

Section B: Your Representation

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation that you wish to make. You must complete 'Part A – Personal Details' for your representation to be accepted.

Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our Consultation Portal. Any representations that are considered libelous, racist, abusive or offensive will not be accepted. All representations made will only be attributed to your name. We will not publish any contact details, signatures or other sensitive information.

Full Name	
-----------	--

Question 1: Which **Main Modification and/or supporting document** does your representation relate to?

Each Main Modification within the Schedule has a reference number. This can be found in the first column i.e. MM1, MM2

Any representations on a supporting document should clearly state which paragraphs of the document it relates to and, as far as possible, your comments should be linked to specific Main Modifications. You should avoid lengthy comments on the supporting documents themselves.

Representations on the Policies Map must be linked to specific modifications in that they reflect a change required as a result of a Main Modification.

Schedule of Potential Main Modifications	MM no.	<input type="text"/>
Sustainability Appraisal	para(s)	<input type="text"/>
Habitat Regulations Assessment	para(s)	<input type="text"/>
Policies Map or other supporting documents	Please specify	<input type="text"/>

Question 2: Do you consider this **Main Modification and/or supporting document**:

Legally Compliant?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Sound?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Question 3: If you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** unsound, please indicate which of the soundness test(s) does it fail (please mark all that apply):

Not positively prepared

☒

Not justified

☒

Not effective

☒

Not consistent with national planning policy

☒

Question 4: Please provide details of either:

- Why you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** to be sound or legally compliant; or
- Why you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** to be unsound or is not legally compliant.

Sorry, this process and document is too legally confusing:

To whoever this may concern or is prepared to listen to sense at this stage,

I am appalled that yet again, I am having to write and comment on the farce that has been the LDP for Brentwood.

In particular R25 and R26 the 2 plots that affect Blackmore VILLAGE. First clue – Village.

These proposals, changes, amendments, Mms or whatever legal term you wish to hide behind are an aberration to any sane planning proposal and policy. The policy contradicts itself so many times yet but is worded in an attempt to justify it's means.

This is GREEN BELT land. Second clue.

The ONLY condition to build on GREEN BELT land is when ALL other options have been exhausted. When all brownfield sites have been considered and declined. This has not happened. There are so many potential sites around the borough that are more suitable. You can't tell me they have all been considered and declined. Strategic?

Blackmore is a small village with considerable historical interest and a large conservation area, which is being chosen to be ignored. The village has been categorised incorrectly. The village does not display the conditions to be in the category it is has been given. Sorry, but please tell me where there is a parade of shops?

The village floods as it has done already over the last year, numerous times. R25 and R26 are uphill in the village, build on this and it will increase run off towards the historical centre of the village and the conservation area. Strategic planning? I think not.

Around the centre of the village, there is already too much traffic, parking problems, where it is an accident waiting to happen. There is already an increase in this traffic where Epping council decided not to liaise with Brentwood council around the large development in the old Norton Heath Equestrian centre, where all these extra people are now adding to the growing local pressures for services, doctors, schools, road conditions. R25 and R26 will add dramatically to this. An additions of nearly 20% housing to a small village. Strategic?

The farce continues. Even the road that is planned to be used, Red Rose Lane, is edged on every side with the sign that it is not suitable for heavy goods vehicles! How are you going to get the materials there if you can't use those roads, or are you just going to rewrite something else to suit the cause? Doesn't sound strategic?

This whole policy is definitely immoral and I would argue, borders on illegal and is hiding behind a mountain of legal and planning jargon.

This is not Sim City where you can blinding place buidlings just because it looks nice on a map. This is lazy and developer led planning. These are real decisions in the real world and will change the landscape of this beautiful village forever. Everlasting and irreparable damage and this policy will forever be the legacy of it's downfall. Shame on you

Yours sincerely

Craig Stevens,

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Question 5: Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** sound or legally compliant, having regard to the matters that you identified above.

You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local Plan sound or legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as accurate as possible.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary