

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)  
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
Date: 20 February 2023 14:58:20

---

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

---

Dear Sirs

I am objecting to the WBC LPR 2023-2039 for the following reasons:

## TRANSPORT

The increase in traffic movements with 1,500 minimum new houses (with something like over 3,000 + extra movements per day), is going to give Thatcham North a huge traffic problem. There are already substantial delays during peak commuting hours causing bottlenecks at the Siege Cross roundabout (Floral Way/A4) and Harts Hill Roundabout (Floral Way/Harts Hill) with cars travelling primarily towards Reading or Newbury. With the increase in time spent at these bottlenecks, inevitably drivers will seek other routes through Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row and Bradfield towards Reading in the mornings and the reverse in the evenings. It is already apparent that traffic avoids the “Chicanes” in Upper Bucklebury by taking alternative small lanes around the village or even into the Pang Valley to reach their destinations. These vehicles (cars, vans and sometimes lorries), unsuitably fast causing damage to road surfaces not designed to take such volumes of traffic, and additional damage to green verges when passing other vehicles on these single track roads. Drivers have scant regard for local people (pedestrians, horse riders, cyclists etc.) going about their daily routine neither slowing down nor thanking them for letting them pass safely. I live on [REDACTED] (I am also [REDACTED]) so I am daily having to watch out for cars travelling too fast without due care and caution, often having to take to the verge quickly.

With regard to Thatcham North residents being encouraged to walk, cycle or use public transport, this seems ill thought through. Walking to the Town Centre, which has little to offer apart from 2 supermarkets, seems highly unlikely for all but a few very fit residents who would then have to return with heavy, bulky shopping. Walking to the station for commuting purposes, in office attire, is also unlikely. Inevitably additional traffic movements will occur to enable people to catch their commuter trains, for children to reach their schools or to shop in the Town Centre, contributing to bottlenecks and pollution. To reduce this, I assume that the council will be providing regular (4-5 per hour) circular route buses (from NE Thatcham, to the station and town centre and other important locations such as schools, dentists and doctors) at peak times at the least?

I also note that a new car park has been designated for one of the most dangerous parts of Harts Hill Road. Why there should be one there is unimaginable. Harts Hill road from Floral Way to Upper Bucklebury is one of the most dangerous local roads with regular Road Traffic Accidents. It has no space for pavements and at places it is almost impossible for a car and lorry to pass safely.

## HEALTHCARE

There doesn't seem to be a Health Impact Assessment for the provision of health services for the residents of 1,500+ houses (say at least 4,000 people). Surely, the local services are already stretched with only 3 doctors' surgeries covering an area from Bradfield to Thatcham and all the villages in between. If there aren't the doctors available it will be difficult to man a 'new' GP surgery on the North Thatcham site. With the type of housing

to be provided, there will be a high demand for young and expanding families who regularly need the services of doctors and dentists.

## ENVIRONMENT

There are already pollution problems on Bucklebury Common from both traffic and those dropping/dumping their litter and driving at speed on the main road from Upper Bucklebury to Bradfield. The introduction of a large number of people wishing to use the common for recreational purposes, because their local 'park' is not substantial enough to support the community, will bring with it more associated problems of pollution and litter harming local biodiversity and impacting on plants, animals (deer, badgers and smaller mammals including snakes) and birds (particularly the Night Jar). We have recently seen the impact of irresponsible use of the common where heath fires have been started, destroying the animal and plant environment and causing danger to local residents (Upper Bucklebury, August 2022). We have been lucky that we did not see instances similar to those fires in the London area last summer which destroyed residential homes as well as the environment.

## EDUCATION

Being an area of residential growth, Thatcham is inevitably needing to provide the necessary schooling required from pre-school to 6<sup>th</sup> form. Secondary school places are particularly important – I cannot understand how these new residents are going to be offered places at their local school (Kennet) which is oversubscribed. The Supporting Documentation with regard to schools appears to state that £15m will be set aside by the developers for a secondary school but I cannot see where it is to be located or when it is to be built, so it is difficult to assess the viability of the statement. It is particularly odd that the study on pupil numbers is dated 2011 – surely things have moved on since then with the increase in local housing (before this development)? And what about Sports Fields, where will they go on this undulating site.

I believe this local plan has not been given enough thought in connection with the placing of housing and the facilities, infrastructure etc needed for these sites, particularly NE Thatcham.

Yours faithfully

Jane Rowe (Mrs)

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area of the letter.