

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Thatcham housing development OBJECTION to approval
Date: 03 March 2023 12:11:58

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

Conor Southgate

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear West Berkshire Council,

I write to formally object to the North East Thatcham (NETD) housing development which has been approved by West Berkshire Council.

I run a design and build construction company, building new homes in West London. I am unable to comprehend how this scheme is suitable for the proposed site between North East Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury.

I have lived in [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] years and proposed scheme will destroy the protected AONB countryside to which it is being placed on the border with. I have set out my reasoning for the above statement below;

- Road infrastructure is unsuitable to support traffic from an additional 1500 homes. Based on NETDs location, the majority of commuting will via local highways.
 - The A4 is already over congested at peak times and this will worsen traffic levels. How do cars sat backlogged for extended periods on the single carriageway into Thatcham correspond with WBCs green policy for reducing emissions?
 - In turn more road users will cut through villages such as Upper Bucklebury & Chapel Rowe. These roads are not suited for additional traffic demand nor the speed at which motorists drive through villages with elderly care homes & young pedestrians going and from school.
 - The additional roundabout proposed on Harts hill as well as the carpark is not suitable for to this connection single lane road, nor is the increased in levels of traffic.
- I was a [REDACTED] and understand student numbers have continued to increase to 30+ students in a classroom, while Kennet schools overall performance has suffered. This is not effective learning. Where do 1500 homes send children & young adults to school without overloading the teaching system? We do not have the local school infrastructure for this size of development.
- Medical practices cannot support this number of additional residents in the area. Building a new practice on completion of the development in 2036? Where will all

the 1500 homes worth of residents be looked after prior to this?

- There is no legitimate positive impact for the NETD presented in the design access statement. It offers a housing target figure, but has been placed in entirely the wrong location within WBC. Greenfield sites between Thatcham and Newbury would offer significantly better locations for additional housing as well as transport routes & the local amenities support the increase in population.
- Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) which are outlined in the plan will require enormous attenuation systems to prevent flooding of Thatcham. These fields offer vital storage of storm water which otherwise runs off to Thatcham. I was at [REDACTED] in 2007 to witness cars being washed down Stoney Lane. Schemes such as this, regardless of permeable external and attenuation systems **will detriment** Thatcham and increase likelihood of the 1:100 year flooding, which is becoming evermore occurent with recent extreme weather. I have seen this myself on smaller developments of 9 homes - 1500 homes in this location is not suitable.

West Berkshires local plan notes; *'without a local plan, building new things in our community won't be done in a way that makes sense' & 'it's important that we get it right and work with you to shape West Berkshire until 2039'*. The aforementioned list would speak somewhat to the contrary on these statements. `

This proposal benefits developers pockets & a housing quota for WBC, without the care or diligence to review the application and its impacts. It also benefits developers pockets. It must be reconsidered and properly reviewed. This should never have been approved.

Please protect our home and reconsider the decision on this application.

Regards

Conor Southgate

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]