

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	Malcolm Hurford
-----------	-----------------

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" value="78,81, 107,108"/>
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.

MM107 and 108

- The plan for Vehicular access via Red Rose Lane is inherently flawed as this is a narrow lane which will not tolerate increased traffic giving rise to risk to life and limb to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders who regularly use this narrow lane. There are no pathways or street lighting which further increases the risk when introducing more vehicles to the lane.
- It is acknowledged as a Critical Drainage area in the document but there is little depth to the mitigation required the developer.
- Blackmore is in a critical drainage area and sustainable drainage systems will not provide a workable solution, green fields clearly provide a more effective solution.

MM78

The flood risk in Blackmore seems to be underestimated and ignored by the authority, they are failing to acknowledge the increased risk to the village of the two proposed sites which are also uphill from existing dwellings which will likely cause increased surface water flowing and the resultant flooding in and around the village.

MM81 Green Belt and exceptional circumstances

- The authority has not fully evidenced or justified the exceptional circumstances that allow for altering the boundaries of existing green belt.
- There is not an unmet need in Blackmore for further development and there is no pressing housing need
- The authority has not examined all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development", including making use of brownfield land, increasing the density of existing settlements and exploring whether neighbouring authorities can help meet its needs.
- The release is not the most sustainable option it does not have a range of services and facilities nor is it serviced by sustainable travel modes.
- A lack of access to services and facilities and access to sustainable modes of transport surely suggests that more development within the green belt is not a more sustainable approach
- These site allocations fail to set out ways in which the impact of removing land for the Green Belt will be offset by compensatory improvements to the environmental quality. Seems a contradiction how will the quality of the environment in Blackmore be improved by increasing the housing stock by over 30%?