

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	Sara 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.	<input type="text" value="78; 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.

MM78

The LDP recognises the flooding problem in Blackmore and refers to a Critical Drainage Area. However neither BBC nor the Government Inspectors recognise the Fluvial Flooding of the River Wid. In fact the Inspectors have so crass as to remove the original comment that the development may impact surface water drainage. Covering 2 large fields with houses and road will make flooding significantly worse, and this will continue to get worse as the effects of Climate Change produce more frequent and extreme storms.

MM 107/8

BBC recognised the error of including R25 & R26 and went as far as partially mitigating the situation by reducing the number of houses. The Inspectors showing total ignorance of local problems and refusing to look at, or judge any individual sites blindly propose increasing the numbers back to an arbitrary National standard and increased the total number to 70 houses on these sites. This makes the a bad situation worse and renders the sites (and therefore the Plan whilst they remain) unsustainable.

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

The Environment Agency needs to do an assessment on both types of Flood Issue and the results of that acted upon. The most likely outcome will then be to require the exclusion of both sites from the Plan

MM 107/8

The only way to stop the destruction of this historic and beautiful community is to remove the sites from the plan. The community and infrastructure would be totally overwhelmed by such a dramatic and disastrous increase in the dwelling numbers. If (as should have already happened as a matter of course) a Local Neighbourhood Plan were to be produced for the Northern Villages, it would show there are in fact many more appropriate sites, that are indeed looking for development, but have been excluded by the flawed way the LDP was constructed from the outset.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary