

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 20 February 2023 20:46:29

---

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

---

Hi,

I am writing to you to object to the WBC LPR Regulation 19, I have laid out my reasons for my objections below.

WRT Transport;

There are plans for the traffic from the proposed housing estate to exit to Floral Way and the A4. These roads are both already extremely busy at peak times with regular tailbacks for several hundred metres from the roundabout at SSE going towards Reading in the morning and from Reading in the evening. This is already an everyday occurrence.

There is no provision in the plan for how to make alternative forms of transport (ie. not cars) safe or even provision for them.

The plan predicts that some traffic would go to wider rural routes which are not adequately provisioned for this (no pavements for instance).

It is unclear how if a secondary school were provided adequate transport links would be provided. I would encourage examination of the area around Kennet school in the morning and at closing time to get an idea of the impact which is currently what local residents are experiencing.

Paragraph 3.26 proposes new junctions on to Floral Way and Harts Hill Road. These roads being steep and already a 40mph limit would not constitute either a safe or a practical proposal. I also noted that there are no modelling results to back up the statement in the plan that the proposals will not cause problems.

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which accompanies the Local Plan consultation assesses the allocation of North East Thatcham against key Sustainability

Objectives. Objective 4 is – To promote and maximise opportunities for all forms of safe and sustainable transport. The SEA makes the following assessments:

‘To Reduce Accidents and Improve Safety’

Council Assessment - The policy is likely to have a Positive Impact on road safety as safe travel will

be critical to the design of the site.

I question this conclusion and suggest to the council to reconsider how the LPR is likely to have a positive impact on road safety.

There is also the following assessment:

‘To increase opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport’

Council Assessment – Significant Positive Impact

Council Commentary - The policy is likely to have a significant impact on walking, cycling and

public

transport as the development should be designed with these in mind.

The LPR does not provide sufficient evidence to come to this conclusion. Again I would ask for more concrete data on how this outcome is expected to be achieved.

WRT Healthcare;

Though the NE Thatcham plan (SP17) proposes a primary healthcare facility suggesting a GP surgery be offered the document itself does not offer background to strategic healthcare planning. A Health Impact Assessment should be provided for a development of this size. Such an assessment should include reference to how the proposals for impact of the development have been discussed with health care service providers. This omission implies there has been no engagement between the NE Thatcham Development Consortium and local general practises.

The general shortage of GP's is a well reported fact, and it is currently going in the wrong direction. Though the plan suggests facilities will be provided there is nothing to suggest that there will be GP's to staff it or that it would make financial or organisational sense to provision such.

As a general comment the practises in the area are already overstretched. With the closure of local pharmacies (and the same direction of travel for pharmacy workers as GP's (<https://pharmaceutical-journal.com/article/news/nearly-three-quarters-of-pharmacists-considered-leaving-profession-in-the-past-year-finds-rps-survey>) I don't have faith in the LPR addressing provision of local health care.

My concerns for dental services in the area are similar to the above and are not addressed by the LPR.

WRT Environment;

There is not sufficient evidence to support the council's claims that SP17 will have a positive impact on the environment. As a result the proposals can only be considered to have a negative impact.

I do not consider the mitigation of the environmental impact of the NE Thatcham development to be met by the provision of the community parks described in the LPR.

The LPR states that a sustainability charter is required to establish how policy requirements will be achieved and that the charter will be informed by various strategy documents (including one specifically on ecology). These strategy documents have not been made available for the Regulation 19 consultation.

The claimed provisions for green space via the proposed country parks will be sufficient for the number of people introduced to the site.

I noted how the original Thatcham Growth Plan referenced country parks. The proposal for these were vague initially. The updated SP17 text refers to community parks, the difference between the reference is not clear. The commitment from WBC to protecting the natural environment

and biodiversity is not clear in the plan.

The sustainability appraisal in the plan is contradictory in saying on the one hand that since the development is being done on a greenfield site its impact on environmental sustainability would be negative and on the other hand that it would have an overall positive impact on sustainability.

The overall impression of the plan with respect to the environment is that there is not a convincing attempt address the consequences of the development.

WRT Education;

The LPR does not provide detail on the provision for Nursery or early years education. With regard to Primary education there is no data on the planned number of schools or form entry requirements.

The sum quoted of £12 million to be contributed by the developers is based on 2011 data. It is now 2023 and it is not clear if this figure is still relevant. The timing of the school provision is not clear. Feasibly this could be towards the end of the duration of the LPR.

With regard to Secondary education there are no details of the land to be provided for this provision.

The statement that the study has not engaged in a detailed demographic prediction and modelling exercise, has not attempted to predict long term capacities of existing schools and intends to address this in more detail as the development progresses implies a lack of planning and a risk of not having contingency in place.

I would suggest this section is revisited with more up to date data and at least an effort at more detail.

The LPR mentions provision of sports fields. Where these are to be situated is not clear. Additionally there is no mention of funding for such facilities.

My name & address are:

Dom Brown

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

If you can please acknowledge receipt of this message and that my objections have been lodged it would be much appreciated.

BR,

Dom Brown