Wayford Lodge Wayford, Norwich, Norfolk, NR12 9LL 17 April 2025

, Planning Officer (CC BA Planning Dept.) For the attn., of

Dear

Thank you for your email dated 9 April 2025 in response to my letter of objection to BA/2025/0047/FUL dated 19 March 2025.

As your email raises yet further issues which will need to be addressed, this letter will be confined to the failure of the applicant to serve Article 13 notices which correspond to items F, E (partial) and Note 2 from my letter of objection. Further correspondence will follow regarding the other points of objection, the applicants non-compliance with BA/2017/0268/FUL and the issues raised in your email.

With reference to the 'National requirements for validating a planning application' (located at https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/planningpermission/validation-checklist-

1#:~:text=Your%20application%20must%20be%20made%20up%20of%3A%201,compl eted%20planning%20application%20form%204%20The%20correct%20fee.), I quote the following passage from the 'Location plan' bullet point:

'The application site must be edged clearly with a red line. It should include all land necessary to carry out the proposed development – for example, land required for access to the site from a public highway, visibility splays, landscaping, car parking and open areas around buildings. A blue line must be drawn around any other land owned by the applicant, close to or adjoining the application site.'

This statement is also a partial copy of government guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#Plans-and-drawings) in compliance with The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

With reference to the Location Plan submitted with the proposal (Paul Robinson Partnership, 20/01/25, project 8627, drawing LP01 rev. B), as noted in my letter of objection:

- The red line does not include all land to carry out the proposed development (how will the spoil get from the mooring basin to the site to be deposited South-East on the plan? Hot Air Balloon? The excavators will need to operate outside the areas marked for the deposit of spoil.);
- The red line does not include the land required for access to the site from the public highway (A149);
- The red line does not include car parking (you concede in your email that moorings numbers will increase as a result of the proposal plus with the increase in staff numbers, more parking will be required); and
- the blue line only encompasses part of the site owned by the applicant.

Based on the above, to afford compliance with the aforementioned act:

- The Application Site (red line) should extend through the turning area owned by the Applicant (presently shown outside the blue line), then through the approximately 90 metres of private road owned by Mr & Mrs Roche (the Maltings) linking the Application Site with the A149.
- As the Application Site cannot be reached either by vehicle or on foot without traversing Mr & Mrs Roche's private road then an Article 13 notice must be served on them and Certificate B should be signed. Note that an Article 13 notice was served in this manner in application BA/2017/0268/FUL and BA/2018/0460/FUL.
- Now that the Application Site has been corrected, this leaves the red line now bordering the Wayford Bridge Yacht Station (my boatyard). Hence my expectation of receiving a letter to the Wayford Bridge Yacht Station notifying me of this application, as was the case with previous applications involving Wayford Marine.
- A Location Plan illustrating the Application Site showing the private road is on public record for application BA/2017/0268/FUL (dated stamped 28 July 2017).
- You will note that the guidance requires the Application Site to include car parking which, despite being required by the proposed usage, none is included within the red line as previously stated.
- The blue line on the Location Plan for the proposal affords absolutely no relation to the land owned by the Applicant. Large swathes of land owned by the Applicant lie outside the area (including the turning area abutting the private drive and mooring basin). For reference, the solid red line presented on the Location Plan for BA/2017/0268/FUL (referenced above) is generally accurate,

Correspondence from Alice Brown to (Broads Authority Planning) dated 17 April 2025.

- and acceptable for a Location Plan from our perspective as it is conformant with the deed plan for Wayford Marine (NK ).
- All members of the public (including planners, Development Managers and Agents) have access to deed plans which can be downloaded from the Land Registry. They are matter of public record. Enclosing a plan as you suggest is pointless as I would not expect a Planning Officer, Development Manager or Agent to accept one person's word regarding ownership without performing the necessary checks. Wayford Marine's deed reference is NK , my land to the North of the site is NK . Bearing in mind that the Agent is making a declaration that the information provided within the application is correct, after being notified that it is not, in light of the reed bed fiasco, one would of thought it might be prudent to make the necessary inquiries to avoid further embarrassment.
- For the record, Wayford Lodge is on the same side of the A149 as the Application Site. I find it extremely disturbing that your grasp of the local area is this deficient.
- The vast majority of the numbered boats on the Location Plan for the proposal lie outside of the blue line. This indicates that the applicant does not own the dykes / areas where these boats are moored. If this is true then an Article 13 Notice should have been served on the owner of the dykes in question.
- As stated in my objection, the blue line on the Location Plan for the proposed application extends into my field (NK ) located to the right-hand side of Wayford Marine's gateway looking North. This is glaringly obvious when you compare the blue line on the proposed Location Plan with the Location Plan submitted with application BA/2017/0268/FUL, date stamped 28 July 2017. I expect the Location Plan for the proposal to be corrected or an Article 13 notice served on myself without delay.
- Since Moonfleet Marine Ltd operate from the site, be it as a tenant or an owner of part of the site (the additional employees noted in this application relate to this business), surely they should have been served an Article 13 notice. Another reason why Certificate A is not appropriate in this instance.
- Should the Agent conclude incorrectly that there is nothing wrong with the blue line in the Location Plan for the proposal, perhaps they can explain why the Location Plan included in BA/2017/0268/FUL (despite matching the deed) is completely different?
- There is another issue relating to Article 13 here, but I will leave you to work that out for yourself.

I will refrain from thanking you in advance for ensuring the corrections are made to the application form with regard to Article 13 notices and the Location Plan. Compliance with the law is an expectation.

A copy of this letter and my objection has been placed online.

Kind Regards,



Alice Brown.

N.B. My name is Alice, not Alison as I was addressed in your email.