

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 25 February 2023 15:44:15

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

I would like to register my objections to the proposed building of between 1500/2500 houses on the North East of Thatcham – namely WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection.

My name is Ian Dalgarno of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I am against the development because of the environmental impact it will have on Bucklebury Common as well as the proposed development site. Bucklebury Common has many legally protected species including ground nesting birds. Even a proportion of the population of the development and their dogs who will come onto the common will cause significant disturbance and damage as happened during Covid.

The green sites on the proposed development will not satisfy the demand for green space by all the inhabitants of the proposed development as admitted by yourselves with the complete lack of strategy documents.

The flagrant carelessness displayed in the consultation document for the environment are at best vague and at worst unsubstantiated. I fail to see how a Council supposedly working for the people are prepared to accept this destruction of their local environment.

Leading on from this there is the dramatic increase in traffic which will inevitably pass up Harts Hill, onto Broad Lane through Upper Bucklebury and the surrounding small 'quiet' lanes. Cycling or walking is already hazardous in these lanes and will become impossible with the increased usage that is inevitable. The consultation document actually admits this increase.

From reading the local newspapers there is already sewage being dumped into the Kennet and Avon canal suggesting that our already overstretched water and sewage systems are overloaded. Unless there is a huge investment by Thames Water to address this then there is another environmental issue which must be given urgent consideration.

There is insufficient infrastructure such as Surgeries and Schooling – already overstretched areas.

The whole plan is unsound and based on something paid for by developers who have nothing but financial gain in mind. The Secretary of State for Leveling Up Housing and Communities has had the sense to back down on the number of houses needing to be built.

Indeed the Government has recently said that green field development can be reconsidered. There seems to have been little attempt by the Council to consider alternative brown field sites.

It does seem to me there are many flaws in the proposed plan of this unnecessary development and I do hope that it is rejected.