

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WPC LPR Regulation 19 objection - SP17  
**Date:** 02 March 2023 18:06:18

---

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

Objection as follows

1. I am objecting to the plan as so much of it is seriously unsound and it would have a massively detrimental effect on the local area and it's residents as well as extra stress on Buckkebury common environment, flora and fauna.
2. The statement by Michael Gove (6th December 2022) indicates that the housing numbers are now advisory and that the planning Inspectorate should no longer override sensible local decision-making.
3. The plan shows no evidence of any surveys to provide baseline conditions or indeed to provide definitive proposals explaining exactly how the environment would be improved and what they would do to "mitigate" any destruction of environmental features. This makes this important section of the plan unsound.
4. Building a major Greenfield development in the north Wessex downs AONB will forever affect the enjoyment of the local countryside by local communities. There will be a detrimental impact to legally protected wildlife known to be present on the site, not to mention increased and damaging use of existing areas such as Bucklebury common. This again shows that the plan is unsound in its analysis, research and conclusions.
5. Before any development of this size is undertaken, there should be sufficient capacity in the local foul water processing plant to handle the waste produced. I have seen no mention of analysis or funding for the expansion of the sewage processing facilities. As this has to be completed before any building starts, surely that is another reason why the plan is unsound.
6. The plan is unsound where traffic considerations are concerned. There is no plan or funding for a bridge over the railway crossing at Thatcham for example.
7. The development is so far away from Thatcham station and Thatcham town centre that many extra cars will be on local roads. Another example of an unsound part of the plan.
8. As a local resident for over 40 years, I feel that the building of 1500 houses so close to Upper Bucklebury will change the character of the area detrimentally and forever for me, my household and anyone living in this very special area.
9. The plan for secondary school provision is unsound with no timing or funding, no analysis of possible pupil numbers and no precise size and location of any school.
10. This is still essentially a plan for 2500 houses. The developers have simply reduced the headline numbers to 1500 but left the outline of the development the same. It would then be a comparatively easy matter to build the other 1000 houses in the future. Headlining 1500 houses now is no concession at all.

I hope I have shown in the above examples that this unsound plan should be rejected.

Thank you

Corinne Bertrand



