

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

CHORIE HICKS

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, 78, 81
107/108

Sustainability Appraisal

para(s)

2-6, 2-8-1
para 5

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 does not fit the guidelines of either BBC or the government it is a remote village with poor road connections, distant from towns/railway stations, bus service is unsuitable for commuting. Car travel is essential to get anywhere, so more houses more cars/pollution/congestion. Which is contrary to BBC & the government aims for reducing unnecessary journeys.

MM5

The village should be classified as a class 4 village, not class 3 such as Kelvedon Hatch, class 3 villages are meant to have a parade of shops, be closer to towns with good transport links, Blackmore has none of these

MM78

Flooding has always been an issue with Blackmore & removing 2 large fields will just make the situation worse. With more extreme weather situation will only worsen.

MM81

Blackmore residents identified alternate non green belt sites, ie brown field sites in Red Rose Lane Blackmore & at Stondon Massey therefore had to believe that BBC could not also have located them & included in LDP.

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 as Blackmore does not meet any of the strategic BBC tests or meet government guidelines.

MM5

Blackmore does not fit the criteria of a class 3 village, needs to be reviewed by BBC or independent body, before the plan goes any further.

MM78

Environment agency needs to be involved & their recommendations acted upon

MM81

There is no evidence that an exceptional circumstances test was carried out to allow the release of green belt land for development, that fits in with government guidelines.