

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WPC LPR Regulation 19 objection - SP17
Date: 01 March 2023 16:49:30

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

Dear sir

1. The written ministerial statement by Michael Gove (6th December 2022) indicates that the housing numbers are now advisory and that the planning Inspectorate should no longer override sensible local decision-making, which is sensitive to and reflects local constraints and concerns. In other words is any of this development needed at all?

I would therefore urge refusal.

2. I am objecting to the plan as so much of it is seriously unsound and it would have a massively detrimental effect on the local area. The extra traffic, extra load on the health services and extra stress on Bucklebury common are just a few of the things that would affect me. As well as other locals.

3. The document talks about how the environment, both human and natural, will be improved or if not improved then the damage “mitigated“ by actions taken by the developers. The plan shows no evidence of any surveys to provide baseline conditions or indeed to provide definitive proposals explaining exactly how the environment would be improved and what they would do to “mitigate” any destruction of environmental features. This makes this important section of the plan unsound.

4. Building a major Greenfield development in the north Wessex downs AONB will forever affect the enjoyment of the local countryside by local communities. There will be a detrimental impact to legally protected wildlife known to be present on the site, not to mention increased and damaging use of existing areas such as Bucklebury common. This again shows that the plan is unsound in its analysis, research and conclusions.

5. I understand that before any development of this size is undertaken, there should be sufficient capacity in the local foul water processing plant to handle the waste produced. I have seen no mention of analysis or funding for the expansion of the sewage processing facilities. As this has to be completed before any building starts, surely that is another reason why the plan is unsound. With the current state of the local sewage system no additional housing should be built.

6. The plan is unsound where traffic considerations are concerned. There is no plan or funding for a bridge over the railway crossing at Thatcham. There are plans for exits from the estate onto a number of roads including Harts hill. This will produce a large increase to the traffic going through cold ash and Upper Bucklebury. There are comments in the plan that “modelling suggests” that all this will not cause problems, but the document shows no modelling detail or results.

7. There is no mention in the plan of building low energy, sustainable houses. Simply that the 2500 houses have been reduced to 1500, but with no indication as to exactly what the design of the housing would be Surely any council, in this current climate, should not be considering such a massive change to the environment in the Thatcham area and as such, I feel that this makes the plan unsound.

8. The development is so far away from Thatcham station and Thatcham town centre that cars will be necessary. Surely this does not tie in with the section on safe and sustainable transport and the strategic environmental assessment which accompanies the local plan. Objective 4 is to “promote and maximise opportunities for all forms of safe and sustainable transport”. With probably 1500 extra cars it is difficult to see how this complies with the safe and sustainable transport objective. Another example of an unsound part of the plan.

9. As a local resident for over 40 years, I feel that the building of 1500 houses so close to Upper Bucklebury will change the character of the area detrimentally and forever for me, my household and anyone living in this very special area.

10. There is no health impact assessment in accordance with guidelines from public health England, and no obvious consultation with local NHS surgeries. This makes the plan unsound and would also mean that none of the possible 1500 + residents would have absolutely no healthcare available from the three local over-subscribed surgeries.

11. The plan for secondary school provision is unsound with no timing or funding, no analysis of possible pupil numbers and no precise size and location of any school.

12. This is still essentially a plan for 2500 houses. The developers have simply reduced the headline numbers to 1500 but left the outline of the development the same. It would then be a comparatively easy matter to build the other 1000 houses in the future. Headlining 1500 houses now is no concession at all.

I hope I have shown in the above examples that this unsound plan should be rejected. The West Berkshire housing numbers should be recalculated based on recent government figures of housing requirement and this will probably show that there is no need at all for another 1500 houses at all.

Thank you for your consideration of this email.

Alexander Morrison

