

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

RAYMOND EDWARD THOMPSON

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
+ 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

Due to poor public transport & being a remote village, Blackmore isn't suited to commuting. This means the only way to travel will be by car. More houses will cause more cars and therefore more congestion, cars & pollution, contrary to government aims to reduce unnecessary journeys. Furthermore to the climate impact of ~~the~~ the construction of houses ~~on~~ on two fields will be the loss of habitat for wild animals.

MMS

Blackmore has 1 (often completely unstocked) shop, 1 tea shop & a part time ladies hairdressers. These are not qualities of a class 3 village & should be a class 4 village.

MM78

Ground surface level water is caused by moderate rain in Blackmore & removing two fields will only worsen the exceptional flood risk in the village, which often leaves roads impassable. With the current climate outlook & BBC's disregard for the issues of flooding in the village, the construction of houses will only worsen the situation.

MM107/108

Houses were reduced from 70 to 50 houses due to residents' concern. For this to be increased back to 70 disregards the public response which was asked for.

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.

If ^{the} MMs mentioned earlier within this form are to be appropriately reconsidered in a tactical way, sites R25 & R26 need to be delayed until the next work of the 'immediate partial review', ~~the~~ in order to review & resolve the errors of the existing LDP. This delay should see the LDP revised & appropriately altered and reverted to the decisions made before January 2018. This should ultimately see sites R25 & R26 removed from the plan.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary