

Dear Sirs,

please see below our comments and objections on the proposals for Wem 012 under the current review. We sincerely hope that you will heed our concerns when considering this application.

**Flooding**

The field in question although for some strange reason not listed on the flood plan for the area, is always very wet. During the rains the run off floods our garden to a depth of several inches. So far, our house has not flooded, but a few more inches of water would be critical. We would be very concerned that if some part of the field were to be built upon the run off would increase significantly. We understand that under recent changes we would be able to claim compensation resulting from the granting of planning permission which has compromised any other adjacent property specifically with a known flooding threat.

**Sewers.**

Currently our sewers block and back up several times a year. We would be very concerned that unless a new trunk sewer were to be laid, bypassing the current sewer runs, this situation which is not pleasant, would occur more often.

**Traffic.**

The roads on the Roden Avenue area are currently subsiding causing problems for the under laid utilities. If the access to the proposed development were to use the existing roads then this could greatly exacerbate the problem particularly during any construction phase. We would suggest that any access could only be onto the Tilly road with a new mini roundabout on the north side of the railway bridge to assist traffic flow and safety.

**Wildlife.**

The hedge line to the east of the field provides both a hunting ground and flight path to both barn owls (displaced by the development of the old mill) often observed at dusk and Peregrine falcons during the day flying very low along the hedge bottom. Any road access through this hedge or development would significantly affect the habitat of these rare birds which we believe are a threatened species.

Our garden has a small wildlife pond in which newts are present at certain times of the year. We have to assume that their access is via the often marshy field in question. Any development would compromise the ecological importance of this area.

**In Conclusion.**

We simply cannot understand why this planning permission may be given for ten houses given that there is a much larger site available to the south of Wem adjacent to the railway. We can only assume that once the ten have been built then another permission would be sought and so on until the entire field was built over. Does this not go against the need to keep a clear open green area between Wem and Tilley? Would it not also lead to the degradation of the adjacent wooded area by having residential development so close?

We are also led to believe that at one time the boundary between 'Wem Urban' and 'Wem rural' was moved to incorporate this field into Wem Urban. This may not be correct but if it is it would seem to warrant more investigation particularly its implication with regard to this planning application. This is something that we will investigate further.

Regards

Robert Blowing