

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: The Proposed Development of 2500 houses along the A4 and Floral Way
Date: 20 February 2023 15:00:59

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

Dear Sirs

I should like to register my strongest objection to the proposed North East Thatcham development as put forward by WBC in Reg.19. I believe this plan to be unsound because:

1. Building so many houses on greenfield sites goes against Government guidelines of 'supporting brownfield sites' first. i.e. Colthrop
2. The WBC modelling for traffic shows exits from the site onto the A4, which is already badly congested several times a day, and Floral Way and apparently onto Harts Hill Road but no drawings for this proposed exit exist - suspicious
Because Harts Hill road is already too dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians, it is steep with sharp blind bends. A proposed Car Park also on Harts Hill would equal double trouble. Therefore the Council's assessment of a Positive Impact of Road Safety and Safe Travel which is critical to the design of the site is surely questionable.
3. Combined with the obvious substantial increase in the use by cars, vans, lorries of the roads through nearby villages, with few pavements and little lighting, equalling dangerous rather than 'safe travel'. Especially in relation to the Primary School in Upper Bucklebury. The huge increase in traffic would impact every single person be they cyclist, dog walker, horse rider or resident.
4. No Health Impact Assessment for this development has been published, and we understand this should have been done for a development of this size, which may leave the scheme without any Healthcare.
5. There does not seem to be any funding earmarked for a new GP Surgery. Few new practices are being commissioned presumably for lack of staff nationwide. Therefore a new GP Surgery and its' associated health practices are not a realistic prospect. This is another indicator that the Infrastructure needed for a development of this size is problematical.
6. Combined with the building, or not, of new schools
7. Combined with water run-off from this quantity of houses, especially if they are to be built up hills, which will adversely affect the river Kennet.
8. A development of this size, 1500 or 2500 houses, will effectively join the village of Upper Bucklebury to the top of Thatcham, and there has been no approach by WBC to the residents of this area despite the Council's member for housing Hilary Cole stating that they would work with and consult with 'the local community'. This has not happened.
9. The damage to the environment and in particular Bucklebury Common which would occur cannot be overstated. Bucklebury Estates management are working to reduce footfall in order to protect the rare habitats and species therein, not increase it, and the LPR's own Sustainability Appraisal accepts that there will be a negative impact on environmental issues particular to the Common, and the whole area of the proposed development.

10. The scheme ignores the fact that in Bucklebury Vision and Bucklebury Plan a definite and substantial green belt between Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury was agreed to and approved by WBC.

This proposed development the size of a town the size of Hungerford represents a massive over-development of green fields, rolling hills and farmland and adjacent AONB.

I believe the proposed development known as North East Thatcham to be inherently unsound.

Yours sincerely

Susan Lloyd

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area, with a small white rectangular cutout in the middle.