

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 17 February 2023 19:41:31

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

Dear Sir/Madam

Please accept this e-mail as our objection towards the proposed development in Thatcham NE based on the following:-

Significant increase in population - what provisions are being made for a Doctors surgery, Dentists and hospital space, the existing of which are already at full capacity, with some services reducing i.e pharmacies closing down.

Significant increase of traffic - we already have a struggling road network around the whole area, take Thatcham Train Station crossing as a good example. The 'rat runs' the surrounding villages will be subject to will most certainly increase danger to life as they are mostly single track lanes with very few passing places and blind bends. Harts Hill does not lend itself safely to more traffic with the added danger of it's blind bends and narrow width. The junctions of Burdens Heath onto Broad Lane and short section of road by the SAAB garage to join Harts Hill Road are both blind and will be extremely hazardous to pull out of with the extra vehicle numbers. Likewise the 'pinch points' along Broad Lane in Upper Bucklebury will no doubt see more 'near miss' incidents as drivers will be waiting much longer for their turn to proceed

Services - we have had a number of issues with our water supply and leaks over the years. Whilst there has been work done to try to improve this we still experience a number of leaks. Can all the services, be it water, waste, electricity etc cope with such an increased demand, and losing more land to help alleviate flooding, where will all the rainfall run off to now as it wont have the fields to help absorb it? a fact that scientists regularly predict will become a more common problem with our changing weather patterns.

Whilst we appreciate affordable housing is in short supply, does this area really deserve to be disfigured by a development of this size and, at a time when open green space is being hailed as a 'healer' and everyone is being encouraged to go out and benefit from it, why do we still insist on destroying it, let alone the untold damage we are doing to our wildlife. There are alternative plots of land available for development, some of which are brownfield sites, why can't these be looked into before all the irreversible damage is done to our green fields?

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Yours faithfully

Miss Jane Cobb and Mr Stephen Owen.