

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 03 March 2023 15:00:10

---

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

---

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear WBC Planning Department,

In response to the West Berkshire Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation, I want to state my objection to it in the strongest terms. I find the plan itself unsound and unsustainable on many grounds.

1. The proposed location of such a large greenfield development is completely inappropriate to the needs of either the existing or proposed new residents.
  - a. The proposed development will forever remove this vital biodiverse environment from the enjoyment of both the existing wildlife and the local residents.
  - b. There appears to be no mechanisms to protect the existing (particularly legally protected) wildlife and ancient woodlands on the site or the adjacent areas (eg. Bucklebury Common) which also depend on that site as part of the local biodiversity.
  - c. The claim in SP17 that this proposal would have a positive impact on the environment is incredulous and brings into question the competence of those preparing the whole document.
  - d. Creating "County Parks", which appear to already have been downgraded to "community parks", is no credible replacement for genuine (existing) biodiverse environment and certainly no justification for eradicating an existing ancient and biodiverse environment. Further, these proposed parks would not have the same long-term protection and could themselves be consumed by housing in future plans. Lastly, these small parks would be insufficient to prevent increased load on the existing green spaces, causing further load on an already fragile environment in the surrounding area, undermining the current efforts to support and restore the existing ecosystems around Bucklebury Common.
  - e. When walking through and around Bucklebury Common, it is not uncommon to find people riding motorised vehicles on footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways (and other areas). These spoil the enjoyment of the area, but worst have a detrimental effect on the wildlife and ecosystem. These can also be heard at night, cause disturbance to those living around Bucklebury Common. Increasing the local population will inevitably cause this problem to grow. WBC appears unable to enforce the current regulations with the current population, it would be inappropriate to increase the local population significantly without first demonstrating the ability to protect the existing environment and then presenting

some proposals to ensure that this can be scaled.

- f. The effect of climate-changing pressures can be seen when walking around the local woodland in terms of animal sightings, tree and plant deaths due to water stresses. Increasing the local population and inevitable further pressure on this already struggling environment and ecosystem. This has not been considered within the proposal.
2. The roads in the surrounding area and particularly in and between the local villages are entirely inadequate for the current traffic and it is not credible to consider adding further traffic:
    - a. Any increase in the volume of traffic would require a significant upgrade of the local roads and the proposed development would inevitably cause a large volume of increased traffic. Such an upgrade is (rightly) not proposed, but if it were, it would be completely at odds with maintaining the existing environment as a stated goal. This appears to be a self-contradictory aspect to this plan.
    - b. Some of the local roads have been designated as “quiet roads”. These are currently overused by traffic. Adding further traffic will degrade these further. The plan contains no means to mitigate this problem.
    - c. Many of the roads through the local villages (many on the obvious “rat run” paths) do not contain pavements or anywhere for pedestrians to avoid traffic. This will lead to serious accidents and “near misses” (particularly at dawn/dusk/night and during the winter). Several years ago, one of our neighbours children was forced into a ditch due to passing traffic and the traffic is already much worse.
    - d. There has already been a steady increase in the traffic through the villages over the last few years. It is no longer possible to sleep with our windows open (in hot summers) on our road in [REDACTED] as drivers start using the road outside of our house for commuting as early as 5:30am. This will only get significantly worse with such a large increase in population. As there are no alternate routes (that won't also be affected), this traffic will further increase and affect the quality of life of the residents on ours and similar roads throughout the day.
    - e. The increase in traffic will prevent recreational road users (cycling and walking) from an enjoyable and safe experience. This could dissuade people from using the more green mode of transport (cycling) to reverting to their cars for safety purposes. This is against the overall government and local policies to move people away from using cars where possible.
  3. The provisions for healthcare have not been adequately addressed:
    - a. It can currently take us up to 3 weeks to get a routine appointment with our doctor. Several years ago this was within a day or two. The plan does not address adequately the impact or a large number of people further increasing the load on the local healthcare system. Simply building one or more new health centres and/or extending existing ones does not address the underlying problem that these cannot be fully staffed. This problem has not been understood and acknowledged in the plan, thereby casting doubt on the competence in this area of the plan.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

