


From: 
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Subject needs to be WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 03 March 2023 16:15:55

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

Dear WBC planning committee,

Please find below my objection to the proposed NE Thatcham development and my concerns about the planning document.

Healthcare and education

- 2500 extra houses will need healthcare, the plans state this will be provided with a new primary care facility however it is evident that new GP surgeries are rarely ever approved by NHS England, there is a current staffing crisis in the NHS which will make staffing a new facility very difficult and there is no evidence that existing local surgeries have been consulted about the potential for expansion. The provision of healthcare must be established before any development could go ahead to maintain safety of new and existing residents. These plans are inadequate in this regard.
- Education facilities have also not been properly outlined in this document. There is no detail as to how/where/when education will be provided for the new development. There are contradictions in the document such as stating that funding will be partially provided for a new secondary school, but then stating that the development is not big enough to justify a new secondary school. This is again unsound and inadequate.

Traffic:

- Current road conditions are unable to cope with existing traffic burden (poor road maintenance, potholes, serious ice in winter) and there will be more accidents with higher traffic burden
- Many roads don't have pavements but are quiet enough for this to not be a problem, increased traffic trying to use the villages as an alternative to the A4 will render this a disaster for pedestrian/cyclist safety
- Why is there an additional car park on Harts hill road? No clear use set out for this in the document. This is a high risk area for accidents already, this will worsen the problem. Also concerned about encouraging antisocial behaviour as this is already an issue on the common.
- No detail about how walking/cycling/public transport will be improved in this planning document. How will this be achieved? How will this be funded? The current document just proposes increased risks to walkers and cyclists from higher road traffic burden. It is inadequate to claim these risks are going to be mitigated without outlining how.

Environmental

- Bucklebury common is an ecologically diverse site and the addition of 4000 extra people into the area can only have a negative impact on this.
- The document clearly states that your own analysis shows this development will have a negative impact on sustainability due to it being a greenfield site.
- There are no clear plans on how environmental impacts will be mitigated, just vague statements that they will. This is unacceptable.
- The location of this proposed development will turn Upper Bucklebury from a small village into the outskirts sprawl of Thatcham's housing estates which will undeniably change the ambiance and character of the village. This is likely to result in residents who value its current charm leaving the area, and taking with them their investments in the local

community and infrastructure. The size of this development is disproportionate.

General

- The recent change in governmental view on housing provision from a mandatory number of properties to an advisory number should be considered. They also state that the Planning Inspectorate should not override sensible local decision making simply to make up these numbers. Why are WBC not taking the opportunity to pause the planning process while awaiting the outcome of the revised planning guidance that will be due later this year rather than pushing forward with a clearly unsound and damaging development of far too many properties on a valuable greenfield site.

I object to the proposed development for the reasons outlined above as I feel the planning is unsound and the risks have not been properly considered and mitigated.

Yours sincerely

James Atkins BSc Hons MIED

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]