To: WEB Local Plan

**Subject:** New Houses Planned for Washwell Fields (Ref: PS41)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

We (a number of residents of Lower Washwell Lane, Painswick Glos), strongly object to any development activities on the land adjacent to Lower Washwell Lane, which we believe was previously the property of Washwell House.

Our key objection is to that of access. Unless access is made directly from the A46, we believe that any development could result in a dangerous traffic issue on Lower Washwell Lane, which is a single track with very tight, blind turns. It is already a common and very hazardous issue exiting the lane onto the A46 with parked cars completely blocking the view of oncoming traffic. The lane is also frequented by cars whose occupants make use of the recreation ground on a weekly basis and park on both sides of the lane. Young children and/or dog walkers are nearly always present on the lane in order to gain access to the recreation ground or walking to/from school. The lane has seen a steady and significant increase in traffic already and this proposal increases the danger/ hazards further, with the expected additional traffic load. 20 more houses could result in 40+ extra vehicles (conservative estimate) using this lane and I do not believe the lane is capable or up to specification to cope with this level of traffic.

It appears (from Highways advice) that the scope for widening Lower Washwell Lane and remedying this problem is very limited/not possible?.

In addition, we also object to this land being developed due to use of the land by the local wildlife, including foxes, badgers, deers and local Tawny Owls. If the council are keen to make better use of this area, we wonder whether the creation of a formal wild life sanctuary might be more appropriate, which might attract more visitors to the village and create a small number of jobs. Any such plans should involve proper provision of parking within the village.

Lastly, I would question the whole 'Painswick needs more housing ethos'. Where is the <u>traceable</u> data to prove this? Why do we need to develop such an area of outstanding natural beauty based on wide speculation and not a vague interpretation of current government guidelines?