

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

NICHOLAS LESLIE WILKINSON

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
4 PARAGRAPHS
2.6 & 2.8.1

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

The remote nature of Blackmore necessitates car/van travel in most cases. The bus service that does exist is poor and thus used infrequently. A development such as that proposed with increase car usage and general vehicular movement in/out and around the village. The roads into/out of and through Blackmore are, in many instances narrow. Parking is often a problem in some roads - causing roads to become even narrower when double parked! The loss of 2 large fields would have a significant effect on wildlife habitat

MM5.

Blackmore has only 1 shop, 1 Tea Shop and a part time ladies hairdresser and thus cannot be considered 'on-par' with villages such as Doddington & Kelpston Hatch. It should thus be re-classified as a class ~~3~~ ⁴ NOT ~~4~~ ³

MM78

Flooding (in varying degrees) has now become an annual event (sometimes frequent events per year!) Development of the 2 fields will only exacerbate this.

MM81

I doubt the exceptional circumstance test was carried out rigorously and fairly. This would

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

have surely shown brown field sites more suitable for development eg at Sardon Massey.

MM 107/108

Housing density was reduced from 70 to 50 by BBC due to the many local residents concern. To arbitrarily increase this back to 70 ignores the point of asking for public response to the LDP

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.

Blackmore village needs correct classification
i.e. class ~~3~~ 4 NOT ~~4~~ 3

A robust and vigorous analysis of
suitable brown field sites in the area
should be conducted.

A full investigation and survey of
existing AND potential flood risk
should be carried out reflecting
accurately the potential impact of
the development being proposed. (and any
others!)

The current proposal should be removed
from the LDP as it is not justifiable!

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary