

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	Patricia Moulton	
-----------	------------------	--

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" value="1, 2, 78, 81, 107/108"/>
Sustainability Appraisal	para(s)	<input type="text" value="2-6, 2-8-1"/>
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.

MM1/MM2

Blackmore is a remote village. It has poor connections, and public transport. Car travel is essential! So more houses mean more cars (national average is 2 per household) So more pollution and congestion. This is contrary to BBC strategic objectives + the government aims for reducing unnecessary journeys. Even more so after pledges made at the Climate Change Conference this autumn in Scotland, by the UK government.

MM 78

Flooding is and has always been an issue with Blackmore. If more houses are built on this will add more pressure on the natural ability of the ground to infiltrate surface water. The demand for urban development, impermeable surfaces and CLIMATE CHANGE are already contributing factors leading to excessive flooding. Blackmore can not afford to have anymore.

MM81

I don't believe the exceptional circumstances test was carried out with any conviction. If it had been the brown field sites in Red Rose Lane Blackmore, and at Stondon Massey would have been identified + included in the LDP.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

MM107/108

The house numbers were reduced from 70 to 50 by Brentwood Borough Council due to high levels of concern by Blackmore residents. Why ask for the public response to the LDP if we are just going to be ignored and the number of houses be increased back to 70?

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.

MM1/MM2

The reason for selecting Blackmore for 70 new dwellings needs to be reviewed. BBC need to be transparent + advise how this decision was arrived at. Blackmore does not meet any of the strategic BBC tests.

Was this developer led? + then of course the main motive has to be profit.

MMS

Blackmore does not fit the criteria of a class 3 village again no explanation ever given why it was given this classification.

MM78

Environment agencies need to be involved + their recommendations acted on - not just left to the developers to resolve.

MM81

Where is the evidence that an exceptional circumstances test was carried out to allow the release of green belt land for development.

MM107 + 108

This needs review - to ignore the objections of the Blackmore residents goes against the democratic rights of local people. Why agree to reduce development to 50 ~~new~~ homes + then without taking objections into consideration increase back up to 70 homes!

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary