter Ernest Robin of 32 Wattsfield Road Kendal LA9 5JN (and jointly with
The Ramblers Association of 2nd Floor Camelford House 87-90 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TW)

hereby apply for an order under section 53(2) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
modifying the definitive map and statement for the area by:

Upgrading FP322003 322001,341013 and part of 341008 to
Bridleway NY687251 to 684232 and 680233 in Parishes of Dufton
and Long Marton

as shown on the map accompanying this application on p3

1. This application is made because, on the cut off day,

The effect of s.53(1) and (2) Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 on a public path that existed prior to 1949, still exists on the cut-off date, and hasn't been a highway of a different description in between, and is not shown in the definitive map and statement at all is to extinguish all rights on that route. (This applies if the route is determined to be a footpath or bridleway.)

2. In order to be able to modify the definitive map and statement, the Surveying Authority needs to have a discovery of evidence which shows, on the balance of probabilities that highway rights exist. The use of the 'balance of probabilities' test rather than 'beyond reasonable doubt' was confirmed by the High Court in [*Todd, Bradley v SOS for EFRA* \[2004\] 4 All ER 497](#).

3. The courts have given guidance on how evidence of highway status is to be considered. In *Fortune and Others v Wiltshire Council and Another* [2012] EWCA Civ 334, Lewison LJ said, at paragraph 22,

In the nature of things where an inquiry goes back over many years (or, in the case of disputed highways, centuries) direct evidence will often be impossible to find. The fact finding tribunal must draw inferences from circumstantial evidence. The nature of the evidence that the fact finding tribunal may consider in deciding whether or not to draw an inference is almost limitless. As Pollock CB famously directed the jury in *R v Exall* (1866) 4 F & F 922:

"It has been said that circumstantial evidence is to be considered as a chain, and each piece of evidence as a link in the chain, but that is not so, for then, if any one link broke, the chain would fall. It is more like the case of a rope composed of several cords. One strand of the cord might be insufficient to sustain the weight, but three stranded together may be quite of sufficient strength."

4. While no single piece of evidence may be conclusive, the applicant believes that taken as a whole the pieces of evidence demonstrate highway reputation over many years, indicating that the route does indeed have highway status

* Peter E Robin MB ChB BDS MD FRCS retired surgeon, lifelong walker and Life Member of *Ramblers*.

Path Ref. Dufton 1

Extract from CCC Illustrative Definitive Map 1:10000

