

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	Kathleen Budd
-----------	---------------

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"/>
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.

BBC Strategic Objectives have been compromised by adding sites that directly contradict their goals. Blackmore is a very small village with one small coop and all the existing infrastructure is already overloaded and failing. The only way to live here is to own one or more cars and drive everywhere. Increasing the number of car by an extra 150 or more totally blows the BBC and the central government objective of reducing pollution and car journeys. When you add the additional deliveries to the new builds it would be reaching an additional 1000 traffic movements per day. No suitability and sustainability assessment has been undertaken on any sites in the plan as they were all suggested by developers with no input from BBC.

The Inspectors input of re increasing the number to 70 with no justification or site inspection apart from saying "larger settlements than Blackmore can meet higher density level" just added fuel to the fire of burning useless bureaucrats that waste taxpayers money instead of doing the job of protecting our communities.

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.

R25 & R26 should be removed from the Plan to allow it to go forward. If BBC require justification for that, they should undertake the viability study that should have been done at outset to allow selection of the most appropriate sites from the list given to them by developers. Even perhaps listen to local opinion who suggested a number of better sites but were ignored.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary