

Wayford Lodge  
Wayford, Norwich,  
Norfolk, NR12 9LL.  
19 March 2025

For the attn., of the Planning Department,  
Broads Authority.

**Planning Ref: BA/2025/0047/FUL**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to lodge my objection to planning application BA/2025/0047/FUL. My reasons for objection are as follows:

- A) The continued raising of the land by the current occupiers (without planning consent), exacerbated by the current proposals in which the deposit of spoil will further raise the last portion of land to the South-East boundary greatly increases the flood risk to my land and thus is in contravention of Policy DM17 (a).
- B) The application area required to receive spoil from the dredgings (a Reedbed) is required to accommodate the surface water from the additional boatshed by application BA/2017/0268/FUL. Hence, the reedbed was filled and the surface water drainage from the boat shed was re-routed without planning consent.
- C) If passed, the planning proposal would result in increased vehicular movements to the A149. No traffic survey data has been provided by the applicant and furthermore, Highways have not been consulted regarding these plans. To date, Policies DM23 and SSROADS have been completely ignored by both the Applicant and the Broads Authority.
- D) No additional visitor / short stay moorings are included within the proposal, necessary to comply with Policy DM33 (m).
- E) Whilst the Planning Application hints of 'access improvements', there is no specific detail regarding car parking for customers using these new moorings. The applicant has not provided evidence that DM24 has been complied with.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

F) Failure to Serve Article 13 Notice - With reference to the existing and proposed site layout plans, both the blue line to the North and vessel numbered 79 extends into my land. I have not been served an Article 13 notice regarding this.

Note 1) With reference to the size of the stern-on mooring excavation to be carried out I am unconvinced that the amount of spoil generated by these excavations can be accommodated within the Application Site specified on the plan (remember, earth will be excavated to a depth of 6 feet) unless:

- The final finish level of spoil will be greatly exceeded forming bunds; or
- Material will be deposited outside the Application Site by necessity, raising the land levels elsewhere, further increasing the flood risk to my land; or
- The removal of spoil from site has been planned; or
- Less earth will be removed than can be estimated on the plan as the red line seemingly abutting the bow of the proposed moored boats lies considerably in the river (thus, a considerable portion of the proposed construction (pontoons and moored boats) will lie outside the applicants land / legal boundary), reducing the navigable width of the River Ant.

Note 2) With reference to the blue line on the plans indicating the land owned by the applicant along the North-East boundary, this boundary line is completely inaccurate and seems to be positioned to indicate that the applicant owns less land than in reality. Possible reasons for this are:

- a mistake on the drawing (a very precise shape for a mistake); or
- The applicant believes that that is where the boundary actually is (I find this unlikely as this does not match the deeds or previously submitted plans); or
- Something has been placed in their land within this area which may be detrimental to their application; or
- They wish to ensure that the drain in my land is not considered by any Flood Risk Assessment; or
- Habitat mitigation measures supposed to be constructed along this boundary as a condition of BA/2017/0268/FUL have not been completed.

Note 3) Issues with the published Heritage Statement written by Andrew Smith on behalf of Paul Robinson Partnership (v8627):

- Paragraph 1.01 states that the planning application aims to enhance '*accessibility for leisure boating and **tourism***'. This intention is missing from the Application for Planning Permission. As it stands the application documents do not support any tourism benefit, **unless of course the new moorings are to be used to accommodate a hire fleet!**

- Paragraph 2.05, Wayford Marine was incorporated in 2001 (so the current owner (Wayford Marine Limited) has been in possession of the site for 24 years). However, the present Directors have only been involved with the site since 2016.
- With reference to figures 5 and 6, the windpump was located within the applicants boundary (within the red line on their current deed plan) (on the portion of land which abuts into mine at the most Easterly point). Historic changes to the deed provide evidence of this.
- The report makes no mention of the ferry used to access the Tuberculosis Isolation Hospital from the application site across Long Dyke. The location of this is shown in the Flood Risk Assessment, Feb. 2025 (3682/RE/02-25/01), last page, photograph C, dropped quay. The access route follows the line of the buried electricity and BT cables which pass through Wayford Marine to the former TB Isolation hospital building.

Note 4) Wayford Marine possesses no deeded right to operate a hire fleet. The deeded right which existed within the deeds was sold prior to their purchase of the site. The operation of their current hire fleet (presently 8 day boats) has not been regularised by planning permission!

## **A) Continued raising of the land at Wayford Marine**

- Orientation - I own the land to the North-East, North and North-West boundaries of Wayford Marine. This amounts to all land to land boundaries, except for a small area abutting driveway.
- It is noteworthy that I was not consulted by the applicant regarding this planning application, nor was I notified of this planning application in writing by the Broads Authority, inviting me to comment.
- Over many years, Wayford Marine have significantly raised the level of the land. This has been carried out by depositing material brought in by dump trucks, both hardcore type materials for making up roadways and hardstanding in addition to soil. This extensive raising of the land has not been regularised by any planning permission.
- This extensive land raising is evidenced by: (a) Customer and visitor photographs (published online); (b) Aerial photography and satellite images; (c) The applicants own surveys showing AOD levels submitted to the Broads Authority within application BA/2017/0268/FUL; (d) Environment Agency flood risk maps and LIDAR data (including those provided within the Flood Risk Assessment for this application).

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

- If the classification of the flood zone of land is decreased (i.e. Flood Zone 3 to 2, Flood Zone 2 to 1), common sense dictates that the land level has been significantly raised.
- The Local Plan for the Broads states:

*'Policy DM17: Land raising*

*Schemes that propose to raise land are required to justify this approach and explain what other options to address the issue that land raising seeks to resolve have been discounted, and why.*

*Proposals that involve land raising will not be permitted if they have adverse effects which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated on:*

*a) Flood risk on site **and elsewhere**; '...*

- The NPPF is abundantly clear regarding this issue and states:

*'181. When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.'*

- Neither the Flood Risk Assessment carried out for this application, or the previous Flood Risk Assessments commissioned by Wayford Marine provide any comment regarding the effect of raising the levels to the Flood Risk on my land. However, whatever the content of these reports, as stated clearly within the NPPF, the responsibility lies with the Local Authority.
- Background information - My land located to the North-East boundary is pumped - that is to say it contains dykes maintained by the IDB which are pumped out, returning water into the river at the Hunsett Mill pumping station. This pumping station is responsible for draining my land plus low lying land located towards the Mill. There are clay pipes buried beneath my land which extend up the hill to the north of the A149, draining this land and conveying water to the drainage ditches within my land.
- Despite, the fact that part of my land is used for drainage, it has been dry in the past - evidenced by the many Oak trees found there.
- Over the years, the land level of the mooring plots located along the South-East boundary of my land has been raised due to dredging works and quay heading. This acts as quite a significant flood bank.
- A considerable portion of Wayford Marine used to be very low-lying land, consisting of marsh and reedbeds. Any surface water flooding of my land (due to the draining of the higher land in Wayford during periods of excessive rainfall) would have flowed over Wayford Marine to the river, leaving small amounts of surface water within my land which the pump at Hunsett Mill could easily accommodate.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.



- As previously stated, Wayford Marine has raised the level of their land across the entire width of my boundary with them. This means that there is no longer any possibility of any natural drainage through their land, plus during periods of high rainfall, significant run off from their sheds (as they have removed the reedbed within their land one can only assume that their surface run-off from their shed drains into my land), in addition to large areas of concrete hard standing will all drain into my land.
- So to recap, there are two ways to build a lake. Either, a hole can be dug in the ground or the surrounding ground level can be increased and compacted acting as a bund, thus retaining the water. It is the latter that their actions have produced.
- My land is connected to the drainage ditch conveying water to the Hunsett Mill pumping station through a pipe which passes under Nobbs Loke. The internal diameter of this pipe (seemingly less than 10 inches) is woefully undersized.
- It did not take long to witness the impact of the land raising. In 2023 after a period of high rainfall 7.14 acres of my woodland was flooded, picture below. The issue is not that the land was flooded as we had exceptional conditions, it was that the flooding to the land persisted for over 5 months! Despite the river levels having abated, my land remained flooded!



Photo taken of my land behind Wayford Marine site office, taken 3 Nov. 2023. You will note the drainage ditches are now invisible as the land is totally flooded.

- Whilst I concede that the flooding of my land located behind Wayford Marine may not be considered a risk to life as there are no people living there, the extensive buildup of water in this area caused part of Nobbs Loke and the car park of the Nobbs Loke moorings to flood. A number of these moorings are used for residential purposes (people live on boats moored there). Thus any increased flood risk of my land comes with the potential increased flood risk to the vehicular access of the mooring plots accessed by Nobbs Loke.
- Furthermore, the flooding of my land will undoubtedly affect the habitats within, potentially reducing the biodiversity of the area.
- Due to the natural slope of the land towards the river, you will note in my photograph above that the flooding pictured in 2023 was located adjacent to Wayford Marine's gateway (3 metres from their driveway, a portion known as the yellow shaded area). This driveway is not only the sole evacuation route for Wayford Marine, it is the evacuation route from my field access, my Marina (the Wayford Bridge Yacht Station) and my holiday accommodation.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

- The 2023 flooding to my land not only affected land classified in flood zone 3, but the flooding overwhelmed the flood ditches and encroached significantly into my grazing fields which are Flood Zone 1. Flooding to this extent is unprecedented.

#### **Expected Action by the Authority**

1. As the application further seeks to raise the land it is expected that the authority ensure that a Flood Risk Assessment which includes the risk of flooding to my land is prepared, taking into account of current and historic levels at Wayford Marine so that the risk to my land of being flooded by surface water is quantified.
2. If it should be found that by raising the levels of Wayford Marine the risk to my land of surface water flooding has been increased, then I expect the Authority to undertake enforcement action to lower the land levels or to enforce the applicant to carry out other equivalent mitigation measures within their land to reduce these flood risk levels.



## **B) The reedbed has been filled in without planning permission**

- Planning Permission was granted to the applicant for the construction of an additional workshop, office and toilet (the office and toilet has yet to be constructed), application reference BA/2017/0268/FUL. The application site included a large reedbed.
- Satellite photography of the site taken in 2017, 2020 and 2022 clearly show the Reedbed in place.



Aerial photograph showing the Reedbed taken in 2022.

- The Reedbed is clearly shown within the application documents of BA/2017/0268/FUL. The large Reedbed is shown on the Proposed Site Plan 1079-04Q (William Glover, Jan. 2017), the proposed landscape plan by Richard Morrish Associates dated 23 May 2017 and further information and a photo of

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

the reed bed is provided within the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan by Richard Morrish Associates dated June 2017 (revised 28 Nov. 2017).

- The reedbed is also clearly visible in an aerial photograph shown as part of an image gallery on Wayford Marine's website; the image file is located at <https://wayfordmarine.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/aerial-shot-1400x718-1.jpeg> and has been accessed at 18 Mar 2025 14:08:17 GMT. The image was first uploaded to their website on Thu, 14 Mar 2024 14:31:57 GMT.
- This reedbed is valuable from both an ecological perspective and is necessary to handle the surface water. Indeed, in BA/2018/0281/APPCON (the Application for approval of details reserved by condition of BA/2017/0268/FUL), Nick Gill, a former company Director of Wayford Marine Ltd confirms that '*Surface water from the new storage shed will be discharged in to the reed bed.*' (letter to BA dated 16 July 2018).
- This Reedbed lies within the application site of BA/2025/0047/FUL and is the intended location to receive spoil from the excavation.
- However, by 2024 (in particular by 12 Feb. 2024 when the biodiversity value was calculated) it seems the Reedbed had vanished and had become a grassed area! This is confirmed by readily available photographic images. One would assume that this size of reedbed would have achieved a much higher calculated biodiversity value than just the grassed area that now exists!
- Since, the presence of the reedbed, notwithstanding its ecological value, was clearly necessary to satisfy BA/2017/0268/FUL, surely it would require planning permission to fill it in? As such permission has not been granted, I can only assume a mistake has been made on the Application for Planning Permission, Biodiversity net gain (page 8).

### **Expected Action by the Authority**

1. As there can be no argument that the reedbed existed, ascertain from the applicant the date that the reedbed was filled in and provide evidence to ensure the declaration made within the Planning Application Form (page 8) was accurate.
2. Undertake enforcement action to restore the reedbed as it was required in BA/2017/0268/FUL.
3. Ensure that the surface water produced from their boat shed is not drained into my land, but into the reedbed within theirs in compliance with BA/2017/0268/FUL.

### C) Increased vehicular movements onto the A149

- Based on the aerial photography taken in Summer 2024 (freely available online), this shows 6 cruisers moored side-on in the space to be excavated to create the 16 stern-on moorings. That is an increase to the mooring provision of 10 boats. That corresponds to 10 new customers and 10 extra annual mooring fees. This makes the project a good idea financially.
- The above paragraph is the only justification why this project could support an extra person being employed as there would definitely be the potential for extra work for the marina in vessel maintenance with these extra 10 boats.
- The above paragraphs would outline a sound case to convince a lender that the project was viable. With that in mind, why would the applicant then take ridiculous measures to hide the increase in the number of boats?
- On studying the existing and proposed site plans included in the proposal, the applicant wishes to state that the existing mooring numbers (apparently 79) also equal the proposed mooring numbers. How have 10 more moorings been added without apparently increasing mooring numbers?...
  - By showing more moorings on the 'existing' plan where the excavation is going to take place than actually exists (as evidenced by aerial photographs);
  - By replacing all boats of approximately 8 to 10 metres in length with boats of 12 metres in length, therefore reducing the number of boats and leaving empty space (moorings in the dyke connected with Nobbs Loke moorings);
  - by replacing 4 boats in the South mooring basin with two larger boats (a reduction in revenue) (mooring dyke to the South);
  - Leaving empty side on space which could easily accommodate another side-on berth (perhaps this is for an additional visitor mooring?).

The applicant has undertaken all of the above measures.

- The nature of a marina is you will never fill it with boats of the same length (**unless of course they are all hire boats owned by the applicant or a tenant operating on the site**) - so the number of boats in a marina will fluctuate. **So any mooring numbers are meaningless.** They are a matter of utilisation. One cannot request planning permission to build three houses, but request that planners only look at the effects of the construction of one house by stating that two will be left empty! In planning, all parts of the plan must be assumed to be utilised. Ergo, common sense dictates (in both business and planning) that empty mooring spaces will be filled, that sheds will be used and that hard standings will be filled with boats. This is proven by looking at the available satellite imagery of Wayford Marine since the incorporation of Wayford Marine Limited.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

- With reference to the 2022 aerial photograph of the site (copy enclosed in the appendix), the image shows that there were 85 boats moored on site.
- With reference to the latest satellite image of the site available on Google Maps (<https://www.google.com/maps/place/Norwich+NR12+9LL/@52.7691709,1.4828229,171m>, accessed on 18 March 2025 at 14:03 GMT) the image shows 86 boats moored (excluding the visitor moorings). A Google Maps image has also been reproduced within the Heritage Statement written by Andrew Smith on behalf of Paul Robinson Partnership (version 8627), page 6, figure 5.
- This fixation on mooring numbers is baffling since the Broads Authority removed the only restriction to the number of boats moored (in the water) and stored on land on this site by removing the Section 52 Agreement on 17 May 2018. The Section 52 Agreement was enforced upon a previous owner of the land to regularise development undertaken without planning consent. The agreement was entered into the deed to prevent excessive development which the size of the site and its location was unable to support.
- Without the Section 52 Agreement in force there is:
  - **no limit** to the number of boats that can be stored on land; and
  - **no limit** to the number of boats that can be moored.
- So if the applicant wanted to fill the moorings with lots of 22 ft launches or yachts (which clearly would give rise to more customers, therefore more traffic movements onto the A149) then they could do so without planning permission.
- If the applicant wished to operate a boat stacking system on land and provide launch-on-request services (massively increasing the number of boats on land, increasing the number of customers and therefore increasing the traffic movements onto the A149) they could do so without planning permission.
- In light of the above, you can see why the manipulation of apparent mooring numbers on a plan is rather comical!
- Looking back, the applicants previous application for 5 holiday lodges on this site (BA/2018/0460/FUL) was refused on highways grounds (the applicant subsequently appealed to the Planning Inspectorate which was dismissed (Appeal Ref: APP/E9505/W/19/3233093) ). The refusal was due to the road access being considered unsuitable to support the additional traffic requirements of the development. A modification to the access to the site on the A149 was considered as a mitigation measure, but the applicant chose not to make any modification to the road junction.
- On the subject of utilisation, how the moorings will be used is of importance. In my assessment regarding parking spaces I have assumed (possibly incorrectly) that the applicants intention is to use the new stern-on moorings for private moorings by contract. **Should the moorings be used to operate a hire fleet then the traffic flows to the A149 generated by this would greatly exceed those which would**

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

**have been generated if they had been granted the 5 holiday lodges**

**(BA/2018/0460/FUL).** If the moorings are to be used as residential moorings this would also exceed the predicted traffic movements of BA/2018/0460/FUL.

Therefore, both these situations would be unacceptable to NNDC Highways, greatly reducing the safety of the junction with the A149. It is noted that **the applicant has not stated how the new stern-on moorings will be used!** If we do not know, and even if we did, we cannot control it, then the worst case scenario from a vehicle movement perspective must be assumed and the application be assumed that it is for 16 large hire boats. Such an application would be totally unacceptable on Highway grounds.

### **Expected Action by the Authority**

1. Request the applicant to provide a traffic study to show the vehicular movements relating to all current usage (including container storage rental), then add usage for the additional 10 moorings plus the additional employee.
2. Request the applicant provide a recent traffic study of Wayford Road to assess the current traffic movements along the A149.
3. Request the consultation of NNDC Highways re the above as you are required to do to ensure that road safety is not compromised by the current proposals / usage plus further uncontrolled development made possible by the removal of the Section 52 Agreement.
4. Ensure that the applicant provides written assurance of how the moorings will be used (e.g. annual contract, hire fleet or residential). Any such use would have to be controllable by planning restriction (which I believe is no longer possible without the Section 52 Agreement).



## **D) No additional visitor / short stay moorings are included within the proposal**

- The applicant states in the Application Form that they are applying for '*Formation x 16 all new stern-on moorings and access improvements*'.
- Despite the application seeking to provide a significant number of new moorings, no new visitor moorings were included with the proposal. This renders the application not compliant with Policy DM33.
- The Local Plan for The Broads, Policy DM33 (m) requires that an additional one permanent short stay (visitor) mooring should be provided where the number of moorings proposed is between two and nine, inclusive. This provision has not been satisfied by the current proposals.
- The above requirement is taking into account the number of boats presently moored side-on in the area to be excavated. Otherwise the requirement would be to provide two new visitor moorings with this application.
- However, it should be noted that, should this application be granted it would be obvious that the applicant would seek to convert many other areas of the site from-side on mooring to stern-on mooring in a 'drip-wise' fashion. By this method they would be able to avoid to provide the number of visitor moorings which would be required by submitting a single application on a larger scale now.
- It is noted that Policy DM33 requires the applicant to demonstrate compliance by submitting a mooring questionnaire. Note that the link to the Mooring Questionnaire on the Broads Authority website is broken and the completed questionnaire has not been placed with the application documents on public record, so we can only assume that this step was not complied with.

### **Expected Action by the Authority**

1. Place a copy of the completed mooring questionnaire on Public Record.
2. Request the applicant to update the proposed plans to show where the new visitor moorings will be located.

## **E) No specific detail regarding car parking for customers using these new moorings**

- As the applicant has provided no detailed parking or traffic information then we will need to carry out some basic calculations.
- The Proposed Site Layout indicates that there is only one area denoted for Car Parking on the whole site which lies adjacent to the workshop building.
- According to the plan this 'Car Parking' equates to an area of approximately 625 square metres.
- Assuming an average sized car (hatchback, although in rural areas the vehicles used tend to be larger) of size 4.3m x 1.9m; this covers a ground area of 8.17 sq. metres.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

- Based on the above size, the 'Car Parking' area could fit 76 cars - of course to achieve this they would have to be craned in (they would be touching each other)! In reality you would be lucky to achieve half that number, say 38.
- Based on recent aerial photography taken in Summer 2024 we can count the number of boats on moorings and the number of boats on hard standing. In effort to estimate the maximum number of vehicles which will be on site at any one time we will need to make some assumptions denoted below.

	#	Number of vehicles associated with usage	Factor to take into account that even at peak summertime they will not all be on site	Minimum number of parking spaces which should exist to handle current usage
Boats on hard standing <sup>1</sup>	61	61	0.4	24.4
Boats in Moorings <sup>2</sup>	70	70	0.6	42
Hire Boats <sup>3</sup>	8	14	0.8	12.8
Containers <sup>4</sup>	11	11	0.4	4.4
Employees <sup>5</sup>	8	8	1	8
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91.6</b>

\*<sup>1</sup> Only boats on hard standing within the whole site under the ownership of the applicant were counted. Trailers in storage were ignored. Any boats within the sheds being worked on where the owner was paying for storage were not counted.

\*<sup>2</sup> All boats present on the moorings were counted. Boats on Visitor moorings have been ignored as these should not require parking provision. Note that some boats were clearly missing from regular spaces in use but these 'spaces' were not counted. Whilst one may consider that a factor of 0.6 is high, many of the boats at Wayford Marine are greater than 10 metres in length (a 6 berth vessel or larger), and consequently their use results in two vehicles being parked per boat. The three vessels moored within the slipway area were also not counted. If looking at the aerial imagery as a whole, taking into account of the moorings that are normally filled then the actual number of moored boats (excluding any use of visitor moorings) equals 87.

\*<sup>3</sup> The hire boats offered by Wayford Marine are picnic boats designed to cater for 8 to 12 people. Therefore, it is reasonable that a single boat hire will result in parking for two vehicles.

\*<sup>4</sup> Wayford Marine has offered container hire for storage for some time. As stated the aerial photograph depicts 11 containers positioned against my field boundary. These are let for general business storage and I assume is the reason for business vehicles coming and going early in the moorings before office hours.

\*<sup>5</sup> The number of employees used is the number the Applicant provided in the Application for Planning as the current number. As they are stated as full time and they do not live on site (there are no residential moorings referred to in the planning history) then their employment must result in the presence of motor vehicles.

\*<sup>6</sup> No allocation has been made for visitor parking, people looking at boats for sale in the brokerage or any cars / trailers using the slipway.

- The planning application seeks (assuming my calculations above), with the construction of the stern-on moorings and the additional employee to add an additional 6 vehicles for moorings and 1 for the extra employee. **That brings my estimation to 99 parked vehicles possible on site at peak times.** Please note, these calculations provide only the minimum number of parking spaces which should be provided on site. They do not provide an estimation of vehicular movement to and from the public highway.
- Clearly 99 vehicles could not be accommodated within the 'Car Parking' area identified on the plan. It is also noteworthy that this 'Car Parking' area lies outside the Application Site (red line).
- From the above generous assessment of the whole site, **the 'Car Parking' area is definitely not of an appropriate and commensurate size for the facility it serves, so cannot be compliant with DM24.**
- As there is no detail provided within the application regarding the parking or general access provision the following questions, pivotal to demonstrating compliance with policy DM24 (and additionally DM33 (n) ), remain unanswered:
  - where the additional vehicles which exist due to the creation of the additional moorings will park (i.e. marked parking spaces on a plan);
  - the route people will take to access this parking area from the newly created boardwalks;
  - the surface treatment of the parking area stating how the surface run-off will be accommodated within the applicants land.
- In the event that the new excavated moorings were to accommodate hire boats, then my parking assessment of the requirement of an additional 5 or 6 spaces is woefully inadequate. The site would need to accommodate an additional 28 parking spaces (2 parking spaces per boat, due to the size of the vessels (number of berths) ).

### Expected Action by the Authority

1. Update the proposed plan to show all car parking spaces on site.
2. Indicate which car parking spaces you expect to be used by the customers of the new stern-on moorings;
3. Show the route on foot between the new boardwalks and the parking spaces;
4. Specify how the surface water is to be disposed of from the parking areas.
5. Request the applicant to provide details of site usage to prove that the parking provision on site is more than sufficient to accommodate the current usage in addition to the 10 extra moorings and the additional employee.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.

## Summary

To summarise, the justification for my objections are as follows:

- To ensure that my fields, marina and holiday cottages are not put at an increased risk of flooding due to the actions of a third party;
- To ensure that the habitats and biodiversity within my wooded land are not put at risk by local development;
- To ensure that road safety of the A149 at Wayford Bridge is not compromised; and
- That the requisite public benefit of planning (visitor moorings) are secured.

I am disappointed therefore that after extensive pre-application consultation between the applicant and \*\*REDACTED\*\* member of the Broads Authority has taken place over many months, that it should be necessary for a member of the public to write to ensure due diligence is exercised by a Local Authority.

Yours faithfully,

Signed by:  
*Alice Brown*  
0B8A40B94D984CF...

Alice Brown.

CC: Environment Agency; NNDC Highways

## References

Youtube video showing Wayford Marine by user ISawJakub ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpPg\\_sr5Z10](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpPg_sr5Z10)), uploaded 18 Aug 2024, accessed 18 March 2025, 16:12 GMT.

The excellent aerial photography by John Fielding available for view on Flickr.com ([https://www.flickr.com/photos/john\\_fielding/49258690153/in/photolist-q7WziQ-2i3PErg-2i2VevX-2i2SQLu-2i2VerD-2joNofA/](https://www.flickr.com/photos/john_fielding/49258690153/in/photolist-q7WziQ-2i3PErg-2i2VevX-2i2SQLu-2i2VerD-2joNofA/)), albums viewed 18 March 2025.

## Appendix

Aerial Photograph taken in 2022 of the Wayford Marine site showing 85 boats moored (with some hire boats on hire) and the presence of the reedbed plus the container storage business.



The woodland above Wayford Marine (my land) was completely flooded in 2023 for the duration of 5 months.

Objection to Planning Application BA/2025/0047/FUL, from Alice Brown, dated 19 March, 2025.