

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you as I understand TVBC is considering some policy changes that may, in the future, affect our recently agreed Neighbourhood Plan and ultimately affect the way we live in our village.

I fully appreciate the requirement to provide more housing in the area, and I am community spirited enough to realise that whilst few people want new housing near where they live, we must all play our part. However, some of the planning assumptions that have been made about Upper Clatford and Anna Valley are erroneous, and it is incumbent upon me to highlight these before they may be wrongly factored into TVBC planning.

First and foremost, the assumption that we could share facilities with Goodworth Clatford (therefore placing us in Tier 3) is a nonsense.

My family (three children under 7) and two dogs are extremely active. We regularly run, walk and/or cycle for the school drop off and to various kids' clubs around the area. We are a robust outdoors family. However, **every** time we have attempted to travel from Upper Clatford to Goodworth Clatford on the main road, be it on bike or on foot, we take our lives in our hands; it is simply not safe to travel down that road with a dog, pram or young children on bikes (no matter how capable they are).

Travelling to Goodworth Clatford as a pedestrian is simply not safe.

The buses (once every 4 hours?) are far too infrequent for them to be a viable mode of transport, as evidenced by them being practically empty every time they go by. I have seen elderly members of our village nearly knocked into hedges by passing cars and chatted to a few of them who have said that they have given up trying to walk to Goodworth Clatford unless someone drives them. How could this be an option for them, let alone those in wheel chairs? It's not.

Without 6 key facilities of our own, Upper Clatford and Anna Valley cannot share viably facilities with Goodworth Clatford, and should therefore be placed in Tier 4.

Allied to this issue is that of the Local Gap policy. My family feel totally immersed in the Upper Clatford village community, and an effective Local Gap policy will help to preserve the identity of the village we love. Because the journey to Goodworth Clatford (and therefore the rest of the southern villages) is so perilous, we often bite the bullet and take the much longer journey to Andover to reach the facilities we need. This distance of trek is of course not for everyone, but we are all much more likely to make this journey to Andover through beautiful green spaces and wooded pathways, where we can let the children and dogs run free, than through housing developments that pose more danger and erode the character of the area. Wouldn't preserving these spaces, encouraging the community to use them rather than their cars, contribute to meeting air pollution and climate change targets?

The final point I would like to make is that of adequate sewage and waste water management in the village. I am not sure how consideration can be given to increasing

housing in Upper Clatfrod and Anna Valley when one of the fundamental infrastructure requirements, that of properly functioning sewers, is clearly not yet met for the houses we have here at the moment. Pillhill Brook should be maintained as a clean chalk stream, not constantly having sewage discharged into it on a regular and enduring basis. It seems the Southern Water is unable to cope with the demand as it is.

Adequate waste water management systems should be in place before consideration be given to increasing the number of houses in the village.

I appreciate that someone has to have new housing built in or near their village. I also understand that TVBC are under pressure to meet certain targets and that difficult decisions need to be made. However, where Upper Clatford & Anna Valley are concerned, some of the planning assumptions are fundamentally wrong and there is a real danger of significantly disrupting the community if they are not reappraised. Furthermore, I believe that the TVBC climate change, air pollution and equality targets can still be achieved if my comments are taken into consideration

Regards,

Richard Orvis

██████████