

Wayford Lodge
Wayford
Norwich
NR12 9LL

3 December 2020

**Sara Utting, Governance
Broads Authority**

**Ref: Request to Speak at Planning Meeting to be held on 4 December 2020; Application ref.
BA/2020/0335/FUL, Written Statement**

Dear Sara,

Many thanks for the information regarding the planning meeting scheduled for Friday 4 December 2020.

I would like to speak in the capacity of a neighbour. I have owned the property (two cottages) nearest the proposed site for 37 years. This is an ancestral home of 3 generations (since 1910) and was purchased by my Grandfather as a home and base for his unusual occupation as an Eel Catcher, working the rivers from Dilham to Gt. Yarmouth. In addition, I would like to speak as a member of the public, as a user from childhood of RB11 and FP2 over Tonnage Bridge.

I understand that the recommendation of the Authority is to refuse planning permission, being contrary to policies DM27, DM29, DM16, DM21 and DM23. However, I am fully aware that the committee may be tempted to grant planning permission by imposing conditions, in an attempt to address some of these material non-compliances.

Further to my 18 page letter of objection dated 22 October 2020 I wish to make the following statement:

In consideration of all the applicable policies for determination, the Broads Authority Planning Officer's recommendation is to refuse planning permission, the proposal being contrary to policies DM27, DM29, DM16, DM21 and DM23.

I object to the use of Restricted Byway 11 (RB11), part of the PROW network, as the sole means of vehicular access to the proposed site.

Policy DM23 states:

'The Authority will safeguard public rights of way and ensure that future routes are not compromised'.

Should this application be approved you would also be giving your consent to the use of RB11 by motor vehicles for tourism purposes. Due to the nature of such use and the geographical placement of this byway in relation to the highway network, the inevitable, illegal use of the byway would be uncontrollable; and the law, designed to protect the rights of walkers, cyclists and horse riders would be unenforceable. **RB11 would have become a road.** A much more dangerous place for children on bikes or on horseback.

The presence of streams of cars traversing the Restricted Byway would blight the stunning Landscape character of this area (DM29). The increased level and much more frequent vehicle noise would certainly not provide the expected level of tranquillity currently in great demand by walkers or horse riders using this PROW, a tranquillity which they currently enjoy (DM16). The overbearing nature of the mere presence of motor vehicles on RB11 would only dissuade the public from using it and by extension, the public footpaths which branch off. RB11, a much used local and visitor facility will be lost by willful degradation (DM27).

Furthermore, this would open the door to the use of other fields located along the length of the byway as 'pop-up' caravan / campsites. Use of just a couple of these fields could easily exceed the 70 units of accommodation the Applicant already has in operation in the area (DM29). With these outrageous levels of vehicular use, in addition to the resulting unavoidable illegal use, this would undoubtedly have a detrimental impact on the amenity of properties along both Oak Road and Broad Fen Lane (DM21).

Should you approve this proposal, the Authority would have failed to protect public rights, in addition to being responsible for the removal of a valuable and ancient facility from both local people and the country as a whole. During the next few years of austerity in the wake of COVID-19, our PROW network will be relied upon more than ever, being essential for the physical and mental health of us all.

I have suggested that the Authority impose an Article 4 Direction to all land that borders RB11, to prevent development without the grant of planning permission, (such as caravans / tents for 28 nights).

In summary, by permitting this development it will be impossible to safeguard the public right of way afforded by RB11. Thus assured non-compliance with Policy DM23 and indeed DM27, DM29, DM16 and DM21 all act as a permanent impasse to development on this site, and by extension all other sites bordering RB11.

I am hopefully optimistic that the committee will respect the recommendations of the Planning Officer and in doing so, will safeguard our public rights.

Thank you.

If for some reason I am unable to speak or am cut-off during the planning meeting I request that the section outlined and shaded above on pages 1 and 2 is read aloud during the meeting in its entirety and will act as my Statement.

Kind Regards,

03 December 2020 | 22:50 PM GMT

DocuSigned by:

35E71986B5A946A...
Alice Brown.