

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 26 February 2023 13:23:06

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

Dear Sir, Madam,

Please find below my objections to the proposed Thatcham NE development (SP 17), part of the WBC LPR Regulation 19.

My details are Dom Feurtado, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Objections

Roads - negative impact

- lack of modelling or plan for the traffic that will be pushed from the development onto Harts Hill and through the local villages i.e. through Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row and Bradfield Southend. The route through this will become a “rat run” to get to the M4 and Reading. Improving a few junctions on the already busy A4 will not solve this. There will be a negative impact to both Thatcham and local villages. The increased number of cars from the new properties plus the associated increased in deliveries, hgvs, visitors etc will also have a negative impact on the area. Negative impact on the environment.
- speeding is a huge issue in these local villages, and particularly on the road that runs from Harts Hill through Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row and Southend to Common Hill. Nothing is shown in the plan help prevent this issue. Negative impact on local villages. Negative impact on environment. Negative impact on road safety, both for road users and pedestrians.
- The junction where Union Road meets Common Hill, and where Common Hill then meets the A340 can not cope with the current traffic levels, particularly the A340 junction. This will be made much worse if the new houses are built and when this route becomes a “rat run” to Reading and the M4. Negative impact on road users. Negative impact on environment.
- the final stretch of Union road where it meets Common Hill is not suited for additional vehicles. It is already narrow and windy. Would need significant improvement. Negative impact on road users. Negative impact on road safety. Negative impact on environment.
- there appears to be little consideration for additional pollution the extra vehicles will produce. Negative impact on environment.
- there appears to little concern for other environmental impacts additional cars will cause - noise, inconsiderate driving, for example Negative impact on residents in local area. Negative impact on road safety.
- there appears to have been very little thought on how to provide public transport so that not using a car is a sensible option. Negative impact on environment, local population. Negative impact on the environment.
- what is the car park on Harts Hill for if use of Harts Hill is going to be dissuaded? Negative impact on local population.
- I understand the SEA states the development will have a positive impact on safe travel. This clearly won't be the cause for surrounding villages. Negative impact on road safety as cars use country roads rather than A4. Negative impact on environment.
- I understand the SEA states the development will have a positive impact on walking, cycling and public transport. The proposal doesn't make it clear how. Significant

improvement in public transport needed so stop creation of driving “rat runs”. Negative impact on local population. Negative impact on the environment.

Healthcare - negative impact

- it is already hard to get a GP appointment in this area of West Berks. Adding thousands of additional people to the area will obviously make this situation worse. Relying on current GPs in Thatcham and local villages will not work. It will also promote the use of local roads rather than the A4 to get to proposed GP surgeries i.e. to Chapel Row. Negative impact on local population.
- proposal for GP surgery to be built isn't clear. Doesn't appear to have been discussed with local GPs, which surely would be the first step? Negative impact on local population.
- how long would it take to get the surgery open? Acknowledged it is very difficult to establish a new GP surgery. Surely needs to be open before housing is completed. Negative impact on local population.
- this new development will rely on GP surgeries with a high elderly demographic, with higher reliance on healthcare. Adding thousands of new users will have a hugely detrimental effect on current users. Negative impact on local population.

Environmental - negative impact

- obviously this development will have a huge detrimental impact on the local environment and ecology simply by paving a huge part of the countryside. Negative impact on environment, ecology, the AONB, local countryside, local native and protected species, on the fight against climate change.
- there will be significant protected species that will be negatively impacted regardless of measures put in place. Negative impact on local ecology.
- no evidence presented that it will have a positive impact, as appears to be stated in the proposal.
- replacing countryside with country parks! This appears a strange approach. Surely just leave it as countryside. Negative impact on local environment and ecology.
- how will the country parks improve ecology and biodiversity? Negative impact on local ecology.
- the development should make an ecological improvement to the area, this plan doesn't clearly show any benefit. Negative impact on local ecology and environment.
- a development of this size on a greenfield site will have a negative impact on national efforts to prevent climate change. Negative impact on fight against climate change.
- a development of this size on a greenfield site will have a negative impact on local efforts to prevent climate change. Negative impact on fight against climate change.

Education - negative impact

- the plan seems to miss significant aspect of end to end education provision. No clear plan for early years/pre-school/nursery, vague plan for a primary school, no clear plan for a secondary school. Negative impact on current population. Negative impact on overstretched education system, particularly second provision.
- development will significantly impact secondary provision, with already oversubscribed schools. Likely to result in bussing children long distances. Increasing traffic on village roads. Negative impact on overstretched education system, particularly second provision. Negative impact on local roads. Negative impact on environment and fight against climate change.
- where will schools (if built) be placed? Obviously will need to be close to A4 and not near rural roads. How likely is this? What would the school catchment be?
- when will the proposed funding for school provision be made available? Surely the school(s) need to be in place prior to c.4-5000 new residents moving to the area.

Legal requirement - Inconsistent with current central govt guidance

- central government has removed the legal requirements for specific housing numbers to be met by councils, these are now advisory. It would be good to understand why WBC is continuing to force through this huge development? What are the other external factors making WBC think it is sensible to build between 1,500 and 2,500 houses in this area where roads, public transport, GPs and schools are already creaking?
- the removal of the legal requirement makes it a great opportunity to pause and produce a properly put together, modelled, researched plan, of a scale sensible for this area.

Character of the local area

- this development will effectively make Upper Bucklebury part of Thatcham, eroding Upper Bucklebury village's unique character. It also has the potential to open up further developments that erode the countryside that defines and separates the various towns and villages in West Berks from one another. Ensuring villages remain just that, villages, is an important part of this part of West Berkshire. This proposal will have a negative impact on the character of the area and on the local population.

Thanks you.

Yours faithfully

Dom Feurtado

Sent from my iPhone