

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

DARRELL POUNOS

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 - CONCLUSIONS
* PARAS: 2.6; 2.8.1

Habitat Regulations Assessment

para(s)

Policies Map or other supporting documents

Please specify

ANNEXE 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.

Please see attached.

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.

Please see attached.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

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 towns/railway stations, bus service is poor & not suitable for commuting. Car travel is essential to get anywhere if you reside 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, which contain badgers, foxes, voles, hedgehogs.

MM5

Blackmore has 1 shop, 1 tea shop & a part time ladies hairdresser, this cannot be aligned to large villages such as Doddinghurst/|Kelvedon Hatch/Mountnessing they have a parade of shops, far more dwellings, better road links & closer to towns & stations.

The village should be classified as a class 4 village, not class 3 as per Doddinghurst.

MM78

Flooding has always been an issue with Blackmore & removing 2 large fields will just make the situation worse, the suggestion of digging 2 ponds on the site as a solution is unworkable as at times of heavy rain the water table is at ground surface level. With more extreme weather predicted this situation will only worsen.

MM81

Do not believe the exceptional circumstances test was carried out with any conviction. If it had been the brown field sites in Red Rose Lane Blackmore & at Stondon 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.

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

The reason for selecting Blackmore for 70 new dwellings needs to be reviewed. BBC need to be transparent & advise how this decision was arrived at as Blackmore does not meet any of the strategic BBC tests.

All residents of the village believe only reason that Blackmore was chosen was that it was developer led, & their main motive if of course profit. Bur BBC should be choosing correct locations not easiest solutions.

Whenever BBC have been asked this question they just avoid the subject.

MM5

Blackmore does not fit the criteria of a class 3 village, again no explanation ever given needs to be reviewed by BBC or independent body.

MM78

Environment agency needs to be involved & their recommendations acted upon, not just left to the developers to resolve, their only motive is to maximise profits.

MM81

There is no evidence that an exceptional circumstances test was carried out to allow the release of green belt land for development. BBC have to give clear evidence that this was done thoroughly & legally, or review situation fully so that it meets government guidelines.

MM107 & 108

This needs to be reviewed, BBC agreed to reduce to 50 houses with Dunton Hills agreeing to take the other 20 dwellings, due to huge level of objections from Blackmore residents. To just ignore this goes against the democratic right of local people who will be affected by this to have any say in the matter.