


From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 01 March 2023 18:31:55

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

>

> Name - Alison Gatenby



>

> Prepared to attend public enquiry if required

>

>

>

> Dear Sir / Madam

>

> I am objecting to the plan relating to the Thatcham NE Development as I believe that there are components of this plan that are unsound. These components are as follows.

>

> **SAFE AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT**

> I understand that the WBC state the policy is likely to have a positive impact on road safety as safe travel will be critical to the design of the site, with an increase in opportunities for walking and cycling.

>

> However, the likely significant increase in traffic in the Upper Bucklebury area generated by the additional +4000 residents will clearly increase the risk to walkers and cyclists on these roads. These are roads that our family use regularly for these pursuits. Many of these roads are narrow and / or are without pavements. Such a scenario will massively increase the dangers to the many walkers, cyclists & horse riders that use these roads and regrettably result in an increase in serious accidents. This will certainly result in less likelihood of us using our local roads for these activities.

>

> **HEALTHCARE**

> I am concerned about the impact +1500 homes in this area will have on our already overloaded healthcare services. We already are experiencing significantly increased waiting times at our local surgery for Doctors appointments, blood tests etc.

>

> I understand that WBC and the developers are proposing a new healthcare site to be built for this area. However, they have failed to arrange a fit for purpose Healthcare Impact Assessment, nor provided evidence of having liaised appropriately with local healthcare agencies or providers, such as the local general practices and dental practices. Surely the provision of increased healthcare facilities to accommodate the extra circa 4500 residents needs to be secured before this project can be considered?

>

> In essence, the objective of WBC and the developers to improve access to the health service component of community infrastructure has not been met as they have failed to provide evidence for the provision of the required primary care medical facility. The impact of this could be potentially life threatening.

>

> **ENVIRONMENT**

> I have major concerns regarding the impact that building so many new houses in this small area of countryside will have on our local environment.

>

> I understand that the Bucklebury Parish Council have reviewed the background documentation provided by the WBC in support of the draft LPL. The BPC has concluded that there is no evidence to support claims that

SP17 will have a positive impact on the environment. Indeed, it is likely to have a significantly negative impact.

>

> We live in a beautiful area. I am concerned that the impact of the proposed 1500 houses (potentially 2500 houses in the future) will cause significant issues to our environment with potential collateral damage to Bucklebury Common due to significantly increased footfall and have a detrimental impact on legally protected wildlife. Indeed, the LPR states its intent for SP17 to drive additional traffic (people & cars) into the AONB. In my opinion, this could have a detrimental impact on the fragile ecosystems that people are currently working on to restore and nurture.

>

> The LPR's own Sustainability Appraisal accepts that SP17 will have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. Whilst stating this would need to be mitigated, no details have been provided regarding how this would be carried out.

>

> It is obvious that the policy is to build as many houses as possible in a small area of countryside, on a cost effective basis as quickly as possible, with no substantiated policies regarding mitigation of the impact on the local environment.

>

> INACCESSIBILITY OF DOCUMENTS

> The volume and complexity of documentation that one is expected to review when considering points to raise is obviously too much for the average person to deal with. Having spoken to numerous people in our community, many of them have stated that it is too confusing and time consuming. Consequently, they won't be taking part in this process.

>

> A true consultation should involve two way communication open to everyone. In my opinion, the WBC is failing in its duty of accessibility to all, due to this. One wonders if this is deliberate in order to reduce the number of objections to the plan?

>

> In conclusion, I object to the proposed Thatcham NE Development for the aforementioned reasons. I believe that the plan involves building too many houses in an area of countryside that is not suitable, resulting in a significantly adverse impact on the local communities environment and the quality of our lives.

> The plan has various flaws, ambiguities and is full of unsubstantiated policies. Consequently it should be rejected.

>

> Yours faithfully

>

> Alison Gatenby

>