

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Objection - WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 01 March 2023 14:09:14

---

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

---

**Lindsay Hallahan**  
[REDACTED]

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to you to submit by objection to the proposed development of 1500-2000 houses in NE Thatcham. I have lived in the area with my young family for nearly [REDACTED] years. I moved to the area making a significant personal investment in the area so that my family could benefit from the local environment, green spaces and support the local community. The mental health of my family and specifically my young daughters wellbeing following COVID, has been improved due to the green spaces and wildlife of the area. Wildlife particularly roam freely in our garden and local area (Deer, Pheasants, Hares, many birds, foxes, badgers etc).

I believe this proposal and planning application to be unsound based on the below points.

### **Transport**

The increased traffic that would result as a direct impact of the proposed development, will significantly negatively impact the local area. The planned exit at the north of the proposed site onto Harts Hill will exit in one direction towards Upper Bucklebury and then split through Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row. These roads are country roads and wholly inadequate currently, never mind with a considerable and wholesale increase in traffic that will come with the development. This is Unsafe. There is already unacceptable level of traffic accidents. The transport assessment that was conducted shared no modelling results for the Harts Hill Road exit - Why Not? There are drawings for all other areas. This will also have a negative impact on the ability to Walk, cycle in the area. Cars travel too fast and the roads are narrow and winding so not conducive to a higher volume of cars providing a safe environment for walkers and cyclists.

### **HealthCare**

The massively overstretched NHS GP and also community and Acute facilities is well documented. The proposal suggested a GP surgery would be offered to the integrated care board but no details or insight was shared about what exactly this would look like. Where is the HIA detailing how this would be considered fit for purpose for the community and how this has been shared and discussed with the local Health Service providers. As a result of these discussions - where can the recommendations and conclusions be seen in the proposed plan? It is of great concern that the details of this is not available from WBC or the developer. The demographic of the community affected here desperately need

access to sufficient healthcare today and in the future. As per the figures available from NHS digital, it is highly unlikely that any additional GP practices would be provided by the NHS. It is shocking that no local GP surgery has been approached by WBC or the developers to discuss the proposal and potential impact. All 3 current practices are massively overstretched. Approximately 27,800 patients which equates to just under 2000 patients per GP and with the existing new homes being built and introduction of more young families to the area this continues to grow. It is not sustainable. This problem continues into Dental practices who are currently unable to meet the demand and patients having to travel often large distances to get dental care.

## **Environment**

1. Collateral damage to the Bucklebury Plateau Biodiversity Opportunity area and its ancient woodland and heaths, in particular the common
2. Siting a major greenfield development in the broader landscape setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB that will forever impair enjoyment of the open countryside by local communities
3. Causing detrimental impacts to legally protected wildlife known to be present on the sites.

From a review of the documentation on SP17 there is nothing to support the claim that there will be a positive impact on the environment from the development in fact the opposite is true. Nor is there evidence of documentation to support the Sustainability Charter which is required but not available or in existence. There seem to be no proven plans on how the development will provide green spaces which will mean a spill over into other areas increasing stress on these fragile eco systems. Where is the evidence to support the claims that there will be an overall positive impact to the Environment??

## **Education**

There is no clearly defined plan on how education will be provided to the increased population and the existing residents satisfactorily. Adding 2000 new homes and approximately 4000 new school places needed based on 2 kids per household, where are the additional school places going to be provided? Clearly if any new schools were to be built that has additional impact on traffic and other local resources. Local schools and nurseries are oversubscribed today without the increased burden. There was no current predictive future modelling to anticipate requirements beyond year one and future resources required.

WBC has a duty of care to provide education needs are met across all school years - this is not defined in the LPR.

In addition, there is a need to provide school fields on flat ground and from the proposed area the only suitable area is close to the A4 which has a clear air quality issue for the

young children using it. This has not been met - where is the evidence for funding or suitable location?

Based on the above points, I would like to register my objection to the LPR Regulation 19 objection.

Regards  
Lindsay Hallahan

Sent from [Outlook](#)