

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: West Berkshire Council (WBC) LPR Regulation 19 OBJECTION
Date: 02 March 2023 10:46:32

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

Name:- Barbara Grey

Dear Planning Officers at WBC,

I write because I believe the LPR Regulation 19 is unsound, I document my reasons to maintain that it is not "Justified" below.

1. West Berkshire Council has a 'Duty to Co-operate'.

This surely means that local parishes and adjacent landowners should be consulted, or at least informed when such impactful planning matters are considered. Since approximately 800 metres of our boundary abuts the proposed new development, I would have expected The Planning Department of West Berkshire Council to have contacted us.

My husband and I co-own [REDACTED]. The western boundary of our land is a stream which abuts the eastern boundary of the proposed NE Thatcham Development.

This stream feeds into the River Kennet, one of the few remaining chalk streams in southern England. The farm consists of land to the west of Coxs Lane and land to the east of Coxs Lane extending along Birds Lane to the village, 60 acres in all.

We have lived here for 29 years during which time we have revitalised the soil following years of arable misuse. We have stopped the use of all chemicals, replaced arable fields with wild flower meadows, planted several kilometres of new hedgerows, properly maintained ancient woodland and hedgerows and planted new woodland. We are recognised for this care by being a farm under the Higher Level Stewardship scheme. Our careful management of this land has resulted in a considerable increase in its biodiversity.

2. Impact on Ecology and Biodiversity

Even though it is our land that is most at risk of damage to its biodiversity, no one from WBC Planning Department has approached us in order to assess the presence of flora and fauna on the land abutting the development. I understand that the data used to judge the current ecology and biodiversity of the proposed site and its immediate surroundings is in most cases more than 15 years old and almost half is over 30 years old. Clearly, this means that no account has been taken of the increased biodiversity we have established whilst [REDACTED] has been under our stewardship. It is obvious that any development on the sloping land to the east of our stream will have a negative impact on the flora and fauna nurtured during our tenure. Any mitigation WBC might propose can do nothing to protect these vulnerable species and the habitats in which they thrive. To suggest that the development will have a positive impact on the environment is just nonsense.

This LPR subsumes part of Midgham Parish on its Eastern boundary. No consultation has taken place regarding the movement of the THATCHAM Settlement Boundary.

The negative environmental impact of the proposed development is clearly of most concern to my husband and I as owners of adjacent land. However, I list below further reasons for my objection to this proposal.

- * Other proposals, some on brownfield sites, have not been given proper consideration. Particularly the Croudace proposal which offers a bridge to replace the level crossing. The traffic jams caused by the level crossing increase year on year and a bridge would be welcomed by everyone.
- * Consultation documents provided in favour of this development were paid for by the developers.
- * Insufficient consideration of the development's impact on the local landscape and the AONB.
- * Disregard for the need of "Defined Gaps" between Thatcham and surrounding villages.

- * The number of houses to be built has been reduced from 2,500 to 1,500 and yet there has been no reduction in the amount of farmland being taken over.
- * No consideration has been given to the likely increase of traffic on Coxs Lane which will become a “rat run” up to the Common and beyond.
- * WBC has provided an oversupply of houses in recent years and yet it has chosen to ignore Michael Gove’s statement of December 6th which will be likely to reduce the overall housing requirements for councils. Many councils have chosen to pause the progression of their local plans, why has WBC not done the same?
- * No consultation has taken place with local GP practices regarding the increase in need from an extra 4000 people.
- * An earlier planning permission for a development at Siege Cross was refused. What has changed.
- * Why is the LPR not being reconsidered by the full council prior to the final submission to The Secretary of State?

I do hope that my real concerns over the unsuitability of this proposal will be seriously considered and that a completely new plan which does not involve building on farmland, will be forthcoming. I would be happy to attend the Public Enquiry if invited.

Yours faithfully

Barbara Grey

.