

## 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

JOHN LESTER

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.	14, 19, 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.

*Does not comply with NPPF in relation to  
Developing the GREEN BELT.*

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.

MM14 C The sewage network in Blackmore is either full or very near to full capacity. The recent extensions & new builds have only exacerbated the matter. (page 60)

See attached sheets

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary ①



MM 19A page 45 - Blackmore frequently floods at various locations around the village. It is identified as a Critical Drainage Area. By removing green fields & replacing with concrete this will not help this problem.



MM 78B page 160 - States a Flood Risk Assessment must assess all sources of flooding & its effect on the surrounding areas. Due to a problem with flooding already around Blackmore this should have been carried out before R25 & R26 were included in the LDP. It needs to be carried out prior to the completion of the LDP.

MM ~~78B~~ (b) page 161 Blackmore is in a Critical Drainage Area.  
(d) page 161 "change of use to a more vulnerable class etc"

Changing Green Fields to hardstanding would have implications to the surface water & drainage to the village.

MM 78 C (c) considerable evidence has previously been submitted to indicate that the flooding & further flood risks will increase.



MM81 page 177 In the last paragraph in this section it states "Development will be considered inappropriate & refused unless very special circumstances are demonstrated and/or where the exceptions apply in line with paras 145 & 146 of the NPPF"

Para 145 relates to outdoor sport & recreation & providing access to it. This does not appear to be compliant with the planned use of R25 & R26. It would mean that development of R25 & R26 would NOT be considered "very special circumstances" as they would not provide access to other greenbelt land, sports facilities etc.

Paragraphs B, C & D support the evidence that R25 & R26 are unsuitable for development. There are no many deletions in this section it is clear that developing the GREEN BELT should NOT be considered & ~~not~~ removed from the L.D.P.



Red Rose lane is a LANE with several bends, access from the site would be a traffic hazard as visibility would be limited. It would therefore be a danger to walkers, runners, cyclists etc. Based on 4 cars per 3 bedroom house that is potentially a total 160 cars emerging onto a LANE. R25 is in a critical drainage area & covering the field could increase surface water causing further danger.

~~The Farnworth~~

To provide vehicular access to Nine Ashes Road would be just as dangerous as stipulated above.

to



Red Rore Lane is a lane & would not support access or egress to the proposed development R26. It frequently floods & developing on this Green Belt area will only cause the problem to become worse. Access through Orchard Piece is not suitable for plant & heavy vehicles during development. The increase in vehicles <sup>using</sup> the road ~~to gain~~ after development, potentially 120, would be a noise nuisance to current occupants. Entry into Fingroth Hall Road would be a traffic hazard as well as a danger to pedestrians, cyclists etc.

This site is not suitable for development.