

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Roberts, Ali](#)
Subject: Highways Act 1980 S.119 - proposed diversion of Purton 104
Sent: 17/07/2025 22:50:03

[REDACTED]
Dear Ali,

I would like to object the application to divert Purton 104 right of way.

Firstly, the landowner was fully aware of the existence of this ancient right of way upon purchasing the property, it seems clear that the main reason for trying to get rid of the right of way is simply because they doesn't like its existence. I don't believe that this is cause for diversion.

The landowner has clearly allowed the right of way to become overgrown to attempt to discourage the public from using the route, this coupled with misleading signage of 'dangers' on the path has pushed people to use the permissive path, this is not reason to divert the original right of way.

Moving on to the alleged criminal activity, I personally do not see a correlation between the alleged activities and the right of way in question. I also do not see how the, again, alleged criminal activity at Ringsbury Camp can be attributed to the right of way, there are several other routes to the Camp, so diverting the route as a result of this is a completely irrelevant point.

The landowner made the decision to extend the garden and so the right of way is now in the new 'garden', additionally, by removing hedgerows from the right of way has in turn made the property more visible from the path. The fact that the agricultural land has been turned into someones garden area is not a reason to divert the original right of way.

I request that this application is refused, the so called issues are solely attributed to the landowners doing. To suggest that the issues are caused by the Purton walking community is a poor attempt to grab land and is frankly, entitled. It seems purely for personal gain/greed.

Regards

David Miles