

## Duly made objections and representations

## Objections

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
1	<p><i>“Extremely disappointed that yet again Wiltshire Council has failed to stick up for public highways, ancient footpaths and traditional rights of way” “I do object to the order, and I’m happy to have that registered. It does seem that Wiltshire Council is particularly comfortable with putting transient landowner wishes above the rights of public rights of way users. The point of footpath/highway law is that it is supposed to act above the interest of a particular landowner, who can of course sell up and move at any time. Public rights of way, particularly those on ancient, traditional paths, should remain in perpetuity. They exist where they are for historic reasons and should not be moved on a whim, especially when so many people have opposed the diversion.</i></p> <p><i>The other issue, when so many rights of way are moved as they are in Wiltshire, is that most people work from OS maps, which get updated on an infrequent basis. It is wholly unreasonable to expect everyone (local or visitor) to consult definitive maps at County Hall. While diversion notices exist for a few months – perhaps, dependent on weather – the confusion exists for many years. I’ve come across umpteen paths in the last few years that have been weather closed , but no signage exists to explain the closure, or diverted, again with no signage. It’s all very poor – and the whole experience of this diversion reinforces the general feeling that Wiltshire Council works harder for rich people than it does for normal council taxpayers.”</i></p>			YES	This objector expresses an appreciation of the historic value of rights of way remaining on their original course and also highlights practical problems that arise with diversions in the short and medium term.
2	<p><i>“I am in receipt of yours of 11 December, concerning the diversion of an ancient highway at Baydon. Whilst it is, in my view, unfortunate that the public are to be turned out of a good part of the ancient track to suit a private whim it is quite unacceptable that the public should be forced to accept an alternative that is narrower than the original. Or, at least that is what appears to be the case, if I am not mistaken.</i></p> <p><i>Now in attending to the landowners desires has the highway authority taken any action to abate the obstruction of the bridleway leading south from point B on the order plan? When I was last in the area this bridleway was inaccessible from either end. One would hope that the diversion of route B-C-D is conditional on the bridleway south of B being returned to public use. I would be most grateful if you could come back to me on this one.”</i></p>	YES		YES	<p>This objector highlights the fact that the proposed new route is narrower than the original.</p> <p>The second route referred to is obstructed but is the subject of an application to divert.</p>

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
3	<p><i>"You may recall that in response to your consultation dated 20 June 2013, offering a new restricted byway along the route A – E – D with a width of 5 metres, I replied to the effect that the width offered was less than generous, bearing in mind the width of the existing route.</i></p> <p><i>In the days when all vehicles were horse drawn, a width of at least 20 feet (6.1 metres) would have been required for a new road. The proposed reduction from five metres to 4.1 metres and 2.6 metres is unacceptable.</i></p> <p><i>Consequently, I object to the Orders on the grounds that the width proposed for the route A – E – D is inadequate for a restricted byway, and that the alternative route for the length C – E is unreasonably long.</i></p>	YES			<p>The original consultation had suggested 5 metres as a desirable width and this was upheld in the Council's original decision but owing to the constraints of existing buildings and land ownership the applicant was only prepared to offer the widths given in the Order.</p>
4	<p><i>"1. The statutory notice is defective. It says that objections should be sent to a particular address "above", but that address does not give the postcode. It is impossible to send a recorded delivery letter to an address without a postcode and, in any event, an address without a postcode is not a valid and complete postal address. I am sending this objection to you instead.</i></p> <p><i>2. The diversion as drafted results in an unacceptable loss of an ancient and direct through route for the public. Passengers approaching point B from the south, and heading northwards via point E, will be obliged to go via point A: a long and unattractive diversion, essentially duplicating the facility of the route up to point A from the south.</i></p> <p><i>3. The order proposes a new section of restricted byway with a width of 8'6". This is much too narrow to allow horse drawn vehicles to meet and pass in contra-direction.</i></p>	YES		YES	<p>The omission of a postcode for Wiltshire Council is unlikely to have prejudiced anyone and is not considered to be fatal to the order.</p> <p>Anyone approaching point B from the south intending to travel to E would face a more lengthy journey (approx. 110 metres). However, the route merging at A is a more likely route for people to use and here their journey would not be longer.</p> <p>A width restriction of 2.6 metres would make it impossible for horse drawn vehicles to pass and difficult for horses and cyclists to pass.</p>
5	<p><i>"I have only been resident in Baydon for 8 years, but I think this still gives me the right to voice my opinion to the planned changes of the village footpaths and our rights of way. I myself and the rest of my family, as well as many other villagers, enjoy walking around all of the paths, both in and around Baydon. These rights of way have been laid down way before any of the present residents of Baydon House ever lived there, or even in this country. Although they have made a very good contribution to the livelihood of the village, they should respect all aspects of the village and its residents and their rights.</i></p> <p><i>Contd overleaf</i></p>			YES	

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
5	<p><i>Contd</i>  <i>"These rights of way must have been taken into account by the owners of Baydon House Farm when they bought the property, and therefore accepted the rights of way. It seems that all too often, things have to change for the minority and their needs, instead of respecting the majority and their rights.</i></p> <p><i>I for one can't see how the changes are going to help anyone in or around Baydon. Rather the opposite in fact. Preservation of long standing footpaths are a must, even though it may seem a tiny inconvenience for the residents of Baydon, to the proposer of the change. Change the route of these paths, and what is next?</i></p> <p><i>The owner of Baydon House Farm had intended to close off a right of way by putting a iron gate and fence across the entrance of this track, until it was brought to their attention of the right of way for all members of the public. Was this an oversight of the owners, or maybe ignorance of other people's rights?!</i></p> <p><i>Keep the paths open and exactly the way they have been all this time. Many rights, rules and regulations of this country and its people have been disrespected over the years, so don't let this start to happen in Baydon or any other village and surrounding countryside."</i></p>				
6	<p><i>"How sad that the village of Baydon and surrounding villages find themselves under siege again from landowners who think when they move to this part of the world they can change these ancient rights of way to suit themselves. These rights of way have been in use since time itself, they need to be preserved for future generations. The public should be able to use them and enjoy the countryside. It should not be the new landowners who think that they can do what they want when they want, aided and abetted by the weak kneed Parish and County Councils.</i></p> <p><i>The planning permission obtained is part of the right of way, so if this portion of it is closed and a 400 metre detour is put into place, it will not be used by the public in general, as it will not be a viable alternative.</i></p> <p><i>How this landowner got planning permission to build on a right of way I do not know. There is something very sinister going on. This will probably make this landowners property even more valuable if he can keep the public out."</i></p>			YES	Considers that a 400 metre detour is unacceptable and that use will diminish.
7	<p><i>"I oppose and object to this further infringement on our right of way. The proposed change does nothing to enhance the village of Baydon and is yet another encroachment by the land owners to grab what they can. I will be engaging with the Institute of Public Rights of Way to help fight this proposed change. There is extremely strong feeling from some residents and a feeling of inevitability from others who feel that we can do nothing about this proposed change."</i></p>			YES	

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
8	<p><i>"I often use this right of way when riding or running out of the village down to Aldbourne. I feel moving this right of way people will use the road to walk on more often. I can see why the owners of Baydon House would want this path moved but they knew about this when they purchased the house."</i></p>				<p>Considers it will discourage use.</p>
9	<p><i>"I strongly object to the changes to the Rights of Way in Baydon around Baydon House Farm. I have used this for over 50 years and now that I am retired I use it every other week. Right (of way) should be protected for us and generations to come. I can see no need whatsoever to change what has been in use since time itself. These new landowners think they can do what they like and it seems to me that get away with an awful lot. They pay no heed to local people and their needs and wishes. Then they sell up and go, leaving the countryside scarred. When Baydon House Farm was purchased these rights of way were there. Why buy it?"</i></p>			<p>YES</p>	
10	<p><i>"I object to this Order. The only part of the Order I object to is the diversion removing rights over E to C. Approx 55 m E to C is being replaced with an approx 300 m loop to get to same point. I would not object to a similar proposal, with direct footpath from E to B, even if this was via gate/style. Or diversion of Right of Way running South from C to the West of Elm Cottage, rather East of Keeper's Cottage.</i></p> <p><i>I have no objection to diversion A – D via E rather than current via B. However I understand there is a footpath running from point B southwards to meet up with 'Preston Bridleway' some quarter mile south of point A. This is not shown on the plan. Have the rights to this path already been extinguished, or does it exist and someone seen fit to exclude it from this plan? If this path does still exist in statute then I object to the PPO as it will cut off 1 end of this path, making it useless.</i></p> <p><i>It currently is an attractive part of a circular route from Baydon, and would be lost if proposal is accepted."</i></p>				
11	<p><i>"I'd like to let you know that I have concerns over the diversions to the footpaths. One of the reasons my wife and I moved to Baydon was the nice country walks. We use these footpaths most weekend, especially in the summer. Please don't re-route them."</i></p>			<p>YES</p>	
12	<p><i>"With reference to proposed footpath changes around Baydon House Farm I would like to object to these changes. Baydon House Farm was built knowing there was an existing right of way past it, I feel there is no advantage to the village to change their route in fact the opposite. Other close public footpaths are almost impassable by foot due to their being used by land owners quad vehicles for farm activities and I feel this would happen here. It isn't in the land owners interest to make a muddy mess as the pathways are now. The only advantage I can see is for the landowner whose property will dramatically increase in value due to there being no public access past its drive way anymore.</i></p> <p><i>Contd overleaf</i></p>		<p>YES</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Considers that soft surfaced paths would become difficult to use as a result of other use.</p>

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
12	<p><i>Contd</i></p> <p><i>Also I'd like to point out damage and missing signage for public rights of way. I've noticed signs have been uprooted at their entrance where gateways have been made. They appear to go missing after a period of time and not replaced,</i></p> <p><i>I have walked many Baydon routes over the last twenty years so I know of their existence however many new villagers would assume they don't exist."</i></p>				
13	<p><i>"The rediversion of the footpath and rights of way are strongly opposed by myself as they are of historic importance to the village, they are old sheep droves between the villages and farms in the area.</i></p> <p><i>If any part becomes closed is this the thin end of the wedge to get it all closed?"</i></p>			YES	
14	<p><i>"I would like to register my objection to the proposals regarding the rights of way 2 &amp; 11 in Baydon.</i></p> <p><i>These right of way have been used by many local residents for many generations. To divert them will benefit no-one (other than the current landowner). Indeed, I would suggest it will lead to less public use of these pleasurable paths due to the convoluted nature of the diversions.</i></p> <p><i>I would also add that the walking/riding surfaces of the diversions are inferior to the current routes particularly with such inclement weather as we've had recently.</i></p> <p><i>Finally I would like to ask how a planning application can be approved if it impacts a public right of way?"</i></p>		YES	YES	Considers use would diminish as the new routes are convoluted.
15	<p><i>"Please record my strong objections to this proposal.</i></p> <p><i>First and foremost paths 2 and 11 are very close to the centre of Baydon and are easily accessible by all villagers. For this reason no diversion or alterations should be made if they detract from the convenience or enjoyment of using them.</i></p> <p><i>This Order includes a proposal to extinguish approximately a 20 metre length from the middle of path 11 and replace it with a 200 metre diversion to the west of Aldbourne road and then return 200 metres east back to path 11. These two diversionary legs are essentially parallel and barely 20 metres apart.</i></p> <p><i>This is an absurd diversion – we will have to walk or ride a further 400 metres to arrive back at essentially the same place. The leg A – B will be so unpopular that it will not be used nor will that part of Path 11 going south from point B. If this happens then the landowner will have little difficulty in securing extinguishment of the southern end of path 11 through lack of use which is clearly what he is trying to achieve."</i></p> <p><i>Contd overleaf</i></p>			YES	<p>Considers diversions are less convenient.</p> <p>Considers that by moving buildings a few metres they could be built without moving the rights of way.</p> <p>Considers that the building plans were diverted deliberately to require the movement of rights of way.</p> <p>Considers that the diminishing of the historical context will have a wide ranging adverse effect.</p>

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
15	<p><i>Contd</i></p> <p><i>“This Order is being made to meet the requirements of recent planning permission E/2013/0170/FUL for Baydon House Farm which cannot go ahead unless Paths 2 and 11 are diverted. However, what is evident to anybody walking these paths, is that there is ample room elsewhere on the landowner’s property for the proposed buildings to be sited so as not to impinge on any of the Rights of Way. Indeed only a 10 metre shift of the proposed building across Path 11 is all that is necessary to ensure that the path need not be re-routed. If it appears that the planning permission is being used as convoluted means of achieving removal of all Rights of way from the vicinity of the landowners house.</i></p> <p><i>In summary I request that you reject this Order because of the unacceptable diversion of Path 11 which would detract from the enjoyment and convenience of what could be a very popular recreation route. This Order is to the benefit of one family only in the village namely the landowner. Every other person in the village or indeed elsewhere will lose out because they will no longer be able to walk where previous generations could hundreds of years before. If this Order is approved it is highly likely that another part of Baydon 11 will be extinguished soon after.”</i></p>				
16	<p><i>“As longstanding residents of Baydon who use this path frequently, please note our opinion on the above proposal.</i></p> <p><i>1. We believe that these changes will restrict accessibility due to the surface type. The current path past the houses is hardcore or concrete and the proposed path is grass and mud. As we have used the path for prams, pushchairs, wheelchairs and bicycles over the years we are concerned that this will no longer be possible because of the churned up muddy nature of the new path.</i></p> <p><i>2. Making it a restricted byway will add to the compromised surface as we are already seeing with the use of quad bikes and particularly with the recent wet weather.</i></p> <p><i>3. This proposal appears to put the needs of the homeowner and landowner above those of the community and restricts accessibility across a range of needs, i.e. disabled, elderly and the young.</i></p> <p><i>I can confirm that this is an objection. In addition we would like to comment having walked the route today, that the hardcore recently added to a section of the path is now disintegrating and will clearly need frequent maintenance and the area at each end of the proposed path remain impassable due to mud. The area at the Aldbourne Road end is particularly dangerous as it is slippery and includes a steep slope down to the road.”</i></p>		YES		Considers surface is inferior and will restrict accessibility.

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
17	<p><i>"I strongly object to this further change in local pathways around our village it should also not be reviewed in isolation but in conjunction with PPO enquiry 2013/16 relative to path 11. Both applications should be refused.</i></p> <p><i>This application is just another step along the property owners stealth plan to eradicate all of the historical paths around the village that cross their lands, it should not be allowed.</i></p> <p><i>As a resident of 33 years standing I have with many of my neighbours used local paths 2 and 11 over the years. Previous changes have been allowed on path 11 against the wishes of the locals; the parish council being negligent in not fully opposing these changes in the past.</i></p> <p><i>The applicants were aware of these pathways before they purchased their properties and are cynically having them altered and closed for their own financial gain. In fact path 11 by their own admission was subvertly closed by previous owners of the cottages; an alternative around the side of Keepers Cottage garden has also been made almost impossible by the recent building and overgrowing beech hedge.</i></p> <p><i>The owners of Baydon House Farm (the applicants) have a history of flaunting planning regulations by building first and submitting planning applications retrospectively.</i></p> <p><i>I could make multiple other detailed points on the two applications if requested but the issue is clear there is no benefit to the village or residents and historical footpaths and bridleways should be kept.</i></p> <p><i>To repeat I strongly object to this application."</i></p>			YES	
18	<p><i>"Having reviewed the proposed changes by these 2 new ROW PPOs, I wholly object to the planned changes.</i></p> <p><i>A few months ago, my family and I cycled from Baydon centre towards Baydon House Farm and then onwards along bridleway 2 &amp; 11, southbound, towards Aldbourne. At the time, there was already a change to the established bridleway and we all deemed that the diversion that was in place (and will become permanent with this PPO) was inappropriate. It is with this in mind that I oppose the changes and request that the diversion that is currently in place be removed and the original bridleway be reinstated."</i></p>				Considers the diversion is inappropriate.

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
19	<p><i>"We have already raised objections to the proposed diversion of the paths referred to above in a previous letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> August which we trust will be presented to the Council and given due consideration. We have also attached a copy of the previous letter to our email.</i></p> <p><i>Firstly we would like to repeat our main objection to the diversion in that the proposed replacement Route A – E – D is neither the same width nor the surface as the current right of way.</i></p> <p><i>The current right of way is 5 meters wide as specified in your original letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> June 2013 but the alternative is 4.1 metres at the widest point and in some parts only 2.6 metres wide. Part 1 of the schedule attached to the order gives the length of the current right of way but omits to give the width so that a comparison can be made. The current right of way is a hard well drained surface, the alternative is not.</i></p> <p><i>For the reasons given above we believe the proposed alternative right of way does not meet the condition as specified in paragraph 2 of the order.</i></p> <p><i>Our other concern is that, bearing in mind that thee unaffected right of way shown on the map south of the junction at B and C is blocked, the closure of the middle of path 11 from C to D makes the right of way between A and B unusable as it will go nowhere and become unused and eventually will also be closed.</i></p> <p><i>We trust the Council will give serious and due consideration to our objections."</i></p> <p><i>Letter dated 11.08.13 submitted with the above:</i>  <i>"Having already contacted you about this at the beginning of July I was advised that I would be notified when a rights of way office was appointed to this case, but I am concerned that I have heard nothing since then so am writing to voice my concerns and to point out that other residents of Baydon will not have the opportunity to voice their concerns before the time to raise objections has expired which I understand to be August 16<sup>th</sup> 2013.</i></p> <p><i>Before it is too late I would like to object strongly to the proposed diversion of parts of Baydon paths 2 and 11. I have been provided with a letter sent to one of my neighbours by yourselves with a reference SM/2013/15 and 16 BAYD 2/11 along with location plans which my comments below refer to:</i></p> <p><i>Firstly I refer to the proposed changes to route E – C (Baydon 11 part) and C – D (Baydon 2 part) being replaced with route A – E – D. The proposed replacement route A – E – D has already been created and it is plainly obvious it is neither the same width nor surface as the current right of way or as specified in the letter as being 5 metres wide and a hard well drained surface." Contd overleaf</i></p>	YES	YES		<p>Considers the surface and the width to be inferior to the existing.</p>



No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
19	<p><i>Contd</i>  <i>"The current right of way has a hard well drained surface and is wide enough to allow large agricultural vehicles to gain access to the various farm lands surrounding Baydon village.</i>  <i>The effects of the loss of this access as plainly felt when the current right of way was blocked for some time and large agricultural vehicles were forced through the village and down unsuitable alternative routes to gain access to the farm lands that have been accessed for many years via the current right of way.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly I refer to the proposed changes to routes A – B – C (Baydon 2 part) and route B – F – H (Baydon 11 part).</i></p> <p><i>At best the existing route which is currently blocked illegally should be reopened but at worst the alternative path, if one has to be provided, should follow the route of the existing path as far as possible. This could be achieved by way of a small diversion around the site of the blockage allowing the walk from B to H via F to still be enjoyed. The replacement so called circular walk is not circular it is simply a straight walk along one side of a hedge/tree row and would be a very poor alternative.</i></p> <p><i>The letter I have been passed a copy of states that comments are invited by August 16<sup>th</sup> 2013 and I am concerned that the proposed changes will be pushed through without allowing enough time for the residents of Baydon to be properly informed about the proposed changes and then to consider and raise any objections they may have.</i></p> <p><i>These rights of way have been in place for centuries and the removal of them should not be carried out lightly or without proper consideration is at all"</i></p>				
20	<p><i>"Further to previous correspondence relative to the proposed diversion of Baydon Bridleway 2. I first visited this location on behalf of Wiltshire Bridleways Association on Mon 5 Aug 2013 when I submitted a report to the committee reflecting that the proposed route A – E - D as marked on the map was well fenced and had an even grass surface. The width was a regular 4 metres with the exception of a strip of approximately 45 metres behind the barn where it was reduced to a width of between 2 and 5 metres (GR280775). On the basis of that information, Wiltshire Bridleways Association supported the application. On Sun 19 Jan 2014 I again visited the area and noted that from the narrowed strip behind the barn and continuing south for a total distance of approximately 200 metres to the point where the diversion rejoins the original bridleway 2, the grass surface has been changed to a layer of planings or similar material, of no more than 2 metres wide. Within a reasonable period of time it is expected that this will grass over and develop a good well drained riding surface. However, Wiltshire Bridleways Association believe that having exited from behind the barn, the width should be returned to the full proposed 4 metres. With the exception of the width change WBA remain supportive of the diversion.</i></p>	YES			Although the surface is acceptable the width is insufficient and should be 4 metres.

## Representations

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
1	<p><i>"Ramblers have no objection to the Order diverting sections of these paths along the route A – E – X – Y – D.</i></p> <p><i>We are pleased to note that you have not made an order supporting the landowner's request to divert the remainder of Baydon 11 along the route A – G – K shown on the map attached to your letter dated 20 June. As you know we objected to that proposed diversion and suggested an alternative route. Since the path is currently obstructed to south of point B and also between points F and G, could you please let me know the current state of your negotiations with the landowner to resolve this situation."</i></p>				
2	<p><i>"I have lived in Baydon since August 2000, have used the existing paths on a regular basis, and want to express my support for the changes – the views from the new paths are much improved, safety of the many runners, cyclists and horse riders using this path is much improved (by not rerouting the path through the yard where tractors and machinery have been seen in operation). My only hope is that others within the village realise the benefits that the revised route brings and how it enhances our village."</i></p>				Considers views and safety are improved.
3	<p><i>"I am completely in favour of this diversion. It is safer, almost the same length, offers better views of adjacent farm animals and those across the valley when walking south east.</i></p> <p><i>One question: - why is it being upgraded to a restricted byway whereas the existing route is shown as a bridleway on the OS map? Also it will enable Mr B Johnson to improve the security of his yard following incidents of burglary in the barn area."</i></p>				Considers views and safety are improved.
4	<p><i>"As a villager who has walked and ridden the public paths in Baydon for 35 years I wish to say I love the new alternative footpath behind the stables in Payne's Lane – a real improvement to the walk through the yard! I walk this 2 to 3 times a week.</i></p> <p><i>The new path to the right I walk less frequently because the loop is quite short and I have to retrace my steps (which I don't like doing) but it does avoid some of the mud along Greenhills if I wish to continue along the lane. As the path passing the cottage has been inaccessible for all of my 35 years here I surely won't miss it."</i></p> <p><i>"I wish to say that I am happy with the diverting order for Baydon path 2 (part) and Path 11 (part) as shown on your map. However I am confused as to why you have decided to retain the path passing from the cottage B to F yet not Path 11 from E to C. Your original letter (20 June 2013) had a far better solution showing an alternative path from A to G. A strange little loop but preferable to b to F which has been inaccessible for years."</i></p>				Considers the new route an improvement.

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
5	<p><i>"I run a large equestrian property in Baydon and have lived in this village for the last 15 years. Our riders and grooms all use the bridleways in the area often on a daily basis and on both experienced and inexperienced competition horses.</i></p> <p><i>We have read the notices placed by the council around Baydon House Farm indicating the diversions and have tried all the pathways including behind the large barns and also west of the cottages. From both a personal and professional perspective, the new diversions are a huge improvement (particularly the areas avoiding tractors and machinery and the length of the driveway) and we support the suggested diversion fully.</i></p> <p><i>With reference to the route behind the cottages, this route has never been available and is not safe or helpful to horse riders. An extinguishment would seem appropriate although I understand the Council was not prepared to do this? The diversion suggested by the sins to the west of the cottage seems a bonus to the village. We therefore support this diversion too."</i></p>				Considers the new route an improvement.
6	<p><i>"I wrote to you last year against the extinguishment of footpaths near Baydon House Farm, and suggesting ways in which the loss of these footpaths could be ameliorated. I have seen recent proposals to divert these footpaths and am very pleased that they address in a satisfactory manner the comments I then made. I have also walked the new paths and have found the quality of the work done to divert the paths of a very high standard, not only in the surface provided but also in the planting which allows wide views across the adjacent farmland as well as being attractive in itself. It seems to me to be a model of balancing the safety and security needs of working farms with the recreational needs of the villagers and visitors. I made similar comments at the recent meeting of the parish council and would like to repeat them formally to you. In particular the proposed diversion footpath paralleling the deeply rutted byway is a vast improvement for the section it covers: I just hope it will one day be extended to Green Hill Trees."</i></p> <p><i>"Having previously objected to proposals to extinguish footpaths in the area of Baydon House Farm I write to you to notify you that I am in agreement with the above diversion order. Having walked the new paths I am happy that the changes improve recreational walking around Baydon while improving the safety of farm workers at Paynes Farm/Baydon House Farm. The new path around the barns to the top of Payne's path has been very well constructed and provides good views across the farm land."</i></p>				Considers this is a good example of balancing farm safety with recreational needs.
7	<p><i>"I'm writing in support of the diverted footpaths at Baydon House Farm. I run round Baydon frequently and find them far safer, better under foot, better views and easier to navigate round."</i></p>				Considers new routes safer, better under foot and easier to navigate round.

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
8	<p><i>"I write to you to express my support for the path/bridleway applications that have been made at Baydon House Farm. I have lived in the village for over 30 years many of those experienced on horseback when working for two village based race horse trainers. I know all the foot/bridlepaths that surround the village very well and have recently ridden the new alternative path at Baydon House farm I am suitably impressed. The new path not only rides well but also for walkers with or without dogs provides a wide safe firm track which also is more pleasant view wise than the existing one which had gone through the farm yard.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the alternative route proposed to allow access to the path that currently runs through the farm cottage/garden also I cannot see will cause any unnecessary inconvenience. I hope the council will consider these applications positively as Baydon is a lovely rural village to reside in and these alternative footpaths will only enhance village walks/rides."</i></p>				Considers new track has better views.
9	<p><i>"I write for a second time to show my support to the suggested new foot/bridlepath at/surrounding Baydon House Farm. The new diversion that runs behind Baydon House Barns is a great improvement for riders either accessing the Preston track of heading out towards Baydon Village itself. The new diversion offers a very suitable wide riding/walking track and does lend a great view when accessing it from Baydon Village end heading down the valley, my horse always stops to look and take in the broad view. The track is understandably safer than the previous option as you do not have to ride through a stable/farmyard with working machinery which can cause safety issues.</i></p> <p><i>With regard to the other path in discussion that currently runs through the farm cottage garden again I can see no negative reason why the alternative route offered should not be set in place. I wholly support both applications and encourage the council to look very favourably at these applications made."</i></p>				Considers the new track suitable and safer.
10	<p><i>"We would like to support the planning application in favour of Mr and Mrs. Johnson, we do use the new path on a very regular basis, we feel it is a much more user friendly path than the old one. We would like to give this matter our strongest support."</i></p>				Considers the new path is more user friendly.

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
11	<p><i>"On behalf of Baydon Parish Council following approved representation of the above order, heard in a public meeting held on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2014.</i></p> <p><i>Having considered the diversion request in detail and the facility provided to the parish by Baydon House Farm, the Parish Council can see no reason to object to the proposed order.</i></p> <p><i>We, the Parish Council reviewed the order and approved for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Improved safety for users of the diverted right of way.</i></li> <li><i>• Improved and safer surfaces.</i></li> <li><i>• Improved viewing for all users across Wiltshire countryside.</i></li> <li><i>• Planned new routes fulfilled the original objections due to a lack of loop.</i></li> <li><i>• The change of usage of the path from a route to a place of work (historically) to one of recreational use. Therefore there is no longer a need of a right of way through a farm yard.</i></li> <li><i>• Positive feedback from Baydon residents.</i></li> <li><i>• Positive feedback from some residents that originally objected, once they had seen the new changes.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Consideration was also taken into account and discussed, which was corrected in the meeting on certain 'negative flyers' that were posted within the village which were factually incorrect and misleading to residence. This was deemed unfair to the current owners of the land where the order has been placed and something that was out of their control."</i></p>				<p>Considers the new path is safer and has better views.</p> <p>Refers only to positive feedback from Baydon residents.</p>
12	<p><i>"I would positively like to support the proposed order for Baydon 1 &amp; 11. The reasons for this are because the improvements made are more suitable for walking with my family and safer all round. Thanks in advance for your consideration."</i></p>				<p>Considers the new route a safer walk.</p>
13	<p><i>"I am just dropping you a line as we went on a family walk around the suggested permissive route this week at the above farm and we fully support the diversions. It makes much more sense and is far safer as I am concerned, as a mother of a fast moving 2 year old girl."</i></p>				<p>Considers the new route a safer walk.</p>
14	<p><i>"Just a quick note to say I fully support the Baydon House Farms' application for the change of footpath, its far better."</i></p>				

No	Content	Width	Surface	Historic value	Officer's comments
15	<p><i>"I am writing to give you my views on the proposed diversion of bridleways 2 and 11 in Baydon (PPO 2013/15).</i></p> <p><i>I am a mother of a baby and I live in Baydon. I very much value, and regularly use, bridleways 2 and 11 as they currently stand. One of the main reasons for this is that the bridleways have surfaces suitable for use with a pushchair (mainly tarmac). There aren't many roads in Baydon with pavements, or other bridleways/ footpaths in Baydon with hard surfaces. I therefore use bridleways 2 and 11 regularly to take walks with my baby.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed diversionary routes are not hard-surfaced. They are just grass. In the winter, the paths are unpassable with a pushchair (even our 'off-road' model), because the ground is wet, very muddy, with long grass, and very churned up by horses. During the summer, I imagine that the paths will still be very difficult to use, because the churned up surface will set hard to become very uneven.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, while I don't object to the routes being diverted in principle, I feel strongly that they should be replaced like-for-like with hard surfaced paths, so that the village's available off-road paths for mothers and young children are not significantly diminished."</i></p>				<p>Considers that the new routes need to be better (hard) surfaced, like the old route.</p> <p>Considers that unless 'like for like' paths are provided available off road paths for mothers and young children may be significantly diminished.</p>
16	<p><i>"I am writing to say that I do not object to the proposed diversion of the footpaths around Baydon House Farm as I feel the new proposed route works as a better alternative."</i></p>				
17	<p><i>"I am writing to you on behalf of the Baydon Running Group, and would like to take this opportunity to tell you that we fully support the new footpath diversions that Mrs Johnson put on her land, and that we use them regularly on our weekly runs. (Something we would never have done with the original footpaths).</i></p> <p><i>They have been thoughtfully laid out, they do not impact unnecessarily on the local environment, and are in frequent use, not only by the runners, but also by dog walkers, walkers, and horse riders.</i></p> <p><i>We fully support the Johnsons application, and appreciate the hard work they have gone to, to provide practical, usable footpaths for the residents of Baydon.</i></p> <p><i>The Baydon runners (who have all agreed to have their names mentioned in this letter) are:</i></p> <p><i>Heather Birch, Paul Bartlett, Dawn Howell, Marissa Carter, Eric Ritchie Caroline Ritchie"</i></p>				

Objector number	Date received	Name	Address
1	10.12.13	Ffinlo Costain	12 Easterton Lane, Pewsey, SN9 5BP
2	13.12.13	Dave Tilbury	Oakbank Cottage, Oakbank Lane, Eastleigh, SO5 6AP
3	19.12.13	Bill Riley	141 Bath Road, Bradford on Avon, BA15 1SS
4	19.12.13	Alan Kind	45 The Fairway, Gosforth, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE3 5AQ
5	05.01.14	Michael Mears	8 Russley Green, Baydon, Wiltshire
6	05.01.14	Hilary Bradley	15 Kandahar, Aldbourne, Marlborough, SN8 2EE
7	06.01.14	Tony Routledge	18 Downsmead, Baydon, Wiltshire
8	05.01.14	Brian Billington	Finches Cottage, The Green, Baydon, SN8 2JW
9	06.01.14	Ken Bradley	15 Kandahar, Aldbourne, Marlborough, SN8 2EE
10	06.01.14	Steve Sutton	23 Downsmead, Baydon, SN8 2LQ
11	07.01.14	Ben Hughes	<a href="mailto:navyben@hotmail.com">navyben@hotmail.com</a>
12	06.01.14	Derrick Ody	<a href="mailto:Cody1455@btinternet.com">Cody1455@btinternet.com</a>
13	08.01.14	Colin Phillips	Swallowfield, Ermin Street, Baydon, SN8 2JF
14	09.01.14	Steve Furber	11 Newtons Walk, Baydon
15	09.01.14	Bernie Gribble	15 Ermin Close, Baydon, SN8 2LQ
16	10.01.14	Bridget Walker	Roman Way, Ermin Street, Baydon, SN8 2JP
17	12.01.14	David Hanley	Redroofs, Baydon, Marlborough, Wiltshire
18	10.01.14	Nick Berry	24 Downsmead, Baydon, SN8 2LQ
19	17.01.14	Mr and Mrs D Jukes	Tucumcari, Ermin Street, Baydon, SN8 2JF
20	20.01.14	Norman Beardsley, Wiltshire Bridleways Association	20 Coombe, Enford, Nr Pewsey, SN9 6DE
21	20.01.14	Allison Dobson	Becketts, Baydon, Marlborough, SN8 2HZ

## Representations

Representation number	Date received	Name	Address
1	21.12.14	Peter Gallagher, The Ramblers	10 Folkestone Road, Swindon, SN1 3NH
2	12.01.14	Kevin Howell	Pine Cottage, Aldbourne Road, Baydon, SN8 2HZ
3	13.01.14	Tony Prior	Challans, Ermin Street, Baydon, Marlborough, SN8 2JF
4	14.01.14	Barbara Furber	25 Downsmead, Baydon, SN8 2LQ
5	15.01.14	Alberto Giugni	Downs House, Baydon, SN8 2JS
6	15.01.14	Terry Ralph	46 Downsmead, Baydon, Marlborough, SN8 2LQ
7	15.01.14	Harriet Knowles	5 Fiveways, Baydon, SN8 2LH
8	16.01.14	A D Jenkins	5 Russley Green, Baydon, SN8 2LJ
9	16.01.14	Sue Bristow	5 Russley Green, Baydon, SN8 2LJ
10	15.01.14	Lee and Marie Hogan	Aldbourn Road, Baydon
11	17.01.14	Baydon Parish Council	5 Fiveways, Baydon, SN8 2LJ
12	18.01.14	Andrea Booth	The Cottage, Ermin Street, Baydon
13	18.01.14	Georgina Taylor	Downs House, Baydon, SN8 2JS
14	18.01.14	Matt Robinson	Downs House, Baydon, SN8 2JS
15	19.01.14	Pamela Withers	7 Newtons Walk, Baydon
16	20.01.14	Alie Plumstead	Barley Mead, Baydon, SN8 2HZ
17	21.01.14	Dawn Howell	Pine Cottage, Aldbourne Road, Baydon, SN8 2HZ

Compiled S Madgwick  
Rights of Way Officer  
13 February 2014