I have read the final SAMDev proposals in relation to Church Stretton and in general I am content with the revised proposals. However, I wish to object to a number of proposals and comment on other key ones.

Ref S5.1

Object

The proposed house building target of 370 dwellings has not been justified in relation to local needs. It is also not consistent with national policy viz Para 115 of the NPPF which makes reference to AONBs which "…have the highest status of protection…"

Ref S5.1/3

Object

The proposal for "….further greenfield land …….on the east of the A49…..". If the inference is to New House Farm, the proposal is again inconsistent with national policy (CS3,CS17, NPPF). The land identified was rejected by Shropshire Council in the last consultation having been met with huge numbers of local objections and there is no credible reason for re-consideration.

S5.1a CSTRO 18

There would be no reason to build on this site if the 300 housing target was accepted. If 370 is demanded, I do not object to the proposal to build on the school playing field.

S5.1a CSTRO 19

The proposal to develop the area around is supported as it is adjacent to the current town boundary.

S5.1b ELRO 78

The proposal to allocate Springbank Farm for employment land (offices and light industry) is supported as it would be the least damaging to the landscape compared to other previously identified sites.

S5.3

The *Area Wide Policies and other allocations* statement is not supported. It is unclear what is proposed and likely to contradict the requirements of the NPPF (para115) which stresses the importance of "conserving landscape and natural beauty"

I trust these comments will receive due consideration

John Sumner FRAgS