

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 03 March 2023 16:18:54

---

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

---

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the proposed development of North East Thatcham along Hart's Hill Road. I am objecting to the proposed plan as it is unsound. The plan does not specify in any detail the provision of much-needed infrastructure for this area, much of which is needed even before the allocation of up to 2,500 new homes. In addition specific provision to protect the local ecology and environment is lacking in this proposal to develop a green field site adjacent to an ANOB. If my presence is requested, I am prepared to appear at the public enquiry.

I am very concerned that this plan does not provide adequate healthcare provision. The area of the proposed development is covered by the current GP practices at Chapel Row, Burdwood Surgery and Thatcham Medical Practice. All three practices are already overstretched with a lack of adequate parking. This plan needs a specific provision for an extra GP surgery not just to be provided by the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire West Integrated Care Board but one specifically to cater for the needs of this particular development and arguably should even be located within the new development, in order to meet the goals of sustainability and allow people to walk and bicycle to services. There is a shortage of dentists in Thatcham and with the closure of one of the pharmacies there are currently long queues in order to obtain most prescriptions. Specific provision for these additional services should be made in the plan to make it a viable option.

The plan does not adequately detail provision for education in the proposed area of development. There are no details in the LPR of the provision for nursery or Early Years education. While the LPR proposes that the developers contribute £12 million to primary education it does not set out whether this money will go to existing or new schools and when any new schools would be built or extended. Moreover, there is no data or evidence on the planned number of schools or Form Entry requirements. Similarly the plan merely suggests that the developers will make a £15million donation to the provision of secondary education. However, there are no details of where additional land for schooling would be located or when it would be built or indeed even the timing of the funding. There is no satisfactory evidence of the numbers of pupils the school is to cater for: although Thatcham is in desperate need of additional secondary schooling, the number of form entries is not defined in the plan and anything smaller than a 6FE school has been categorised as not sustainable by the government.

There is absolutely no evidence that a major greenfield development abutting and adjacent to the North Wessex Downs AONB and Bucklebury Common will have a positive impact on the local environment. On the contrary, unless managed appropriately, increased human impact will be significantly detrimental to the open spaces. The management of Bucklebury Common has been working hard to restore the native woodland and heathland with legally protected species including bats, newts and many species of ground nesting birds. While the plan intends to increase access to the AONB and Common it has no mention of how the Council will manage the human and canine impact on this fragile ecosystem, whether with car park provision, litter bins or managing fires which have been increasingly frequent as a result of climate change and the ensuing dry summers and present a significant risk to the ancient woodlands. Without adequate management of human impact, there is a potential that the enjoyment of this beautiful open space will be lost to future generations.

The plan is also unsound because it does not provide adequately for traffic provision. With limited public transportation there is little alternative but for people to drive. Each household will in all likelihood have at least two cars out of necessity, which would potentially mean an additional 5,000 cars on the local roads. The plan specifically states that increased traffic from the proposed development will be encouraged to use Harts Hill Road and access to Theale and Hermitage (junctions 12 and 13 of the M4 respectively) via Broad Lane and surrounding roads. These are rural roads without lighting, pavements or hard verges. The small lanes surrounding Broad Lane are all single file lanes with hedging and limited passing places. All of these roads are currently deeply rutted with potholes, which makes it necessary for drivers to swerve or stop suddenly making them quite dangerous. In addition, they are all heavily used by cyclists enjoying the countryside. Without cycle lanes, these roads will become too busy and dangerous for cyclists. The negative impact of traffic emissions on children walking to school in Upper Bucklebury and Bradfield Southend has also not been taken into account. While the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) highlights the objectives of "Reducing Accidents and Improving Safety": and "To increase opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport", there has been no adequate provision in the plan to provide footpaths, cycle lanes or adequate lighting for the current roads to cope with the higher volume of traffic.

Yours sincerely,

Ciaran Foulkes

