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	Stuart Moulder		
Question 1: Whice representation re	h Main Modification and/o	r supporting do	cument does your
	ication within the Schedule h	nas a reference n	umber. This can be
of the document i	ons on a supporting docume it relates to and, as far as po Modifications. You should av selves.	ssible, your com	ments should be linked
Representations they reflect a cha	on the Policies Map must be nge required as a result of a	linked to specification	c modifications in that on.
Schedule of Pote	ntial Main Modifications	MM no.	MM5 MM78
Sustainability App	praisal	para(s)	
Habitat Regulatio	ns Assessment	para(s)	
Policies Map or of	ther supporting documents	Please specify	

Question 2: Do you consider this	Main Modification and/or sup	porting document:
Legally Compliant?	YES	NO ?
Sound?	YES	NO X

Question 3: If you consider the Main Modification an unsound, please indicate which of the soundness test that apply):	d/or supporting document (s) does it fail (please mark all
Not positively prepared	X
Not justified	X
Not effective	X
Not consistent with national planning policy	X

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.

MM5

Use of a new Settlement Hierarchy has been misapplied. Blackmore has 1 small Co-op, which does cannot be aligned to large villages such as Doddinghurst, Kelvedon Hatch/Mountnessing they have a parade of shops, far more dwellings, better road links & closer to towns & stations. The village should be classified as a class 4 village, not class 3. The scale of the inequality can be seen by these numbers — Doddinghurst: Population 2,550; Neighbourhood Plan Yes; Housing Allocation 0. Blackmore: Population 800; Neighbourhood Plan No; Housing Allocation 70. Remaining Northern Villages Population Total 6191; Neighbourhood Plan No; Total Housing Allocation 0

MM78

Flooding has always been a major issue for Blackmore and is recognised as a "Critical Drainage Area" in the plan, but the Inspectors have removed the comment that the development may impact surface water flooding. There is also no mention at all about Fluvial Flooding which is ignored. Removing 2 large fields will just make the situation worse. The suggestion of digging 2 ponds on the site as a solution is unworkable as at times of heavy rain the water table is at ground surface level. With more extreme weather predicted this situation will only worsen.

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.
MM5 The Settlement Hierarchy needs to be redrawn to correctly allocate Blackmore to a 4. The Housing Allocation needs to be reassessed to ensure the developer's requests are fully assessed for suitability &
Sustainability by creation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the Northern Villages looking specifically at Infrastructure required to support any new development.
MM78 Environment agency needs to be involved & their recommendations acted upon, as part of the creation of the initial plan. It is ludicrous to leave that aspect until after sites have been included, only to find out later there is no feasible or cost effective solution for developers to introduce and therefore fail to get their expected Planning Permission at the end of the line.
Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary