

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Thatcham NE Development LPR
Date: 03 March 2023 11:07:43

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

1. General:

It is now acknowledged that we humans are systematically destroying our planet, and you still carry on building just as we always have. We are called to be 'sustainable' and growth by definition is NOT sustainable! Thatcham has been growing consistently for the last 40 years and in the 1990s was the fastest growing town in the whole of the EU. The latest development assured us that Floral Way was the limit of development up Harts Hill. But, that was then it appears. Now, that limit is irrelevant and can be ignored.

I recognise that we need homes. Any building is seriously detrimental to our planet for a myriad of well known reasons. Your plans for mitigating the damage are pitiful to the point of being farcical.

If you're serious about mitigating the harm done to the environment by developments such as this then the roofs of the houses would be covered in grass, or wild flowers, or solar panels. And the houses would all be built on rain catchment tanks. And many other facets.

I'm not convinced that we need as many houses as you say and firmly believe that the whole project is driven by:-

- a. Landowners wanting to capitalise on their assets.
- b. Developers wanting to do what they do - make a profit.
- c. The above lobbying government to support their aims.

But, we do need housing. So, all brown field sites must be exhausted before any agricultural land is built upon. "Poor" agricultural land, as you describe this site, is "poor" because it has been over used and abused for centuries, even millennia, in particular the last half century. However it can be improved over time if nature is allowed to take it's course. Building houses in the same old way is quite the worst thing to do. And WE KNOW THIS.

We must use ALL brownfield sites and then scatter a small number of houses among the existing villages.

Your Policy SP 5 para (a) states:-

"a. To withstand predictable effects from climate change for its expected lifetime:"
Is this referring to the lifetime of the plan? The lifetime of the development, or the lifetime of the planet?

Clearly we must consider the latter and the answer is blatantly obvious. It can NEVER withstand the devastating effects on the climate and the planet.

2. Harts Hill Road

Would become a major thoroughfare feeding 60%-75% of traffic for this site through Upper Bucklebury. Southbound traffic will go through Thatcham via Floral Way which is already clogged at peak times. Traffic bound North, East and West will come up Harts Hill Road through Upper Bucklebury and inundate a small village with massive, heavy traffic movement that would devastate this rural village.

You claim that the plans you have for the road will make it safer than it currently is. This is blatantly absurd. Did you know that there is a cycle track and footpath beside the road in the field to the east? This means a large hedgerow and 10-15 meters of earth banking exists between cars and pedestrians/cyclists on Harts Hill

Road. How could anything be safer than that?

3. Infrastructure:

Schools, dentists and doctor's surgeries are currently stretched to their limits and beyond. It's good to know that these are included in the plan but it is essential that current infrastructure in these areas is adequate before any housing is built. This means building surgeries and schools BEFORE the houses.

These plans are unsound because they make no allowance for the time it takes to undertake the multiple, complex processes that Public Health England requires before building surgeries.

These plans are unsound because they make no allowance for primary and secondary schools when the first children move into the new estate resulting in further pressure on our already over-subscribed schools.

4. Safe and Sustainable Transport:

Really? And just how is this achieved? It appears the plans just say that 'it will be' Safe and Sustainable with no justification whatsoever.

5. Bucklebury Common Vision

Currently has a project to control, not restrict, access to the common, a very special local area that hopes to improve the biodiversity of it's already diverse environment. This is an AONB and any development within the vicinity will have serious consequences for the common. Your plans place a mass of houses well within an area of influence and at 2.2 or 2.4 people per dwelling could potentially put 5000-7000 additional visitors within strolling distance of this unspoilt environment.

This makes the Thatcham NE Development wholly unsound.

Thank you for letting me comment.

Yours Sincerely,

Neil SM Rendall.

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.