

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

Miss Natalie Keefe.

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, 2, 5, 7, 8, 81 107, 108
Sustainability Appraisal	para(s)	Page 5 Paragraphs 2.6 + 2.8.1
Habitat Regulations Assessment	para(s)	
Policies Map or other supporting documents	Please specify	Annex 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.

MM1/MM2 - Blackmore is a small remote village that is mainly accessible via village lanes. It is not close to a railway station and has infrequent bus connections. All of this means that car travel in the village is essential. If the developments in Blackmore are allowed to go ahead it will mean more cars, more congestion and pollution. The developments would also see the loss of 2 fields which are used by wildlife. All of this is conflicting with the council's objectives and the government's aim of reducing unnecessary travel.

MM78 - flooding in Blackmore is a known issue, by building on 2 large fields will only exacerbate the problem as a field will provide a more permeable surface than a concrete development. Over recent years the roads leading to the proposed development have been flooded making them un-passable. Should it be suggested that orchard piece be used as an access road is also unsatisfactory. Currently orchard piece is a quiet cul-de-sac that is used by children to play. If this is used as an alternative it will destroy the current peace and quiet and safe road for our children and lead to traffic chaos.

~~MM31~~ MM31 - I do not believe the exceptional circumstances test has been carried out appropriately. Exceptional circumstances do not exist. An alternative on Brown field sites should have been considered and included in the LDP.

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.

The 2 proposed Sites in Blackmore Village should be taken out of the plan for the reasons I have outlined in Q4. Alternatives on brown belt land should be considered as previously proposed on red rose lane an at Shindon Massey.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary