



I wish to object to the proposal by the Banks group to develop 110 houses on the land adjacent to Eastfield on 2 main grounds:-

1, The land identified for development is greenbelt land that should only be developed in "very special circumstances" or where there is "demonstrable unmet need". I do not believe that either of these circumstances apply in this case. There has been significant housing development in the village over the last 7 years some of which remains unsold I would argue that this demonstrates that the need for housing in the village is met, whilst appreciating the need for more housing generally I do not believe that this is the right place for such development.

The land in question has been actively cultivated through the time I have lived locally (38 years) most recently for the production of thatching straw. A historic England report produced August 24 states that thatchers face a supply shortage and there is a need to boost domestically produced straw rather than import from overseas and that this makes sense on both a sustainability and environmental level. The loss of this greenbelt land would mean a loss of this production.

2. Access to the site is proposed to be via Eastfield which is a narrow, poorly maintained estate road, often difficult to drive along due to parked vehicles reducing it to a single lane. I believe Eastfield is not suitable or able to support the additional traffic this proposal would bring. The proposal to make Knowle Park Avenue one-way means that all traffic exiting the proposed development will flow along Eastfield and exit the estate via Lea Drive, this is clearly not viable, anyone who has used this exit will be aware of the dangers this poses during the winter months. The final section of road is steep, often icy and vehicles risk not being able to stop and sliding straight into the busy A629. As a resident of 38 years I would never use this exit in bad weather and have observed many near misses when walking.

Finally the suggestions that public transport is good and that village facilities are such that residents of the development would not use vehicles and would walk and cycle is unrealistic. No account is taken of the volume of delivery vans and visitor traffic which would also access the site.

I strongly oppose this development.