

From: [Jane Carwardine](#)
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 27 February 2023 20:01:37

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

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the proposal to build 1500+ new houses in NE Thatcham.

There are a number of reasons why I want to object to this proposed development:

1. Transport

Roads: the roads around this area of Thatcham are already extremely busy, and this number of houses will massively increase congestion further. In the evening rush hour, traffic regularly queues from the eastern side of Woolhampton to Thatcham, which will become untenable if the number of road commuters is increased. The building of these proposed houses will lead to an increase in traffic through the surrounding villages, particularly Upper Bucklebury and Cold Ash - in the case of Cold Ash traffic will increase on the roads past St Marks and St Finian's schools - these roads are already impassable during school drop off and pick up times, so an increase of traffic would have catastrophic effects. The local roads are already very poorly maintained, so an increase in traffic would result in a further degradation of the road surfaces.

Rail travel: there are already insufficient parking spaces at Thatcham station and a further increase in the number of rail commuters would lead to cars being parked in residential areas in Thatcham which has road safety implications.

2. Healthcare

To the best of my knowledge all the local surgeries are full so it's unclear where the new residents would go. I realise there are plans for new surgeries, but given the challenge in recruiting/retaining GPs I have low confidence that this would actually happen. The negative impact on patient experience at the West Berks Hospital would also be significant. I would like to see the Health Impact Assessment for the proposed development.

3. Environment

I am at a loss to understand why WBC would think it acceptable to develop a greenfield site when there are many brownfield sites locally that could be developed first, e.g. Kennet Centre. Parts of the site have been subject to flooding previously and it's not clear that proper consideration has been given to the unintended impact in terms of water management. The construction of so many houses will inevitably negatively impact air quality in the surrounding area, and to suggest that the overall environmental impact is either neutral or positive is highly misleading.

4. Education

There is no information on how early years education would be accessed. Primary education is already a challenge in the area, with some families having to travel miles to get to their designated primary school. It's again unclear about how primary education would be provided - merely giving money to the developer would not be acceptable - and clearly schools need to be built and established before the houses are built. In terms of secondary education, I feel the contents of the plan are unsound. It is believed that the numbers of secondary age children would be below the threshold required to necessitate a new secondary school being built, but it is unclear where the secondary age children are meant to go to school. This would also result in a reduction in choice for secondary age children in the surrounding villages who can currently choose between the Kennet and the Downs Schools - as presumably these children would all have to go to the Downs.

5. Sports fields - with that many people living in close proximity to each other, it will be important to create a sports field or something similar - it's not clear where that would be as it usually requires flat ground which is in short supply in the proposed area of development.

I tried to use the planning portal but couldn't instantly see where to post my comments, hence emailing instead.
To confirm, my name and address as as follows:

Jane Carwardine



Yours faithfully

Jane Carwardine

Sent from my iPad