

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to voice my concerns and objections with regards to the Bargate Homes latest proposals to the development of land south of Lower Rd.

Having recently moved to the area, I was not remotely put off by the prospect of 50 new homes, naively assuming plans would be sensible, & I subsequently put my offer in on a property.

However, I have now become aware of the specifics of the proposal and am astounded that a development could possibly go ahead on such a series of **blind bends**, on a **road too narrow to allow 2 vehicles to pass without one stopping**, and on a corner where a **child was knocked off their bike on 4th July this year**. When further accidents do occur - and they will with such a heavy increase in traffic - then **whose responsibility** will that be? And although Bargate seem to speak of an exemplary safety record simply because police were not involved and the child being knocked over by a car was not recorded officially as an 'accident', had it been your child or grandchild, would you not deem it so?

From my understanding, there are near misses aplenty, and if an accident is only deemed to be one if it's reported to police - *even when a child is knocked to the ground* - then those near misses and all of the non-reported accidents that do occur, are blatantly going to become far more frequent, with full collisions, when traffic increases by both the vehicles involved in the build and then the 2 or 3 cars per home. There are no pavements, it is too narrow to put any in, and this is without the damage that heavy industrial vehicles would wreak on the historic lane whilst rumbling past the Grade 2* listed building that is The Elms. It is also without the overspill of visitors parking on Lower Rd which has historic sunken lane significance. How can this be deemed acceptable?

I am a runner and my husband is a cyclist - we have lived here for 3 weeks exactly and he has had one near miss on the bends, whereas I have already learnt that running them is not safe unless paying extreme attention to what I can hear in that area. When the majority of runners listen to music, then with an increase in traffic I can imagine the possible consequences. If children or mothers walk to schools, then the pavement at the bottom of Brookside leading round to Bidbury Mead is mere inches wide in places, on bends, and not remotely suitable for heavier footfall. Nor is it wide enough for even a pushchair!! I struggle to contain a small dog on a lead on that pavement and it is entirely unsafe to walk on the road there. The thought of mothers pushing their children in the road due to no other option, and risking the bend on Bidbury Lane, is simply terrifying. Some people take those bends as though they're on a race track.

Having also been made aware of the entirely unsympathetic nature of the homes proposed in comparison to the rest of the local area, and the possible impact of traffic on the main surrounding roads, I am ever further in direct objection. *The clear harm to the area, the conservation area, and the traffic load that will flow back to the Rusty Cutter and A3, deeply outweighs any benefit of 50 homes*. Given that houses are most certainly needed - but that there are better locations more suited for them, with neither historic nor archaeological

significance, and no blind bends in a semi-rural location -then I would suggest that Lower Rd be **removed entirely from the list of possible land**. It is simply not feasible, nor viable, or even sensible. And this is all without the deep sadness - though less practical aspects - of the destruction of one of our rare remaining pockets of beauty in the borough.

The deeply negative ramifications of building on this land are myriad, I have mentioned only those that are personally concerning me the most, and I would urge that the council take these seriously and quash all possible development.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.