

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection - SP17  
**Date:** 03 March 2023 16:29:34

---

**This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. STOP. THINK before you CLICK links or OPEN attachments.**

---

I write with regard to the WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection - SP17. As a resident of Upper Bucklebury I am still strongly against the development due to the significant impact the development will have towards our local environment and the impact on key services such as education and healthcare - which I believe have not been thoroughly considered nor the necessary changes made in the Consultation Statement document of December 2022. Therefore, I ask for the comments below to be taken into account for this round of consultation.

#### Objection 1 - Environment

At a national scale, we cannot afford to continue damaging our environment and preventing this should be the main focus, even at a local scale of Upper Bucklebury, in order to sustain crucial flora and fauna. The documentation provided by WBC in support of the draft LPR shows no evidence to show the SP17 will have a positive impact on the environment. This to me is appalling as building a sustainable future should be at the priority of WBC. The new proposal for 'community parks' in the SP17 instead of the original proposal for two 'country parks,' only shows the inconsiderate commitment WBC has to protect the environment by not even upholding the countryside landscape around us. This negativity against the environment is further evident in the LPR's Sustainability Appraisal which accepts how the SP17 will have a negative impact on environment sustainability: 'The site is a greenfield site and therefore, would result in a negative impact on environmental sustainability which would need to be mitigated.' This mitigation is not highlighted in the new document and once again proves how the impact towards the environment is not being acknowledged properly.

For me this is devastating, how can you continue to not put the environment at the focus of your plans?

#### Objection 2 - Education

The LPR does not have specific details upon how Nursery or Early Years will access education. The proposal states how the housing will be made 'affordable' thus suggesting it will attract young families. This will result in an increased number of young children who need to access Nursery who will not be able to due to the strain put on the surrounding nurseries. Moreover, for Primary education, the LPR appears unclear as there is no evidence for the planned numbers of schools. For Secondary education, the schools in catchment areas (Kennet School or The Downs) are already oversubscribed - which is putting more and more pressure on resources and the quality of education for its students.

### Objection 3 - Healthcare

I take note of SP17's proposal for a primary healthcare facility, which indicates it will be made available to an appropriate public health body. However, even in locations where there is a need, the NHS commissions very few new GP centres, and data in the public domain indicates that other regions have worse GP shortages than West Berkshire. So, it would appear that there is absolutely no chance of constructing a new practice with funding from the NHS. Due to the increased expenses required and the impracticality of operating over two sites, it would also not make sense for an existing local practice to open a branch on the proposed site.

Each of the three currently operating practices that serve the area is already overburdened—according to statistics, each Doctor is responsible for slightly under 2000 patients—and the recent closings of several pharmacies in Thatcham have added to this burden.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, I object to the LPR Regulation 19 Objection - SP17 for the reasons highlighted above. On a personal level, I believe the damage to the AONB land will ruin the heritage of Upper Bucklebury due to the connection residents have had with the local environment and countryside for years on end. It is this topophilia that will be ruined. The poor consideration by WBC towards the impacts on the environment and key services is why I object.

Yours sincerely

Annabelle Gerdes

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]