

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection - SP17
Date: 26 February 2023 18:04:19

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

I object to the plan to build 1500 extra houses and I find it unsound for the following reasons:

The amount of extra traffic generated in Upper Bucklebury, already subjected to heavy through-traffic, would be unsupportable. I understand that there is a plan for an exit at the north of the proposed site onto Harts Hill. This is an extremely dangerous road, narrow, bendy and steep, hazardous for cyclists and a no-go area for pedestrians, having no footpath - totally unsuitable for any additional traffic. The council themselves have admitted that some displacement of A4 traffic onto wider rural routes such as Upper Bucklebury would occur. Although a cyclist myself, I am unable to cycle safely into Thatcham because of the danger on Harts Hill, and the one thing that would improve my life would be a safe cycle route to Thatcham and Newbury - surely we need safe and sustainable transport, and the proposals will do anything but achieve this. The council claims that the policy is likely to have a significant positive impact on walking, cycling and public transport as the development should be designed with these in mind. I would question how the positive impact is to be achieved. In addition, there are no illustrations in the Transport Assessment for the proposed junction at Harts Hill and the proposal to create a new car park on Harts Hill is not backed up by evidence of the need for it.

The increased traffic would also have a serious environmental impact, because air quality would deteriorate further. Long queues of traffic at the "traffic calming" on Broad Lane, which is what we would have with possibly 1500+ more cars, causes severe air pollution. The council claims that SP17 will have a positive impact on the environment, though in fact it is likely to have an adverse effect, damaging the irreplaceable woodlands and heathlands in the North Wessex Downs AONB, not to mention farmland that might be needed in the future for food security. The council should be allocating brownfield sites on which to build houses, not greenfield sites.

I am also concerned about the lack of thought to the provision of healthcare. It is difficult enough to get a doctor's appointment at present. With thousands more residents, the surgeries will be stretched to breaking point. Where is the Health Impact Assessment?

Has the impact of the proposal been considered with regard to infrastructure, in particular foul waste disposal, surface water drainage and water supply? We have intermittent problems with water supply in Upper Bucklebury, when faults occur at the Harts Hill pumping station.

To summarise, I believe the plan is unsound because too many aspects remain unjustified, and the environmental impact on the areas surrounding north east Thatcham would be severe and irreversible.

H Ruth Mahoney
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]