

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Thatcham North East Development
Date: 22 January 2023 16:36:17

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

Regarding the proposed and reduced plan to develop an area of North East Thatcham with 1,500 houses up to the year 2039. Thatcham has had many developments over the years (from [REDACTED] when we moved here); in all these developments infrastructure has been sorely lacking, roads such as Tull Way and Floral Way can hardly be called infrastructure, yet they are there to ease the movements from the most recent developments, yet in Policy SP17 it is stated that the mitigation of the development impact on the highways network - this is not shown and at the February 2019 meeting there was going to be no improvement to Harts Hill Road, which already carries a heavy amount of traffic.

Your policy also states that priority habitats and ecological features will be protected, and yet you also state that all people will have access to the area's land, very hard to achieve both.

Policy SP6 states that flood risk for the site will not be increased, but does not state that flood risk to surrounding areas will not be increased, which is almost impossible to achieve with such a huge number of hard standings with houses on. It is also stated that the benefit to the community will outweigh the risk of flooding. That is hardly something that will endear you to all the people whose houses flooded in previous years and who either can no longer insure or pay increased premiums.

Floral Way was supposed to be the boundary of North East Thatcham. It would be preferable to build

a new secondary and primary school, with leisure centre on part of the proposed site and develop the current Francis Bailey Primary School, Kennet Secondary School and the Kennet Leisure Centre on what is a brownfield site that is much closer to the heart of Thatcham.

Hilary Cairns
[REDACTED]