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To whom it may concern

As a resident of Church Stretton I would like to register my deep concerns over the consideration being given to housing development in the Snatchfield Farm valley

1 Being the only town in this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (and potential National Park) I believe the Council has a responsibility to safeguard and enhance Church Stretton’s position as the gateway to the hills. The Snatchfield/Jack Mytton pathway to the east of the A49 allows walkers from the town (central parking) and railway, easy and immediate access to the hills. It seems incredible that there is serious support to allow this to be urbanised. Either the attractiveness of this area will be diminished, or we will see an unacceptable rise in visitor access and parking up the hill by those wishing to evade the walk through a housing development.

2 My second objection relates to the safety of residents form and beyond the pinch point that is Clive Avenue. This is a narrow country lane with no pedestrian walkway. It narrows to 4.5 metres. Wider cars, and increased delivery traffic already make this a dangerous road. It is used by mothers with pushchairs, schoolchildren, residents on mobility scooters. The prospect of a further 70 dwellings suggests an additional 100-120 residential vehicles together with all the additional service traffic to support this increase. This could generate several hundred additional journeys through Clive Avenue – DAILY.

And, of course add to this dynamic the impact of construction traffic for an indeterminate period! I fail to see how anyone could seriously ignore access as a consideration in the review of this proposal.

There are several smaller and low impact sites already within the town that could provide the sort of low cost practical housing that is required. Allowing the profiteering development of an AONB should embarrass those who are considering it.

**Additional Comments**

Yours faithfully,