Dear Sir

With regard to the ongoing saga about the erection of 60 dwellings on land a Higher Town, Sampford Peverell I wish to register my objection to this development.

The original application for dwellings on this site was, supposedly, to provide housing for 'local' people who would be employed at J27 should that development ever be included in the Local Plan. There is, otherwise, no requirement in this village for such a number of new dwellings. Local people seeking work at J27 already have houses so the idea that housing is required for employees falls flat for a start.

A survey carried out by MDDC showed that what we do need is 10 (TEN) affordable homes for local people, particularly young people who have lived here most of their lives but cannot afford to buy or rent property.

Furthermore, the infrastructure cannot support 60 properties. The school cannot take the large influx of children that would result from 60 houses, the doctor's surgery could not cope with the extra patients and most of all the roadway along which any residents in these new properties is nothing short of dangerous.

There is a footway but it is on the opposite side of the A373, and the traffic along the stretch of road adjacent to any development tends to travel extremely fast as the road is quite straight at the point where crossing would be possible. Having reached the footway and followed it down to the start of the existing houses closer to the village proper, the footway peters out meaning pedestrians are forced to walk on the roadway. In order to reach the church, the school, the shop or anywhere else in the village pedestrians have to cross the road and contend with a bridge on a blind bend. It would only be a matter of time before there is a fatality and who would be to blame? The Council who allowed such a foolhardy scheme to go ahead! Are you prepared to pay out the compensation?

The alternative is for pedestrians to follow the narrow lane through the back of the village where, again, there is no footway and nowhere to put one.

The whole premise is flawed and the development unnecessary. Sampford Peverell does not need these properties and any planner that allows them is extremely short sighted and obviously puts financial gain to the Council over and above the safety and general well being of new residents and the will of the existing residents.

Yours faithfully