

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

Theresa Lynn Reed

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.	14c, 19g, 78, 81, 107, 108
Sustainability Appraisal	para(s)	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	para(s)	
Policies Map or other supporting documents	Please specify	

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.

mm14c Blackmore, and specifically Red Rose Lane is subject to flooding, a situation which will get worse if built on, and compounded by climate change. Sewerage is already over capacity

mm19g This is a critical drainage area. It is important to maintain natural drainage to act like a sponge to take away much of the floodwater before it causes damage to properties. By building on such areas, you will create problems for the future. Your short term gain in meeting the LDP requirements without due consideration to the impact on the environment & community will in turn create a long term problem.

mm78 The LDP has not engaged with the Environment Agency, and as a result has not taken into account the impact of flooding from the River Wld. Red Rose Lane has been impassable on many and increasingly more frequent occasions. Building on R25 & R26 will exacerbate this problem, potentially causing flood damage to houses on Woollard Way & Orchard Piece. No account has been taken of the impact of climate change. With COP26 on going as I write this, I am amazed that the Council isn't even paying lip-service to this planet-changing issue.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

The recent Sustainability Appraisal is clearly seriously flawed.

cont.

mm 81

What is the purpose of building on our green belt? We do not recognise your so-called exceptional circumstances. There are none as far as I can see. Blackmore has already been developed to capacity and has had some smaller scale growth already. Any further development on our green belt can only serve to reduce the beneficial purpose of green belt to the detriment of both Blackmore residents, and visitors who come to enjoy our special environment

M 107-108

The sites are within a critical drainage area - see previous comments above. No heritage assessment has been taken. The number of proposed houses will increase the number of cars significantly. There is minimal parking in the village centre and congestion and inconsiderate parking are a frequent and dangerous problem as it is.

We do not have a parade of shops. We have minimal public transport, so car ownership is the norm. A 20% increase in housing is clearly developer-led. In my mind, that means profit before people. Why would the Council back such unsustainable proposals - unless of course they are being bribed. I like to think our Council is above that sort of thing but it makes you wonder.

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.

1. The BBC should engage with the Environment Agency to carry out research into the impact of building on an area subject to regular flooding, being mindful of the impact of climate change and in light of government promises at COP26
2. BBC should reassess its Sustainability Appraisal with a view to looking at the present infrastructure, drainage, the wanton destruction of green belt, and current public transport availability, over capacity of the school, impact of additional traffic from both the proposed sites & neighbouring developments.
3. BBC should re-look at sites they have already voted out. Some were far more sustainable than Blackmore, with a more suitable infrastructure, & other villages who have actually asked for development.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary