

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 26 February 2023 20:49:38

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

Dear Sir, Madam,

Please find below my **objections** to the proposed Thatcham NE development (SP 17), part of the WBC LPR Regulation 19.

My details are:

Anoup Puri

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The following are all valid reasons for my objections.

Roads - negative impact via a massive increase in cars and car journeys from the proposed new development .

There is a lack of modelling or plan for the traffic that will be generated from the development and pushed onto Harts Hill and through the local villages i.e. through Upper Bucklebury, Cold Ash, Chapel Row and Bradfield Southend. The route through Upper Bucklebury will become a “rat run” to get to the M4 (J12 & J13) and Reading. Improving a few junctions on the already busy A4 will not solve this. There will be a negative impact to both Thatcham and local villages. The increased number of cars from the new properties plus the associated increased in deliveries, hgvs, visitors etc will also have a negative impact on the area. Negative impact on the environment.

Speeding is already a huge issue in our local villages, and particularly on the road that runs from Harts Hill through Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row and Southend to Common Hill. Nothing is shown in the plan help prevent this issue or help control the dangerous speeds for the new “rat runs”. This is a Negative impact on local villages. Negative impact on environment due to

an increase in the extra pollution from motorised traffic and the extra litter dumped out of car windows. I regularly carry out litter picking on the main roads through Upper Bucklebury and I believe the litter will go up exponentially . Negative impact on road safety, both for road users and pedestrians. There will also be a negative impact on the local wildlife with many many more road kills (foxes, Deirdre, squirrels, pheasants, et cetera et cetera).

The junction where Union Road meets Common Hill, and where Common Hill then meets the A340 can not cope with the current traffic levels, particularly the A340 junction. This will be made much worse by the extra road traffic if the new houses are built and this route will definitely become a “rat run” to Reading and the M4. Negative impact on road users. Negative impact on environment.

The final stretch of Union road where it meets Common Hill is not suited for additional vehicles. It is already narrow and windy. Would need significant improvement. Negative impact on road users. Negative impact on road safety. Negative impact on environment.

There appears to be little concern for other environmental impacts additional cars will cause - eg traffic noise, inconsiderate driving, speeding and racing on the straight roads through the common for example. Negative impact on residents in local area. Negative impact on road safety.

There appears to have been very little thought on how to provide public transport so that not using a car is a sensible option. Negative impact on environment, local population. Negative impact on the environment.

What is the car park on Harts Hill for if use of Harts Hill is going to be dissuaded? Negative impact on local population.

Negative impact on road safety as cars use country roads rather than A4. Negative impact on environment.

I understand the SEA states the development will have a positive impact on walking, cycling and public transport. The proposal doesn't make it clear how. Really seems that someone is just dreaming up some of these so called positive impact statements without any supporting research and evidence Significant improvement in public transport is needed to stop creation of driving “rat runs”. Negative impact on local population. Negative impact on the environment.

The roads around Thatcham station and the train barriers can hardly cope at present. The traffic queues are already lengthy at the barriers. There will be a marked increase in the pollution from road traffic on the cars are stopped at the barriers. There is insufficient car parking space near the station to cope with the increase in People using the trains. I don't believe the residents of the new development will be walking to the station as I believe they will be using the cars to drive to the station and hunting for car park spaces.

Healthcare - negative impact

It is already hard to get timely GP appointment in this area of West Berks. Adding thousands of additional people to the area will obviously make this situation worse. Relying on current GPs in Chappel Row and Thatcham and local villages will not work. It will also promote the use of local roads rather than the A4 to get to propped GP surgeries i.e. to Chapel Row. Negative impact on local population.

Proposal for GP surgery to be built isn't clear. Eg funding, finding suitable qualified medical team doesn't appear to have been discussed with local GPS, which surely would be the first step? Negative impact on local population.

How long would it take to get the surgery built, staffed with qualified medical people and running? Acknowledged it is very difficult to establish a new GP surgery. Surely needs to be open before housing is completed. Negative impact on local population.

This new development will rely on GP surgeries with a high elderly demographic, with higher reliance on healthcare. Adding thousands of new users will have a hugely detrimental effect on current users. Negative impact on local population.

Environmental - negative impact

- obviously this development will have a huge detrimental impact on the local environment and ecology simply by paving, concreting, building on a huge part of the countryside. Negative impact on environment, ecology, the aonb, local countryside, local native and protected species, on the fight against climate change.

With the open land covered over by the new build, There will be less space for the rainwater to soak into the ground. This will lead to flash floods further downhill, and more water being drained towards the Kennett and Avon Canal.

- there will be significant protected species that will be negatively impacted regardless of measures put in place. Negative impact on local ecology.
- no evidence presented that it will have a positive impact, as appears to be stated in the proposal.

To replace the existing countryside with man made country parks is an expensive way to fight nature. This appears a strange approach. Surely just leave it as countryside. Negative impact on local environment and ecology.

- how will the country parks improve ecology and biodiversity? Negative impact on local ecology.
- the development should make an ecological improvement to the area, this plan doesn't clearly show any benefit. Negative impact on local ecology and environment.
- a development of this size on a greenfield site will have a negative impact on national efforts to prevent climate change. Negative impact on fight against climate change.
- a development of this size on a greenfield site will have a negative impact on local efforts to prevent climate change. Negative impact on fight against climate change.

Education - negative impact

The local schools are already over subscribed. There is also a lack of suitable well qualified new teaching staff. Negative impact for the existing local population.

Legal requirement - Inconsistent with current central govt guidance

- central government has removed the legal requirements for specific housing numbers to be met by councils, these are now advisory. It would be good to understand why WBC is continuing to force through this huge development? What are the other external factors making WBC think it is sensible to build between 1,500 and 2,500 houses in this area where roads, public transport, GPs and schools are already creaking?
- the removal of the legal requirement makes it a great opportunity to pause and produce a properly put together, modelled, researched plan, of a scale sensible for this area.

Character of the local area

- this development will effectively make Upper Bucklebury part of Thatcham, eroding Upper Bucklebury village's unique character. It also has the potential to open up further developments that erode the countryside that defines and separates the various towns and villages in West Berks from one another. Ensuring villages remain just that, villages, is an important part of this part of West Berkshire. This proposal will have a negative impact on the

character of the area and on the local population.

Thanks you.

Yours faithfully
Anoup Puri

Regards
Anoup