

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: LPR March 2023
Date: 01 March 2023 16:23:22

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

Having followed the proposed development of Siege Cross over many years, I am very puzzled as to why, having opposed the building of 500 houses in 2015, that WBC are suggesting that it would be appropriate for 3 times that (likely 5 times that in the end).

All their 2015 objections are no less valid today.

I have lived locally since [REDACTED], over the years, I've seen flooding increase dramatically, particularly on the A4 at Colthrop and there has been nothing done to alleviate it. I can't see that paving farmland and building houses on it will help that situation one iota.

The proposals for schools are ludicrous, as are those for GPs. Thatcham Medical Practice is unable to fully staff its surgery now, a recent request for a phone appointment took 3.5 weeks. The only way to see a doctor within a sensible timescale would be to lie about the condition, something I'm not prepared to do.

At peak times, it is nigh on impossible to turn right onto Floral Way so traffic ends up turning left and on to Harts Hill Road so in future will be joining extra traffic from the development. This will inevitably lead to more rat-running through Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row as drivers try to avoid gridlock. Everyone knows that this development will involve an enormous number of extra car journeys, it is naive in the extreme to think that residents will use public transport, walk or cycle. The majority of houses on Dunstan Park have at least 2 cars, this development won't be any different; in fact many may have more as children remain in their family homes for longer due to the extreme costs of independent living. So 1500x2x 2 journeys a day, a prospective increase of over 6000

Other people have mentioned the green gap, the AONB, the organic farmland that will disappear, all very important points.

Why is more attention not being given to the proposed development at Colthrop, this will avoid further congestion at the level crossing & will use brownfield land?

Thames Water have stated that there will need to be infrastructure improvements for this to go ahead. They are already regularly polluting our waterways, this is an area which needs close scrutiny too.

I am a firm objector to this scheme in its current form.

Kathryn Hodgson
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad