

## 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	CHRISTINA ATKINS
-----------	------------------

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.	1, 25, 78, 81 107, 108
Sustainability Appraisal	para(s)	Page 5 - para 2.6, 2.8.1
Habitat Regulations Assessment	para(s)	
Policies Map or other supporting documents	Please specify	Annexe 2

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.

I consider main modification to be unsound. Including R25 & R26 in the LDP Plan to build houses in Blackmore Village, means that Blackmore will cease to be a village as it is today. These fields are not suitable for development. Blackmore is unlike other villages like Dodinghurst, Kelvedon Hatch, Herensgate and should be classed as a Class 4 village and not 3.

#### R26 Access

Redrose lane is a Flood Plain and taking 4 Hectares of meadow land with ancient hedgerows & ditches and replacing them with, Houses, Concrete & Tarmac will make flooding worse. Vast sections of Blackmore is flooded by downpours coupled with the River Widd where water enters ditches. I lost my car in this lane when a surge of water from field R26 in minutes entered into the foot wells. Much flooding in areas makes roads & lanes impassable. Also, Redrose lane is not a Road, it has no pavements and is used by Dog Walkers, Cyclists, Horse riders. Cars make this lane dangerous as it is a single track.

#### Sewers & Drainage

Capacity in Blackmore are at their maximum and this should be taken more seriously.

Strongly oppose R25 & R26 be released from the Green Belt. These are 2 Meadows with ancient hedgerows & ditches with wildlife and should be protected as part of the Green Agenda. Will also impact on Bio-diversity too.

Blackmore has a limited Transport System with no buses. Evenings, Weekends or Bank Holidays. Residents are heavily reliant on their cars to reach services.

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.

I have lived here 43 years and know how the village of Blackmore functions. Blackmore is a remote village surrounded by fields and some 7 miles from Brentwood Town Centre. More Hovves would mean more cars, more journeys, more deliveries, more pollution and more congestion in the centre of village. Residents have trouble parking now as we have much through traffic & visitors using our facilities. Blackmore does not have the infrastructure for more housing and people with regard to Doctors, School & Roads. Many Hovves have already been built on brown field sites and surrounding areas more housing built and all use our village. So more housing is not needed in Blackmore. Other areas like Standon Massey need regeneration. Our village is sustainable as it is. Can't believe BBC can't find other sites to build on in areas around Brentwood. Blackmore only has one Food Store, we don't have a parade of shops like other areas. We suffer serious flooding in Blackmore and this must not be ignored. I remember floods where residents were rescued by boat in Church Street & Fire Engine pumped water from graves at Funerals. In my opinion, R25 & R26 should never have been added to the LDP Plan by BBC from the beginning without prior consultation with our Parish Council and its Residents. A huge mistake to make and I think it was disgraceful to do this. This is not "DEMOCRACY" and more Developer head. All Essex villages should be protected for future generations to enjoy and not left to Planners to destroy. Are not at all in agreement with Government Inspector making the decision whether to allow this build or not on our behalf.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary