

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection SP17
Date: 03 March 2023 13:50:53

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

Dear Sir / Madam,

Regarding the above plan, I would like to lodge my objection to this wholly unsound development for the following reason:

1. Provision of healthcare

Currently, all GP surgeries in the Thatcham and Bucklebury Parish areas are heavily oversubscribed and there appears to be no integrated plan to address this within the proposal. You are risking the long term health and well-being of all existing local and potential future residents with this poorly developed plan.

2. Education

The lack of planning for healthcare provision mirrors that of education. There are no clear plans for the provision of primary or secondary schools to meet the obvious future demand that comes with an additional 2500 homes. The existing schools are already oversubscribed and additional housing will simply exacerbate the current poor education choices provided to parents by West Berkshire Council.

3. Environment

The proposed development will be enormously damaging to the environment and in your own LPR you accept that SP17 will have a negative impact on the environmental sustainability. You accept that this will potentially need to be mitigated but provide no clear plan on how this will occur. Given that WBC declared a climate emergency in July 2019, this development would appear to be significantly at odds with your own stated environmental aims. Vague references to 'community parks' within the proposal do not provide any reassurance that there won't be massive environmental damage to an existing AONB.

4. Transport

The existing road network in and around Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury is wholly insufficient to cope with the massively increased traffic that will result from so many new homes. The council's previous failures at mitigating road and car usage in the Dunstan Park development are all too evident and the same mistakes will be repeated here with a totally inappropriate and unsafe level of traffic through Harts Hill and Broad Lane.

In the SP17 plan, the council's assessment is that the development will have a positive impact on the opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport. There is absolutely no evidence of this whatsoever. Glib statements along the lines of 'the development should be designed with these in mind' do not result in actual action being taken. Where are the cycle paths segregated from the

road network? Where are the bus stops and new bus routes? Like the rest of the local area, the car will inevitably represent the only reasonable and safe way to travel and thus massively increase CO2 emissions as well as make existing poor pedestrian provision even more unsafe.

In general terms, I do not understand how an enormous development such as this can be recommended by WBC when there are so many alternatives available.

Regards, Mark

--

Mark Bailey

