

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Regulation 19 Consultation
Date: 02 February 2023 16:05:18

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

I am writing to state my objections to the Thatcham NE Development which I believe is **fundamentally unsound**. Should this be approved, the consequences will be disastrous for our community. I live in Upper Bucklebury and am concerned that the proposed development will cause **real harm** for a number of reasons which I will elucidate.

- Thames Water is already discharging sewage into the River Kennet, causing pollution, so imagine the increased amount of effluent from at least 1500 houses.
- There would be increased traffic and congestion on the A4 so drivers would use Upper Bucklebury as a tat-run leading to increased traffic through our village.
- There would be increased pressure on secondary schools. Kennet School is already over-subscribed ; how will the extra secondary school places be accommodated?
- There would be pressure on medical and complementary services. The NE Thatcham development plan (SP17) proposes a 450 sq m primary healthcare facility with the suggestion that a **GP Surgery** be offered to the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board. However, the document is **bereft of detail or insight** into strategic healthcare planning. Proposals for a major development that is likely to have a significant impact in relation to its size and location should be accompanied by a fit for purpose **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)** in accordance with the current guidance from Public Health England. The HIA should include reference to how the proposals for development have been discussed with health service providers regarding impact on primary health care services. The development proposals should demonstrate how the conclusions of the HIA have been considered in the design of the scheme because an unacceptable impact on the health and wellbeing of existing or new communities will not be permitted. It is of concern that **neither WBC nor the developers**, as public and private stakeholders respectively, **appear to have arranged or published a prospective HIA specific to the proposed North-East Thatcham development.**
- **It is also of concern that there appears to have been no direct engagement between the North-East Development Consortium and local general practices.** Few new GP practices are commissioned by NHS England, even where they consider there to be patient demand for improved services. NHS Digital figures of patients registered in the NHS Berkshire West Clinical Commissioning Group confirm there is an even worse shortage of GPs in other areas of the country. There is therefore **no realistic prospect of a new GP practice being established** in Thatcham or West Berkshire in the foreseeable future.
- There would be consequential damage to the Common – increased footfall by design, increasing damage to an ecosystem of national importance.
- Environment impact – greenfield development abutting an AONB with no up-to-date evidence or strategy for positive impact and overall biodiversity gain.
- Poor excuse of a country park – now reduced to three small, isolated areas inside the proposed settlement boundary of no meaningful environmental value or commitment to exclude subsequent development.
- There is a lack of a strategic gap between Thatcham and Bucklebury – Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury will effectively merge together and Upper Bucklebury will lose its

identity.

- The number of houses now “at least 1500” – from an initial site assessment of 2500 of which 1250 were to be built in the planned period, this has now increased to 1500. Who is to say that this will not increase to 2500 just to satisfy a developer’s profit?

For all these valid objections I urge you to refuse this development.

Mrs Marie Ostovar,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]