

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]; [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 27 February 2023 08:30:21

---

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

---

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**19 Objection**

Please find below my objections to the Local Plan & North East Thatcham SP17 development (Reg 19consultation) on the basis of it being unsound and lacking in sufficient evidence to prove that it will not create a negative impact to the existing communities including myself.

**A. Transport**

The LP & SP17 (eg. Harts Hill Road, exit & car parks proposed, sheer volume of new dwellings) will increase traffic in villages such as Upper Bucklebury & Cold Ash and therefore will have a direct negative impact on those currently living there – pollution, traffic volumes, noise, safety on the roads, wildlife impacts. There is no sound modelling to show the WBC statements that this will be limited and that there will be no problems caused by the traffic related to the new development. The air quality assessment is invalid due to it not covering the correct period and thus traffic & pollution levels.

**B. Safety**

There is no evidence presented that the proposal increases the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and wildlife and no mitigation plans given as to how this can be mitigated on roads such as Harts Hill Road. In fact the proposed exit on Harts Hill Road is likely to create safety issues on what is already a dangerously bending road, with no footpaths or cycle ways. Further reduction of hedgerows or trees thus impacting the environmental sustainability even further is not a sound mitigation for building footpaths. There is also no modelling to identify the increased pedestrian, cycle or moped traffic & the economic, social and safety negative impacts of this on the residents of Long Grove (who fund road maintenance)

**C. Healthcare**

There is no evidence of the required level of consultation, multi party discussions and detail of any acceptance of sufficiency of the proposals relating to healthcare facilities, notably GP surgery / dental care – lack of detail on adequacy of the size, location, timing, how it will be implemented and how the existing users such as myself will be positively impacted and not negatively in the short and long term. I see no Health Impact Assessment or modelling of the thousands of increased patient numbers on GP and dental practices and how NHS can provide for this. NHS dental care is already out of reach for myself and I have to fund private medical insurance due to the current strain on the local GP & NHS facilities which will only get worse with the influx of more patients

**D. Environment**

The council accept that there is a negative impact on environmental sustainability but overall believe this is out-weighed by social and economic gains. This is not backed up with sound studies, detailed assessments or mitigation plans and has unsubstantiated funding statements as to the sufficiency of proposed funding by the

Developers, no commitments as to timing and how this can apply to any reduced housing volume from 2500 to 1500. There are no impact reports or strategy documents setting out how the biodiversity net gains and other positive impacts will be achieved only an 'expectation that the future design will cater for it'. No sound evidence is presented on how the community parks can possibly deliver this without negative impact to protected and non-protected wildlife, AONB or local existing communities & mental health of locals resulting from concreting over substantial waves of countryside, increasing traffic, and years and years of building works and other detrimental impacts. The lack of evidence of consultation on biodiversity, ecosystem impacts and the outweighing social/economic benefits and even if the provision of water and waste drainage can be provisioned for the volume of dwellings proposed is a major flaw.

#### E. Housing volumes

The LP tries to position this as a reduction in dwellings over the period to 1500 (incorrect as reg 18 consultation noted 1250) whilst also not leaving the door open to the overall volume being more like the 2500 originally proposed (settlement boundary remains at 2500 level). There is no evidence that the Secretary of State's written statements have been considered and meet his statements on local constraints and concerns being reflected in plans. Other local authorities have taken this opportunity to delay their plans to gather more evidence and consultation to achieve a balanced and sensitive outcome which WBC is not doing. WBC have also seemingly added in other sites into the HELAA but immediately rejected them without due process, timing & evidential justification.

#### F. Schooling

No detailed modelling has been provided to evidence the demographics and potential future demand for schooling therefore the sufficiency of the proposed primary and secondary schooling in the LP cannot be accurately assessed, nor rule out negative impacts on children in the existing communities especially if their choice is reduced to one secondary school only due to proximity rulings favouring the children in the SP17 development area. It conflicts between the volume of places at primary (2.5 forms) to those at secondary level which would require sufficiency for 4 forms of entry to be considered viable economically and socially and contravenes WBC's own policies. It is even not sound in documenting the relevant commitments for joint use with sports fields, location on flat ground, and funding required to deliver the playing fields it states as a positive impact.

I conclude that the LPR & SP17 are unsound and will have a detriment negative impact on myself and the local communities, wildlife and environment.

Regards

