

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 118
THE WILTSHIRE COUNCIL PARISH OF PURTON PATH 104 (PART)
EXTINGUISHMENT AND DEFINITIVE MAP AND STATEMENT MODIFICATION
ORDER 2025

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 26
THE WILTSHIRE COUNCIL PARISH OF PURTON BRIDLEWAY 104 (PART)
CREATION AND DEFINITIVE MAP AND STATEMENT MODIFICATION ORDER 2025

Purpose of Report

1. To:
 - (i) Consider the 13 representations in support and 11 objections to The Wiltshire Council Parish of Purton Path 104 (part) Extinguishment and Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2025 and The Wiltshire Council Parish of Purton Bridleway 104 (part) Creation and Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2025.
 - (ii) Recommend that the Orders be forwarded to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (**SoSEFRA**) with a recommendation from Wiltshire Council that the Extinguishment and Creation Orders be confirmed without modification.

APPENDIX A. The made Orders and Order Plans showing the existing route and proposed change.

APPENDIX B. Representations and objections to the made orders

APPENDIX C. Representations and objections to the made orders and officer response

APPENDIX D PL/2025/09645 Certificate of Lawful Use, Existing Use – Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 191 (as amended by Section 10 of the Planning & Compensation Act 1991)

Relevance to the Council's Business Plan

2. Working with the local community to provide a rights of way network which is fit for purpose, making Wiltshire an even better place to live, work and visit.

Background

3. The application to divert Bridleway Purton 104 (part) (PURT104) was made by the landowners Mr and Mrs Mosely, under s.119 of the Highways Act 1980 dated 10 July 2023. The application is made on the grounds that it is in the interests of the owners of Restrop Farm to improve the privacy and security of the home and working farm. The application states *"This application is made primarily in the*

interests of the landowner, to improve both privacy and security of the private residence and operational farm.”

4. Mr and Mrs Mosely had made a previous application to divert PURT104. Following objection to the made order a decision was made by the Northern Area Planning Committee on 14 March 2012 to forward the made order to the SoSEFRA, for an independent determination by the Planning Inspectorate. A public inquiry took place 13 and 14 November 2012. On 11 December 2012 an order decision was published by the Planning Inspectorate to refuse to confirm the order. The Planning Inspectorate Order Decision, reference number FPS/Y3940/4/8, can be seen in full on the PPO application register page by following the attached link Rights of way applications see Planning Inspectorate Order Decision FPS-Y3940-4-8.
5. However, there is nothing in the legislation that states a landowner cannot make another application to alter a public right of way. Since the Inspector’s decision in 2012, of a much longer diversion of 380 metres compared to the current proposal which is 190 metres, there has been a release of Defra government guidance on diversion or extinguishment of public rights of way that pass through private dwellings, their curtilages and gardens, farmyards and industrial or commercial premises, dated August 2023, which can be seen in full on the PPO application register page by following the attached link Rights of way applications see Decision Report - Appendix 3. The presumption guidance, states in its conclusion *“In making its decision as to whether the existing path should be diverted or extinguished, an authority should consider in particular the impact of the existing path on the property owner and/or occupier against the benefit that having the right of way through the land brings to the public, taking account of this guidance.”* It continues *“In all cases where the guidance applies, the order-making and confirming authority should weigh the interests of the owner .. against the overall impact of the proposal on the public as a whole. They should note that reducing or eliminating the impact of the current route of the right of way on the owner, in terms of privacy, security and safety, are important considerations to which due weight should be given”*. Therefore, the guidance sets out a presumption that an Order making authority should be predisposed to make an Order and a confirming authority will similarly be predisposed to confirm it, should the Order satisfy the relevant legislative tests.
6. The Planning Inspectorates decision report of 2012, states within the refusal *“that the existing route is an ancient and attractive feature with a distinct history and character which is highly valued by many people ... in addition to the existing route having great historic value, it also offered a rare opportunity for people to walk or ride along a sunken way bounded by ancient hedges full of interesting vegetation and wildlife”*. It is noted that the character of the section of sunken lane that is proposed to be diverted has been irrevocably altered, it has been levelled and cleared so that it is indistinguishable from the rest of the garden. However, the application proposal has been revised, it is 190 metres shorter than the 2012 proposal, and once past the garden the sunken lane retains its character. The applicant states *“We fully understand and accept the Inspector’s conclusions that the ability of the public to experience and enjoy the historic route of the bridleway along the sunken lane outweighs all the other matters that were considered, so we have excluded from the new application that section of the bridleway in order to ensure that use and experience is protected*

and can continue. The length of bridleway now proposed to be diverted is approximately 172 metres. The length of the proposed new route is approximately 252 metres and so would add an additional 80 metres to the overall length of the bridleway. The extent of the diversion now proposed now includes only the part of the bridleway that falls within the area that forms the garden to the farmhouse and the buildings associated with the residential use of the farm, plus the short section across the driveway to the farm and the farmhouse which is in regular frequent use by motor vehicles including farm machinery.”

7. On 12 March 2018 the Chairman of the Magistrates’ Court sitting at Swindon confirmed an order made under Highways Act 1980 s.116 entitled: *An Order for the stopping up of highway rights for mechanically-propelled vehicles over part of Mud Lane, Purton, Wiltshire*. The legal event stopped up the highway rights for mechanically-propelled vehicles on part of Mud Lane, thus reserving a restricted byway over the highway concerned. On 12 September 2023 the Chairman of the Magistrates’ Court sitting at Swindon confirmed a Variation Order under Civil Procedure Rules 3.1.7 entitled: *A Variation Order for the stopping up of highway rights for mechanically-propelled vehicles over part of Mud Lane, Purton*. The order made under Highways Act 1980 Section 116 dated 12 March 2018 should be varied to reflect the correct measurements of the area concerned.
8. Planning Inspectorate Guidance on Procedures for Considering Objections to Definitive Map and Public Path Orders dated June 2025 states at paragraph 23.1.33. *“A diversion order can only amend the definitive map and statement insofar as the course or line of the right of way is concerned, it cannot alter the status of the way. For example, a diversion order can neither downgrade a bridleway to a footpath, nor upgrade a footpath to a bridleway.”* Therefore, officers will use Highways Act 1980 s.118 to extinguish the restricted byway section of PURT104, situated across the driveway, that was reserved by the S.116 stopping up order and the continuing bridleway section of Purton 104 through the private garden; and will use Highways Act 1980 s.26 to create the bridleway over the applied for diversion route.
9. It is therefore proposed to extinguish Bridleway PURT104, a distance of approximately 140 metres with a recorded width between 3.66 and 7.62 metres. It is also proposed to extinguish Restricted Byway PURT104, a distance of approximately 50 metres, with the width recorded on the variation order. And create Bridleway PURT104, a distance of approximately 270 metres with a width recorded of 4 metres.
10. An initial public consultation exercise was carried out from 12 June 2025. The consultation included landowners, statutory undertakers, statutory consultees, user groups and other interested parties, including the Wiltshire Council Member for Purton and Purton Parish Council. The consultation received 7 representations in support including the Ramblers, the Wiltshire Bridleways Association and both the Countryside Access Officers for the area and 9 objections, including Purton Parish Council. The responses can be seen in full, with the applicant’s response to the objection points, on the PPO application register page by following the attached link [Rights of way applications](#) see Decision Report - Appendix 1 and the case officer comments to the responses is at Decision Report - Appendix 2.

11. The officer decision report was written and can be seen in full on the PPO application register page by following the attached link [Rights of way applications](#) see Decision Report, in which the legal tests are discussed in detail. The report concluded that in this case the legal tests for the making of the Orders to extinguish PURT104 under Section 118 and create PURT104 under Section 26 of the Highways Act 1980 were met.
12. The Orders were made on 11 September 2025 under Section 118 and 26 and the consultation ran from 25 September 2025 to 23 October 2025 and included the previous consultees, a notice was placed in the Gazette and Herald on 25 September 2025 and on site at the termination points. The consultation received 13 representations in support and 11 objections to the orders, and can be seen in full at **Appendix B** and the case officer comments to the responses can be seen in full at **Appendix C**.
13. Due to the objections received, the Orders must be considered by the Northern Area Planning Committee whose members should consider the legal tests for extinguishment and creation against the representations and objections received, in order to decide whether Wiltshire Council continues to support the making of these Orders.
14. Where the Authority continues to support its original decision to make these Orders, they should be forwarded to the SoSEFRA for determination, with a recommendation from Wiltshire Council that the Orders be confirmed without modification, or with modification.
15. Where the Authority no longer supports its original decision to make the Orders, they may be withdrawn with reasons given as to why the legal tests for extinguishment and creation are no longer met. The making of the public path extinguishment and creation Orders is a discretionary duty for the Council, rather than a statutory duty; therefore, the Orders may be withdrawn at any time.

Main Considerations for the Council

16. The legal tests that must be applied by Wiltshire Council in considering whether or not the extinguishment Order should be made and confirmed are contained within Section 118 of the Highways Act 1980. The legal tests that must be applied by Wiltshire Council in considering whether or not the creation Order should be made and confirmed are contained in Section 26.
17. ***“118. Stopping up of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways***
 - (1) *Where it appears to a council as respects a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway in their area (other than one which is a trunk road or a special road) that it is expedient that the path or way should be stopped up on the ground that it is not needed for public use, the council may by order made by them and submitted to and confirmed by the Secretary of State, or confirmed as an unopposed order, extinguish the public right of way over the path or way.*
 - (2) *The Secretary of State shall not confirm a public path extinguishment order, and a council shall not confirm such an order as an unopposed order, unless he or, as the case may be, they are satisfied that it is expedient so*

to do having regard to the extent (if any) to which it appears to him or, as the case may be, them that the path or way would, apart from the order, be likely to be used by the public, and having regard to the effect which the extinguishment of the right of way would have as respects land served by the path or way, account being taken of the provisions as to compensation contained in section 28 above as applied by section 121(2)."

18. **"26. Compulsory powers for creation of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways**

(1) Where it appears to a local authority that there is a need for a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway over land in their area and they are satisfied that, having regard to-

- (a) the extent to which the path or way would add to the convenience or enjoyment of a substantial section of the public, or to the convenience of persons resident in the area; and*
- (b) the effect which the creation of the path or way would have on the rights of persons interested in that land, account being taken of the provisions as to compensation contained in section 28 below,*

it is expedient that the path or way should be created, the authority may by order made by them and submitted to and confirmed by the Secretary of State, or confirmed by them as an unopposed order, create a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway over the land."

19. The Council must also have regard to the Wiltshire Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) - the current plan is entitled Wiltshire Countryside Access Improvement Plan 2015 – 2025 – Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2.

20. The Council must also have regard to the needs of agriculture, forestry and the conservation of biodiversity.

21. **Section 118** – allows the Highway Authority to extinguish a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway, where they consider it expedient to do so on the grounds that the path or way is not needed for public use.

The Planning Inspectorate document entitled Guidance on Procedures for Considering Objections to Definitive Map and Public Path Orders, general guidance on public rights of way matters, from para 23.1.15 discusses extinguishment orders. Para 23.1.17 states *"At the confirmation stage, the decision-maker does not have to be satisfied that the way is not being used in order to conclude that it is not needed for public use. An Inspector could confirm an order even if he/she thought the way was likely to be used to a limited degree but was not actually needed."*

22. Defra government presumption guidance states *"Even where a public path through a private garden or farmyard has existed for centuries, and perhaps even pre-dates the use of the land for these purposes, there may be one or more reasons why its presence could be problematic for the landowner."* Reasons stated by the guidance include *"A reasonable expectation of being able to relax in the garden or spend time with family and friends without strangers appearing in the same contained space."* and *"Farmyards or commercial operations putting the public potentially at risk, or being regularly disturbed, because of the limited space within which a route passes."*

23. Many objector's have suggested that the Defra government guidance cannot apply in this case as the landowner altered the landscape to make it appear in the garden and Purton Parish Council requested confirmation that the land had changed use from agricultural land to residential land. A Certificate of Lawful Existing Use, number PL/2025/09645, was granted by Wiltshire Council on 12 June 2026 under Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 191, see Appendix D and states *"On balance of probability, sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the change of use of the land from agricultural land to residential garden has occurred and has been ongoing for more than 10 years."* It is clear the current definitive route of PURT104 is located through what is, and has been for a number of years, used as a garden of Restrop Farm confirmed by a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use. Therefore, as directed by the Defra guidance, there is a presumption that an Order making authority should be predisposed to make an Order and a confirming authority will similarly be predisposed to confirm it, should the proposal satisfy the relevant legislative tests.
24. The current definitive route is located across the driveway of the residence and operational farm, continuing through the residential garden with a well-maintained lawn and past children's play equipment, such as a tree house, swings, a zip wire and cricket nets installed in 2012-13. The route is in close proximity to the dwelling with a clear view through the windows of the home, the large conservatory at the rear of the property and the office buildings.
25. The primary concern, raised by the supporters of the diversion, is that the current alignment of PURT104 is located next to the home and through the private garden, as a result they are conscious that they are accessing someone's home environment, which causes a feeling of intruding on the privacy of the property, creating an uncomfortable situation for both users and residents alike. The current path is less suitable for dog walkers and horse riders as it is a contained space, across a manicured lawn which dog walkers and horse riders feel discomfort about disturbing. Supporters assert that the current route offers an inferior recreational experience as it is less tranquil and does not have the same rural character due to its domestic setting.
26. Supporters also state concern regarding interaction with farm traffic and activities associated with a working farm on the driveway section of the route to be diverted.
27. In their application the landowners have listed a number of incidents of antisocial behaviour and criminal activity taking place at Restrop Farm and have provided an extensive list of incidents, many with police reference numbers as evidence. There are clearly legitimate security concerns at Restrop Farm. Although leading off the busy Restrop Road, Restrop Farm does feel quite isolated due to the high hedging from the road screening the property. As PURT104 leads through the garden the path provides legitimate access to the secluded property.
28. The legislation states that the authority should take into account the effect of the extinguishment on other land served by the path or way and the provisions for compensation. Both the path to be extinguished and the path to be created are

located on land owned by the applicant, it is therefore considered that no claims for compensation will be received. The path to be extinguished is through the garden and in close proximity to the home. The landowner has provided evidence that this proximity has a detrimental effect on privacy and raises legitimate security concerns.

29. In determining whether to confirm a Public Path Extinguishment Order made concurrently with a Public Path Creation Order, the Council or, where applicable, the Secretary of State may have regard to the extent to which the creation Order provides a convenient and suitable alternative route. The path to be created is already available and used by the public.
30. **Section 26 of the Highways Act 1980** allows the authority to make an Order to create a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway where they are satisfied that it is expedient to do so on the grounds that there is a need for a bridleway and having regard to the extent to which the new path would add convenience or enjoyment to a substantial section of the public, or convenience to local residents.
31. The route proposed for creation in this instance was laid out by the landowner a number of years ago as an alternative to the definitive alignment. The route is a clearly definable track, following a broadly similar trajectory and has, in practice, been used by members of the public in preference to the existing route. Supporters confirm that, having experienced both routes, they prefer the proposed diversion and regard it as a clear improvement over the existing alignment, explaining that the proposal provides a balanced solution that maintains public access to Ringsbury Camp and the surrounding rights of way network, whilst respecting the privacy, security and operational needs of the farm and its residents.
32. Whilst the proposal introduces minor changes in alignment, these are limited in extent and would not result in a significant detriment to the purpose, convenience or enjoyment of the path. The proposed path runs across similar grassland terrain with a comparable gradient to the existing route. However, it avoids passing across a driveway and through a maintained domestic lawn, which may be of particular concern to equestrian users where there is potential for ground damage, as confirmed by users of the path in support of this application.
33. In terms of amenity, the existing route provides views across a private garden and associated domestic features. The proposed route, by contrast, offers a more rural setting, being enclosed by trees and hedgerows with a view of Restrop Farm but from a distance which reduces any perception of intrusion into private property which maybe more intensely felt due to its isolated location, as confirmed by the Defra guidance: *"Members of the public may not be comfortable following a path through a contained space [such as a private garden] because doing so feels like infringing on the privacy of a house owner ... Such path alignments can deter people from exercising the public's right to use the path. ... People are used to walking past a house along an adjacent road or pavement, and this feels acceptable because they are clearly outside its visible domain. The degree of proximity can also make a difference."* The proposed route is a clear and obvious track out of the garden, providing clarity of route and

avoiding any intrusion on the home.

34. The public rights of way network is historic in nature, however the network has evolved over time through legal mechanisms to divert, extinguish and create paths, where requirements on land have changed. The landscape at Restrop Farm has changed over time. The extinguishment and creation of PURT104 will have no direct impact on the features of the landscape at this location but is in consequence of the changes already made over time. The section of PURT104 to be extinguished is currently situated through what is clearly used as a garden as previously discussed. It is noted that the character of the section through the garden, which was previously a sunken lane, has been irrevocably altered, it has been levelled and cleared so that it is indistinguishable from the rest of the lawn. However once past the garden the sunken lane retains its historic character, this section is not part of the extinguishment and creation proposal. The Defra presumption guidance specifically deals with the extinguishment of historic paths, acknowledging that there should be a reasonable expectation for a landowner to be able to relax in their garden in private, even if the path has existed for centuries.
35. Again, under Section 26 of the Highways Act 1980, the authority may also take into account provisions for compensation for parties with an interest in the land. The bridleway to be created is on land owned by the applicants, as a result it is considered that no claims for compensation will be received.

36. **Consideration of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan**

When confirming public path extinguishment and creation orders, the Council or the Secretary of State may take into account the material provisions of the rights of way improvement plan (ROWIP), prepared by the local highway authority, in this case the Wiltshire Council *“Wiltshire Countryside Access Improvement Plan 2015 – 2025 Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2” (CAIP)* Within the plan at 4.1 on page 16 the Council recognises that considering the needs of those with mobility impairments is a statutory responsibility and Policy number 7 Gaps, Gates and Stiles recognises that the authority must consider the needs of those with mobility impairments when managing rights of way and access and that this requirement particularly applies when authorising structures (e.g. stiles and gates) on rights of way and seeking improvements to existing structures to make access easier. There will be no additional furniture on the proposed route. The route is a clearly definable, wide, grass track, following a broadly similar trajectory and has, in practice, been used by members of the public in preference to the existing route.

37. In the production of the CAIP, a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the countryside access network, was undertaken with user groups who recognised the following (Appendix 8, page 19 of Appendices):

- *The network is largely historic and although it has evolved, in places it does not meet the present and likely future needs of users and potential users.*

The landscape at Restrop Farm has evolved and PURT104 is currently situated in close proximity to the home of Restrop Farm which affects the privacy of the

property. The making of a public path extinguishment order PURT104 and creation order of PURT104 ensures that the situation on the ground is correctly reflected within the definitive map and statement

38. Regard to the needs of agriculture, forestry and conservation of biodiversity

The path to be created was installed many years ago and is used by the public with no adverse comments having been received regarding the effect of the proposed footpath extinguishment and creation, on agriculture and forestry.

39. Several issues are raised in the objections that are not relevant to the legal test for s.118 and s.26 and are addressed in paragraphs 40 and 41:
40. Objectors raise concern that the applicant knew about PURT104 before they bought the property. However, arguments that when a landowner buys a property in full knowledge of the existence of a right of way and therefore should not be able to alter it were considered in *Ramblers Association v SSEFRA Oxfordshire County Council and Weston* EWHC 3333 (Admin) Case No. CO/457/2012. It confirms that there is no statutory bar to a person making an application in such circumstances. Requirements on land where rights of way are situated can change therefore there are legal mechanisms in place to divert public rights of way within highway law, Highways Act 1980 and planning law, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
41. Objectors state that the applicant knowingly incorporated the right of way into the garden area. The landowner states they were instructed to clear the public right of way of obstruction following the public inquiry in November 2012 where a more extensive diversion of PURT104 was determined. It is clear that the section of PURT104 to be diverted, has been substantially altered, the sunken lane through the garden has been levelled to the same height as the surrounding land and the vegetation has been cleared. The path is now routed across a domestic lawn and past children's play equipment; therefore, the distinct character of the route has been irrevocably changed. The extinguishment and creation of PURT104 will have no direct impact on the features of the landscape at this location.
42. In summary, the current route is through a garden and past children's play equipment affecting the privacy and security of the property. Should the extinguishment order be successful there would clearly be a need to create this proposed bridleway to retain the connectivity for the network. The proposed route was installed as an alternative to the definitive route by the landowner a number of years ago, it runs through similar grass terrain, and inclination as the current route. The route is away from the home resolving any potential sense of intrusion for the user and avoids the garden area. Therefore; officers believe that the legal tests for the making and confirmation of both concurrent orders have been met.

Overview and Scrutiny Engagement

43. Overview and scrutiny engagement is not required in this case.

Safeguarding Considerations

44. There are no safeguarding considerations associated with the confirmation these Orders.

Public Health Implications

45. There are no identified public health implications which arise from the confirmation of these Orders.

Corporate Procurement Implications

46. In the event these Orders are forwarded to the SoSEFRA there are a number of potential requirements for expenditure that may occur, and these are covered in paragraphs 50, 51 and 52 of this report.

Environmental and Climate Change Impact of the Proposal

47. There are no environmental or climate change concerns associated with the confirmation of these Orders. This is wholly rural and recreational route and is unlikely to form any part of a sustainable transport route now or in the future.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

48. Issues with accessibility have been addressed in the report at paragraph 36.

Risk Assessment

49. There are no identified risks which arise from the confirmation of these Orders. The financial and legal risks to the Council are outlined in the “Financial Implications” and “Legal Implications” sections below.

Financial Implications

50. The applicant has agreed to pay all of the Council’s costs associated with the making of these Orders, with the advertisement of the confirmed Orders and with the creation of the new path (works which have been completed). However, Wiltshire Council is not empowered to charge the applicant any costs related to forwarding the application to the SoSEFRA for confirmation by the Planning Inspectorate and accordingly will have to fund these from existing rights of way budgets. Where an application for an Order is refused no costs are payable by the applicant.
51. Where there are outstanding objections to the making of these Orders, the Committee may resolve that Wiltshire Council continues to support the making and confirmation of these Orders. The Orders will then be determined by the Planning Inspectorate by way of written representations, local hearing or local public inquiry, all of which have a financial implication for the Council. If the case is determined by written representations the cost to the Council is negligible; however, where a local hearing is held the costs to the Council are estimated to be around £200 and no legal representation is required and £3,000 to £5,000 where the case is determined by local public inquiry with legal representation.

52. There are no costs associated with the Council resolving to abandon these Orders though the decision may be subject to judicial review and the Council may incur associated costs as a result of that action (see Legal Implications below).

Legal Implications

53. Where the Council does not support confirmation of the making of these Orders and resolves to abandon it, clear reasons for this must be given and must relate to the legal tests contained within Sections 118 and 26 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant may seek judicial review of the Council's decision if the process followed is seen as incorrect. The cost for this may be up to £50,000.

Options Considered

54. Members may resolve that:
- (i) The Orders are forwarded to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation as made.
 - (ii) The Orders are forwarded to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation with modifications.
 - (iii) The Orders are revoked and abandoned.

Reason for Recommendation

55. Unless the objections are withdrawn the Orders must be forwarded to the SoSEFRA for determination.
56. It is considered that in this case the legal tests have been met for the confirmation of the public path extinguishment and creation Orders under Section 118 and 26 of the Highways Act 1980.
57. The proposed extinguishment and creation Orders also meet other considerations which the Council must take into account such as the provisions of the ROWIP, the Equalities Act 2010 and the needs of agriculture, forestry and biodiversity.

Recommendation

58. That The Wiltshire Council Parish of Purton Path 104 (part) Extinguishment and Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2025, and concurrently The Wiltshire Council Parish of Purton Bridleway 104 (part) Creation and Definitive Map and Statement Modification Order 2025, be forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, with the recommendation that they be confirmed as made.

Chris Clark
Head of Local Highways

Report Author:
Ali Roberts
Definitive Map Officer

Appendices:

- APPENDIX A.** The made Orders and Order Plans showing the existing route and proposed change.
- APPENDIX B.** Representations and objections to the made orders
- APPENDIX C.** Representations and objections comments to the made orders and officer response
- APPENDIX D** PL/2025/09645 Certificate of Lawful Use, Existing Use – Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 191 (as amended by Section 10 of the Planning & Compensation Act 1991)