

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** THATCHAM NE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
**Date:** 01 March 2023 17:53:09  
**Importance:** High

---

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

---

Good afternoon,

I hereby wish to formally oppose West Berkshire council's plan to build 2500 houses in the proposed area of North East Thatcham for the following reasons:

The increase in traffic will be quite considerable. This will in turn increase pollution and road safety also quite considerably.

Bucklebury Parish council have commissioned a traffic study, undertaken by 'Yes Engineering'. From this study it appears that the trip rates used by WBC are unreliable and not robust. No assessment has been made of the routes most likely to be affected by an increase in traffic. Let's say that for the moment there is only 1 car in every household meaning that there will be an extra 2500 cars on the road. Considering that there appears to be a road from the proposed site coming out on Harts Hill Road this will mean an enormous amount of extra traffic going through villages like Upper Bucklebury and beyond I have lived in [REDACTED] for almost 20 years and in that time there has already been a great increase in traffic passing through. This is of course with all the associated pollution not to mention safety issues!! I am aware that WBC are only mentioning 1500 houses but I think we are all aware that this will inevitably rise to the original number of 2500 houses!

I understand that there will also be a car park built on Harts Hill Road as well as a new roundabout to allow traffic in and out of the northern end of the development. This will add greatly to congestion on the already very busy A4 and roads coming off the A4. I am specifically thinking of the enormous congestion that builds up because of inadequate measures taken with regards to railway crossing when trains pass through.

I fail to see how WBC can claim that the increase in housing and therefore people will have a positive impact on road safety, I am now specifically talking about Harts Hill Road. I note that there are no modelling results for that so how did WBC come to this conclusion??

Tying in with the increase of traffic is the consequential damage to the Common due to increase of footfall which will lead to damage to an ecosystem of national importance. A Greenfield development abutting an AONB where WBC has not given any up to date evidence or indeed a strategy for positive impact and overall biodiversity gain.

The country park that is mentioned in the plan is to my mind nothing like the 3 small isolated areas inside the proposed settlement boundary. A country park has a meaningful environmental value which the 3 small areas in the plan most definitely cannot live up to!

Then of course there is the increase of people in the area. These extra people will need to be looked after in terms of their health and education for instance. This will place untold pressure on the already very stretched services that the existing GP, dental practices and other health providers as well as schools are able to provide.

I note that there is mention of a new primary healthcare facility to be built but there is no detail or insight into the strategic healthcare planning. There does not appear to be fit for purpose health impact assessment in accordance with current guidelines from Public Health England. Nor

does there seem to be any mention of any discussions with health service providers with regards to impact on primary health care services which to me is something that WBC should have done and if they have they should provide details of these discussions. I am sure that WBC is well aware of the fact that few new GP practices are commissioned by NHS England even if they consider there to be a patient demand for health care services!

WBC seems hell bent on building as many houses as possible in a small area of countryside whilst making unsubstantiated promises about how both the human and natural environment will be improved. There does not seem to be any evidence of any attempt to analyse, investigate and address the consequences of the plans WBC have put forward thereby failing to consider the impact this will have not only on the existing environment, both human and natural, but also on the human and natural environment if the plans go ahead. I don't think it needs spelling out that it will be an unmitigated disaster all round!!

The overall thrust of the SP17 policy is clearly to build as many houses as possible in a small area of countryside, while making empty promises about how the environment – human and natural – will be improved or, if not, mitigated. Despite all the money spent on consultants to prepare the housing plans and justify the 'growth' requirement, there is no evidence of any serious attempt to investigate, analyse and systematically address the consequences. Everything will be all right because their own unsubstantiated policies say it will be.

I therefore am against the go ahead of the plans to build 2500 new homes on the proposed site. There are more suitable sites to be found for this where 2500 houses do not have to be squeezed on a piece of land completely unsuitable for this.

Regards

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