

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

LAURA HARRIS

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 is a remote village which does not meet any of BBC strategic objectives. It has poor road connections, is distant from towns/railway stations, bus service is poor and not suitable for commuting. Car travel is essential to get anywhere. More houses result in more cars/pollution/congestion. This is all contrary to BBC strategic objectives + government aims for reducing unnecessary journeys. Also destroying 2 green belt fields means loss of valuable wildlife habitat. MM5 - Blackmore has 1 shop, 1 tea room + 1 ladies part time hairdresser. MM78 - flooding has always been an issue and removing 2 large fields will make it worse. MM81 - Do not believe exceptional circumstances test was carried out thoroughly, if at all. There are other more suitable sites which were identified several years ago. MM107 & MM108 - increasing from 50 to 70 is a 40% increase + they were reduced to lower figures as BBC accepted some of residents views about unsuitability of site.

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.

MM1/MM2 - Reasons for selecting Blackmore for 70 new dwellings need to be reviewed. BBC need to be transparent and advise how this decision was reached as Blackmore does not meet any of the BBC tests. This needs to be re-visited and the situation reviewed.

MM5 - Blackmore does not fit the criteria of a class 3 village in Essex, again this needs to be reviewed by BBC or independent body. MM78 - Environment agency needs to be involved and their recommendations need to be acted upon, not just left to developers to resolve. Their only motive is to maximise profits. Developers are renowned for building in flood risk areas but local authority should stop this.

MM81 - There is no evidence that an exceptional circumstances test was ever carried out to release garden belt land for development. This needs to be reviewed. MM107/108 - increase from 50 to 70 houses at least cannot be justified. It was reduced to 50 as Dunston Hills agreed to take another 20.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary