

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: BC LPR Regulation 19 OBJECTION
Date: 25 February 2023 18:17:56

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find below my objection to WBC LPR Regulation 19 with reasons for my objection.

WBC LPR Regulation 19 OBJECTION

[REDACTED]

I object to this proposal as I find it unsound for the reasons detailed herein.

3.1.1 TRANSPORT

I live in [REDACTED] - with the proposal for the new development this will increase traffic through the village causing more pollution and risk to the wellbeing of the residence and local wildlife. The main road going from Upper Bucklebury to Chapel Row (Broad Lane) is a through road between the common land and consequently a lot of local wildlife are in danger from the current traffic, increasing the flow of traffic will only increase the risk of fatality. There is currently no pedestrian crossing in the village making the increase in traffic a risk to pedestrians and especially young children crossing to attend the local school. Although there is two width restrictions either end of the village an increase in traffic will only increase the chance of accidents.

As it stands currently there are no footpaths or road crossings between the common land either side of Broad Lane, this proposal will make crossing between the two even more unsafe than currently due to the increase in traffic.

Whilst the development is taking place the amount of large plant & vehicles being delivered to and from the site will also potentially cause issues around the neighbouring villages and access roads with the roads also becoming covered in excess mud from the site.

The proposed plan for an exit at the north of the site onto Harts Hill Road (and only became apparent in Phase 2 Transport Assessment Report July 2021). WBC predicts 'some **DISPLACEMENT** of A4 traffic onto wider **RURAL** routes such as Upper Bucklebury ...'

I ALSO DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO THE COUNCIL'S REFUSAL FOR AN ACCESS ROAD CONNECTING FIVE NEW HOMES PLANNED FOR ST GABRIELS FARM at Cold Ash (near Thatcham) THAT HAS BEEN REFUSED BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE AN 'ADVERSE SUBURBANISING IMPACT.' This argument applies in this case too and I object to the proposed plan and demand that this is equally applied to the village of Upper Bucklebury.

3.1.2 Access and junctions

There is no modelling plan results (despite saying these will not cause a problem) for the new priority junctions for both Floral Way and Harts Hill Road - this is unsound

3.1.3 Car Parks

A proposed new CAR PARK on Harts Hill would encourage even MORE traffic to this dangerous road (I refer you to the NUMEROUS accidents on that stretch of the road in the recent cold spell - despite the council gritting the road it remained impassable for several days). What is the purpose of this car park? How is anti social behaviour and night time 'racing' of cars through the common road going to be quelled by the addition of another meeting site?

3.1.4 Safe and Sustainable Transport

More transport will increase the risk to residence wellbeing and add pollution to the area. How do the council possibly conclude that the policy is likely to have a Positive impact on road safety and travel, walking, cycling and public transport when the impact on Upper Bucklebury **WOULD BE THE OPPOSITE as cited above.**

3.2 Healthcare

The NE Thatcham Development plan proposes a Primary Healthcare facility which the likelihood of funding being approved by the NHS is unlikely, will this be a guarantee and if so is the facility for residence of the proposed site only or for the surrounding villages. Currently to get an appointment to see a GP takes weeks, so if there is no healthcare facility the impact on local GP's and the waiting time for an appointment will be astronomical! Is there any proposal for a dental surgery on the site as this will also have the same impact on local dental surgeries and being able to get an appointment.

3.3 Environmental Impact

Upper Bucklebury consists of ancient woodlands, heaths and an historic and beautiful common (Bucklebury Plateau Biodiversity Opportunity Area) with habitat for important vegetation and animal life.

Placing a major green field development in the broader landscape setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB would cause detriment to legally protected wildlife known to be present on this site.

THERE IS NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT CLAIMS THAT SP17 WILL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. IN FACT IT IS VERY EVIDENT THAT IT WOULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANTLY NEGATIVE IMPACT. Of note the strategy documents required for the Sustainability charter (if they exist) have not been made public for the regulation 19 consultation. Rendering this proposal unsound.

The updated SP17 text makes note of two 'community parks' that were initially put forward as 'country parks'. This downgrading just highlights WBC lack of commitment to protecting the natural environment and peoples' enjoyment thereof.

As SP17 does not provide proven plans for providing adequate green space within the development nor demonstrates sustainability by protecting vital and delicate biodiversity, there will inevitably be spill over of people visiting the common areas locally and causing worsening damage to these. This is in polar opposition to the management vision for Bucklebury Common which is explicitly focused on NOT increasing human traffic on the fragile ecosystems that they work hard to restore and nurture. **The LPRs sustainability Appraisal accepts that SP17 will have NEGATIVE impact on environmental sustainability. This would be irreparable thus is unsound and unacceptable.**

3.4 Education

There is no clear plan showing provision for education from nursery through to secondary

education which renders the proposed and frankly dreadfully conceived housing plan untenable.

The proposed development would have significant impact on secondary school provision for children in Upper Bucklebury as they would be limited to only one school catchment (near Compton) with no provision of a paid for school bus which would prove prohibitive for many families locally. This has not been considered in the plan.

There is no evidence of the number of pupils a proposed new secondary school would have to cater for.

The location of the school is not clear

There is no clear plan of the funding nor that such funding is sufficient to meet the councils obligations to provide education.

None of this is clearly defined nor evidenced in the LPR thus making it unsound.

IN ADDITION

The water and sewerage systems in this locality are often overwhelmed with Thames Water frequently having to attend and repair leaking mains but even more worryingly currently having to pump effluent into the local river nearby. Additional housing (and certainly that in the numbers proposed) in such circumstances is simply not tenable.

The Secretary of State for Levelling up, Housing and Communities issued a statement on 6th December confirming that housing numbers are NOT mandatory and that THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE SHOULD NO LONGER OVERRIDE SENSIBLE LOCAL DECISION MAKING WHICH IS SENSITIVE TO AND REFLECTS LOCAL CONSTRAINTS AND CONCERNS.

I urge WBC to do as other local councils have and PAUSE the planning process in order to bring forward a revised plan in late 2023 that is then in line with the updated planning guidance.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad