

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 22 February 2023 21:53:42

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

I have lived in [REDACTED] for the last [REDACTED] years. During that time I have seen house numbers increase, placing additional pressures on the existing inadequate education and health care facilities, but nothing like that proposed by the NE Thatcham development which quite clearly has been ill thought through and is totally unsound.

I strongly oppose the NE Thatcham development on the following grounds:

1. Traffic

In the years that I have lived on [REDACTED] the traffic volumes have increased significantly. It travels at speed, often ignoring the speed limit, along a stretch of road where there is no pavement or street lighting, making it unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. This development will greatly increase the volume of traffic including along Harts Hill Road, which is a particularly unsafe and windy stretch of road where there are already frequent accidents. Increased traffic volumes will pose yet further threat to the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

I understand that there has been no modelling for the proposed junction on Harts Hill Road. I can only imagine because any such junction would be inherently dangerous. You don't really need a traffic assessment to work that out.

I also gather that a car park is proposed on Harts Hill. It is unclear why one would be needed and this will simply be another venue for the sort of anti social behaviour that already goes on in the car parks on Bucklebury Common.

The Council's assessment that the development will reduce accidents and improve safety as well as increase opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport (which is pretty much non existent in Upper Bucklebury) is totally ludicrous and without any basis or evidence to support it. In fact quite the opposite is likely to be true given the current problems with traffic volumes, which would be dramatically worsened by the proposed development.

2. Healthcare

The NHS is in crisis and unable to provide adequate primary care to those already living in the area. The development has no Health Impact Assessment and there is no coherent plan as to how and where the health care needs of those living on the proposed development or in the surrounding areas will have their primary care needs met. In turn there will be increased pressures on hospital services which are similarly unable to cope. There is no realistic prospect of a new GP practice being established and no financially viable prospect of one of the existing GP practices setting up a branch surgery. Dental practices will be similarly unable to provide for the needs of those on the development. There is no evidence of the development having been considered with local health care agencies or providers.

3. Environment

The site is a greenfield site and would therefore have an extremely detrimental impact on environmental sustainability. There is no evidence of how this negative impact on the environment will be managed and mitigated, if indeed that is remotely possible. There is no evidence of adequate green space on the development site. This development will simply increase traffic (people and vehicles) to Bucklebury Common which is precisely not what the fragile ecosystem of the Common requires. It presents a threat to legally protected wildlife on the site and in the surrounding AONB.

4. Education

How the children that the development will attract are to be educated is totally unclear. How will the Council fulfil its legal obligation to provide suitable education facilities for these children? The current schools in the area are mostly poorly funded with the buildings in very poor state of repair and facilities lacking. How will creating further schools, if indeed that is what is planned, make a difference? It is clear that there isn't a proper plan for secondary school provision. The number of pupils to be catered for is unclear making the financial viability of a school unlikely. There is no indication of where the school would be located or indeed when it would be built, especially as it seems there isn't adequate funding.

It is clear to me that there has been no consideration given to the infrastructure necessary to support such a

development and no consideration given to the extremely detrimental impact that the development will have not only on the lives of those living locally but also the local environment.

I would like to be notified of the progress of this matter.

Susan Brown



Sent from my iPad