

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	GERARD MOUNTSKEWENS
-----------	---------------------

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"/>
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.

MM1, MM2; ANNEX 2 + MM5.

Have concern that the Strategic Objectives have been completed with very little concern for many of the important issues that will Blackmore and its residents (R25, R26).

Blackmore is the smallest village of those considered for development and certainly does not have the infrastructure to cope with additional housing - roads, local amenities, education. An increase of 23% in dwellings is against Brentwood Government guidelines. Plus the new development on the equitation centre site has/will increase further burden on Blackmore - additional cars will increase the traffic flow which will further affect the congestion on our roads with the village being a 'funnel' cut through for vehicles using the A12/M11.

- The fields being considered for development and in Green Belt designation and building is against policy.

- The allocation of these sites seem to bear little consideration for many of the points raised by the BVHA and have only been adopted to justify R25, R26

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.

MM78 FLOOD RISK.

- Huge concern is the regular flooding in Red Rose lane and the area by the pond.
- What consideration has been given to fact of more housing being built and the subsequent land drainage into an area that already has huge problem during the winter, eg. numerous vehicles requiring assistance to be pulled from the flood water.
- this flooding will/does create many problems when accessing the village.
- the Sustainable Appraisal (2.8.1) does not appear to consider the reality of this problem which has existed for many years - only very major work on diverting the water would have to be undertaken at some considerable cost!!
- Also - the present concern of Climate Change damage must be taken into account so as not to cause environment problems as are being experienced in other parts of the United Kingdom

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary