

## 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

LOUISE ROAST

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)

Page 5  
paras 2.6  
2.5.1

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 with poor road connections + is distant from town + railway stations, bus service is poor + not suitable for commuting. car travel is essential to get anywhere if you live in Blackmore, so more houses means more cars / pollution / congestion. which is contrary to BBC strategic objectives + the government aims for reducing unnecessary journeys.

Also losing 2 large fields to houses means loss of wildlife habitat.

MMS

Blackmore has 1 shop, 1 tea shop + a hairdresser's plus 2 pubs. This cannot be aligned to large villages such as Doddington / Kelvedon Hatch / Mautnessing they have a parade of shops, far more dwellings, better road links + closer to towns + stations. The village should be classed as a class 4 village, not class 3 as per Doddington.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

MM78

Flooding has always been an issue in Blackmore and removing 2 large fields will make the situation worse, the suggestion of digging 2 ponds on the site as a solution will be unworkable as at times heavy rain makes the water table at ground surface level. With more extreme weather predicted this will get worse.

MM81

do not believe the exceptional circumstances test was carried out with any conviction. If we had the brown field sites in Red Rose Lane Blackmore + at Standon Massey would have been identified + included in LDP.

MM107/108

Houses were reduced from 70 to 50 by BBC due to high level of concerns by majority of Blackmore residents. For the inspector to just increase back to 70 ignores the point of asking for public response to the LDP.