

1<sup>st</sup> September 2011

Dear Sir/Madam



Re: - Proposal for building dwellings – Land allocations proposal R121M R141 RN302  $\stackrel{\vdash}{\sim}$  ON50  $\stackrel{\smile}{\sim}$  R56

I am putting in writing my objections to the above proposals.

I have already written to you in relation to the first proposal which was brought out for these areas stating my objections and concerns about these developments.

The modified proposal, however, seems to be worse than the first one. With there being more dwellings and more countryside being destroyed.

This will only mean one thing. That the problems that would arise from building in this area, which I discussed in my first letter, would be multiplied.

There would be a greater risk of:-

- → Flooding and damage to property. Is the council going to be held responsible if this happens? If the council gives the go-ahead for this development I think they should be held accountable for it.
- ★ The landscape would be harmed even more.
- ♣ Greater threat to the Great Crested Newt as its habitat is destroyed. This is a protected species.
- ★ More traffic resulting in a safety issue for residents who already live there, especially the old and the young.
- **♣** More air pollution.

Why do we need to build in these areas, at a time when global warming is a big issue, we are supposed to be looking after our planet, not destroying it by taking away the countryside. Think about what sort of place this would be for future generations if we keep building everywhere. More effort should be made into developing and restoring existing properties that are empty.

FCIE 181

Just because it's an empty space means we have to build on it. Empty spaces are good for the people and the environment.

Please do not build on these sites.

Yours sincerely

Mr Jason Blackstone