

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WPC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 28 February 2023 10:16:20

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

Dear Sir/Madam

I write to object to the notion of building 1500-2500 houses in NE Thatcham which is in the final phase of West Berkshire Council's Local Plan Review

I can understand the pressure on the council to provide new homes in the locality but there are numerous reasons that have been well documented in the press and by parish council as to why concentrating this many houses in a single area will detrimentally affect the local communities in so many ways.

We have no confidence that the outcomes from this proposed development of increased strain on local services for doctors, dentists, nurseries, primary and secondary schools, care homes etc have been properly considered.

In addition the increased traffic this will create with the new home owners short-cutting through local villages along dangerously pot-holed and dropped-verged single track roads not only changing the physical state of these villages but also the mental health and wellbeing of the existing inhabitants. There is also the well documented change this will make to local pasture, woodland etc and the negative consequences on the local ecology.

On the subject of transport and the rising awareness of the climate emergency, we are being persuaded to get out of our cars and use public transport, would it not make more sense to keep developments small say 50 to 100 houses but look at where these can be nearer to public transport terminals. Also more brown-field sites and the switch to residential of more and more office spaces as they become redundant should be given greater consideration.

As said, I do appreciate more homes need to be built but more, smaller developments spread across West Berkshire will surely have a lesser impact on exiting public services than one huge development with a rapid influx of say 4000 new residents.

Yours faithfully

James & Claire Dibble

[REDACTED]