

466/2184



The Cottage,
The Hayes,
Cheriton Fitzpaine.
EX17 4JG
DEVON
19th March 2014

Accu

Dear Sir,

After a public parish meeting at Cheriton Fitzpaine on March 18th, I am writing with my views on the Local Planning Review.

The Review details four sites for possible housing.

Site 1 Glebe plot: I strongly disagree with this site being developed because it has for generations been used and enjoyed by villagers. It is used daily for recreation and as a thoroughfare for walkers, and in the winter its natural slope allows for sledging and skiing.

- In addition, some of the plot lies in a water meadow and is therefore unsuitable for development
- Finally, there are several old oak trees at the top of the slope, and a huge specimen tree in the centre (which I believe has a preservation order on it) which have formed part of the village landscape for over a century.

Site 4 handboat • This site would allow for almost 60 houses (some near the stream/water meadow) which would swamp our small community. Each household could have one or two cars (60-120) needing to make use of narrow country lanes. Every house could have between

2 and 6 people making a grand total of 120 to 360 new inhabitants. Whilst we would welcome newcomers, the density of housing on this large site is not viable in our community.

Site 3 Barnhill • We have known for some time that this might be an in-fill site, and 12 houses would be acceptable in the village, providing that 2 or 3 of them were affordable and could enable locals to remain in the area.

Site 2 Primary School • This site, I believe could have up to 35 houses. If it were the only one of the four sites to be developed, I believe that the village could just about cope. If 10 affordable homes were made available, the site would prove to be ideal.
I do not, however feel that site 2 and site 3 should be jointly developed.

I am sure that at the meeting you felt the strength of opinion shared by many that affordable, and 'green' housing would be welcomed if the numbers were commensurate with local demand, and with the suitability

of a site. We would not welcome inappropriate types of housing and we would not accept large numbers of dwellings.

I would accept either site 3 or site 2 being put forward for development, but not both.

Yours faithfully,