

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** OBJECTION - PROPOSED THATCHAM NE DEVELOPMENT SP17/WBC LPR REGULATION 19 OBJECTION  
**Date:** 01 March 2023 17:41:34

---

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

As a resident at [REDACTED], I believe there are many unsound issues in the proposed plans to develop 1500-2500 new homes in NE Thatcham and believe such a development would have a serious negative impact on myself and on the area. According to the hatched red on the map my home will be engulfed and Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury will be one urban soulless sprawl with no new amenities. Doctors, dentists, schools, anything resembling a means to serve the community seem non-existent in these plans. I have to wait 3-4 weeks for a Doctor appointment, and I have never been able to find a dentist nearby. Thatcham itself has no banks since NatWest and Lloyds have closed down; Lloyds Pharmacy has closed, the car park for local shoppers is costly and small. We are only able to have recycling and rubbish collections every fortnight, another 2500 homes can surely only be more challenging for the Council.

The proposed development will have a hugely negative impact on what is currently a rare agricultural landscape in an already built-up area. It is inappropriate in the current climate to diminish agricultural and farming land which has for decades been actively harvesting wheat and barley, and grazing sheep. The farmland the proposed development will destroy is home to much wildlife, deer, pheasants, fox, badgers and the red kites are back flying after many absent years. The woodland is a natural resource and in light of the advent of the Queens Canopy seems counter-productive to destroy. These fields and woods give accessible footpaths to nature for residents and visitors to enjoy and they are badly needed. WBC should be encouraging and supporting local farmers so they don't have to sell up to developers to survive, to increase the amount of home-produced food, not diminish agricultural spaces.

Harts Hill Road is a steep narrow road and the drive into my home means a sharp right turn on the hill, across oncoming traffic, and with an extremely limited view around the bend. The speed limit has been adjusted over the years to encourage lower speeds, but there are still daily potential incidents on this dangerous corner with particularly drivers cutting through from the busy A4 and taking little notice of the speed limit. There is no footpath on the hill road for pedestrians and walkers including children are often risking their lives walking in the road. Cyclists too are in peril, the hill is steep and not all cyclists expert enough to make it up the hill, causing tailbacks of traffic, including heavy goods traffic. Harts Hill Road would be a key artery for such a huge development and the extreme numbers would make this a more dangerous road, and the proposed development with cars owned by 1500-2500 new properties would have a hugely negative impact on safety, access and pollution.

The building of 1500-2500 new homes would take many years. The everyday lives of current residents would be severely impacted with the inevitable upheaval and disruption caused by such proposed building works. Noise, pollution, inconvenient road closures, water supply interrupted, power cuts, would all have a negative impact on the environment and the daily lives of current residents.

I write as a local resident, in objection to the proposed development, in what I believe is the majority view, and trust WBC will make the appropriate decision to deny planning permission for such an unpopular development and which would have such a detrimental effect on the community and local area.

Lin Chandler



