

**From:** [annnmiles](#)  
**To:** [Roberts, Ali](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Highways Act 1980 S.118 S.26 - PURT104  
**Sent:** 21/10/2025 19:24:23

---

Dear Ali,

I oppose the decision to close Purton 104 Mud Lane.

- 1) The footpath runs through agricultural land and not a garden. Therefore the Defra guidance does not apply.
- 2) It is an ancient right of way with great historical value to the local community. To close this would negatively impact the enjoyment of the route.

Regards

Ann Miles

**From:** [annnmiles](#)  
**To:** [Roberts, Ali](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Diversion of Purton 104  
**Sent:** 16/07/2025 15:34:11

---

[REDACTED]  
Dear Ali,

I am writing to object to the proposal to divert Purton 104 right of way.

At the time of purchase the owner was fully aware that this ancient right of way went along the side of the property. The owner made a decision to extend the garden and would be aware that the RoW would be included in the new garden. The owner has removed a significant number of Trees and hedgerow from Mud Lane. Therefore, by their own doing, has made the property more visible.

The alleged activities at The Camp cannot be solely linked to Purton 104 as many RoW, including the permissive path, lead to this area.

As a regular walker in this area I have never witnessed any anti social behaviour.

I have been put off using Purton 104 due to its poor maintenance and this should not be a reason to divert the route.

Regards

Ann Miles

Sent from my Galaxy