

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objections  
**Date:** 02 March 2023 10:48:36

---

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

---

To whom it may concern:

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

I wish to raise my objection yet again to the proposed plan for development in NE Thatcham outlined in the Local Plan Review. This LPR is clearly unsound and lacks the proper evidence/analysis required to support such a large scale development and I am amazed that the council continues on this course despite the overwhelming objection from its local residents, who live and work in this community, and the revised guidance from central government detailing that housing numbers would now be an advisory starting point and not mandatory. I urge the council to follow what so many other Local authorities have done and pause its plan making process.

The proposed development will negatively affect me and my family as well as all the residents of Bucklebury parish, where we live, in the following ways:

- **Increased traffic towards Upper Bucklebury** – following the publication of the Transport Assessment on January 6<sup>th</sup>, it is clear that there will be significant displacement of traffic from the A4 and Floral way due to the nature of the exit from the north of the proposed site onto Harts Hill. In your own words *“there will be some displacement of A4 traffic onto wider rural routes such as Upper Bucklebury”* which is precisely where the roads are inadequate for safe and sustainable transport such as walking and cycling. As someone who cycles and walks these roads with my children, I already find the flow of traffic particularly fast, dangerous and unsafe for children, particularly between Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row, where the traffic is very fast and there are no pavements or street lighting. Adding to the flow of traffic on these routes and many other rural roads coming off these routes can hardly be described as “Safe” transport.
- **Increased littering, fly tipping and anti-social behaviour** along Harts Hill Road and into the village and AONB. The addition of Car Parks on Harts Hill will surely only increase such activity. I have personally already been involved in confronting intoxicated teenagers who were wandering in the middle of the road on Harts Hill, nearly causing an accident with moving vehicles, having been up to no good in the woods and found one lying by the side of the road unconscious. Can the council explain how the addition of such a car park will serve to reduce such behaviour?
  - Please can you show your reasoning and analysis that serves to support your assessment that the *“Policy is likely to have a positive impact on road safety as safe travel will be critical to the design of the site”*?
  - Please can you show your reasoning and analysis that serves to support your assessment will have a significant positive impact on *“walking, cycling and public transport as the development should be designed with these in mind”*

- I have to question both of these assessments and how you arrived at this proposal as significantly positive outcome?
- **There will be a Negative Impact on healthcare provision for existing residents.** The NE Thatcham Development plan proposes a new primary healthcare facility but is woefully light on detail on this matter. A development of this size and scale should be accompanied by a fit for purpose Health Impact Assessment, but I have been made aware that no such assessment has been arranged or published by WBC or the developers. There has been no approach by WBC or the developers to any local GP practise to discuss an appropriate site, space or location or how such a branch GP surgery could be staffed, funded and administered. The reality is that existing GP practises are already overstretched and underfunded. You are proposing a healthcare site that is unsuitable for NHS primary care and have not made provision to mitigate the burden that 1500+ new houses and families will make on a local NHS struggling to cope. As a local resident, I find this lack of planning and foresight and detailed analysis deeply disturbing and would request that you provide proper evidence for the provision of viable primary care in this plan.
- **There will be a negative impact on the environment for existing residents and wildlife.** The collateral damage to Bucklebury plateau biodiversity opportunity area and its ancient woodlands and heaths will be irreversible. So claims made that SP17 will have a positive impact on the environment are clearly fabricated given the lack of evidence provided to support these claims. Your own LPR's sustainability appraisal accepts that SP17 will have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. *"The site is a greenfield site and therefore would result in a negative impact on the environmental sustainability which would need to be mitigated."* As there appears to be no provision for adequate green spaces and protecting biodiversity in the plan, there will inevitably be a spill over of people and traffic into adjacent areas of the AONB and Bucklebury Common. This is in direct conflict with the management vision of Bucklebury common which is explicitly focussed on not increasing human pressure on the fragile eco system. Go figure!
- **Finally, there is no clearly defined plan for the provision of schools** within the local plan review. As a father of ■ boys going through primary and soon into to be secondary education, this is very worrying. I also noted that the data used in the Thatcham NE Development plan was based on data from a study in 2011. Again, the basis for this recommendation using 12 year old data continues to support my concerns that the planning review is unsound and based on poor quality data. WBC, as an education authority has a duty to provide suitable provision for schools. I find no evidence in the LPR this has been clearly defined, evidenced or thought through properly. Again, this is evidenced by the lack of considered/realistic provision for sports fields which require large amounts of flat land and have no funding allocated.

It would be nice to think my local council was more focussed on representing its existing residents and preserving its existing environment, more than developing every last square inch of green field sites and natural surroundings, to the detriment of many and the financial benefit of a few. I doubt very much the new residents of such a development will thank you when their kids can't get places in schools, access GP or primary healthcare services and spend their lives stuck in traffic in around Thatcham and Newbury along with the rest of us, becoming increasingly sad at how our lovely rural towns and villages have turned into just one more urban sprawl.

I look forward to hearing your responses and am happy for my objections/concerns to be shared publicly. I am happy to appear at the public enquiry in the future should it be required.

Kind regards,

