

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 25 February 2023 16:35:17

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

Thatcham NE Development

I am lodging my objection to the LPR (Regulation 19) as I find the proposal to be unsound.

I have no knowledge of planning laws, and the huge amount of information available on LPR Regulation 19 is complex. From a layman's point of view, I find many of WBCs arguments promoting the benefits of this development unsound. I am lodging my objection on the grounds of the impact this development will have on me, my children, my community and the local environment.

Traffic: This will have a significant impact on traffic in the area, especially on the routes in and around Thatcham and over the level crossing. This will increase the traffic through all of the surrounding villages of Upper Bucklebury, Cold Ash, Chapel Row, Bradfield Southend etc.

With the plan to have an exit at the north of the development site onto Harts Hill Road and a roundabout on Harts Hill Road this will increase the risk of accidents on an already dangerous road and also lead to congestion on the A4. I'm also not sure what the new car park mentioned in the proposal is for?

WBC say that there is likely to be a positive impact on road safety (as safe travel will be critical to the design of the site) but I fail to see how WBC thinks this can be the case.

Schooling: There doesn't appear to be a clear detailed plan for the provision of nursery or early years education.

For secondary education, Kennet School is already oversubscribed. If the development goes ahead, children from that development will have priority in getting into Kennet School. Children from Upper Bucklebury will be limited to going to the Downs.

Although the LPR provides for a new secondary school being built, it's not clear where it will be located, or the number of pupils it will cater for. It's not clear if the proposed funding is sufficient to meet this cost or the timing of this funding.

AONB and the destruction of wildlife: This development would be a massive over-development of the countryside and would destroy the beauty of the area. There would be an increase in dog-walkers, quadbike/scrambler riders, dog fouling and litter. The increase in cars driving and parking on the Common for people to go walking etc. would have a huge detrimental effect on the area...not to mention the destruction of the wildlife. Contrary to WBC claims in Regulation 19, there is every reason to believe that this development will have a significant detrimental impact on the environment.

Medical Practices: Although there are proposals for a new GP Surgery, a development of this size should have a Health Impact Assessment carried out to assess how the development's design has considered the impact on the health and well-being of existing and new communities. This doesn't appear to have been done.

Also, it doesn't appear that WBC/developers can convincingly evidence that they've liaised with the local health care agencies to detail how the NHS can cope with the extra burden of these new houses.

While I understand the need for more housing, WBC and the developers appear to want to build as many houses as possible without proper consideration of the consequences that a development of this scale will have on the health and education services, traffic and environmental aspects of the surrounding area.

Gráinne McQuaid

