

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 01 March 2023 12:03:40

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

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I wish Objection to the proposal to build 1500 – 2500 additional homes on the proposed site to the North East of Thatcham.

The grounds for objection are as follows -

1) Environment based objections

- There will be a negative impact upon –
 - on the area of outstanding natural beauty both visually but also from noise, and pollution
 - a loss of green space
 - impact upon trees and will result in loss of mature trees,
 - impact on local wildlife and the biodiversity of the Bucklebury Plateau.
- In time when food security is of paramount concern the use of valuable farmland for housing flies in the face of this need,
- There will be a potential coalescence of Thatcham and upper bucklebury with the strategic gap being lost or reduced
- Quality of environment will be diminished, and pollution will be increased
- In times of global warming the carbon footprint of this development will be enormous, from all the traffic, the materials production, the workers travelling to the site, and the digging up of the ground, this development will add to global warming.
- The loss of the grass land, hedges, trees, which are a huge carbon sink will be lost and carbon will be released into the environment adding to global warming

2) Community based objections

- The community benefits of the scheme have not been fully explored and any suggested benefits are not sufficient to allow the application.
- Whilst local facilities such as Doctors Surgery may well be provided these will not be staffed as the current GPs cannot recruit staff cove. Additional strain on health facilities
- There will be additional strain on police facilities and policing in the area and no plan for this has been detailed
- There will be additional strain on additional strain on dental facilities in the area and no plan for this has been detailed
- There will be an impact on local safety especially with the increase in traffic using

the harts hill/common road through bucklebury as a rat run

- There will be significant noise during construction,
- There will be an increase in light pollution in the area affecting the wildlife and local people
- There will be an additional strain on power supply and no real plan has been detailed on how to deal with this
- The development will have a detrimental impact upon drainage capacity and no detail has been provided on how this sewage and surface runoff will be dealt with,

3) Traffic based objections

- There will be an increase in volumes of local traffic generated by this development, even if as the documents suggest 1500 homes will be built (a minimum!) this will mean at least 3000 additional car journeys each day (assuming one car per household and we know most households in rural areas have 2 cars), if the volume of houses are at the higher estimate of 2500 homes built this will mean at potentially up to 10,000 car journeys a day (2500 homes with 2 cars each doing 2 journeys each day) this will result in unacceptable impacts on the local highway network and at peak times in particular.
- There are no retail provisions proposed, creating additional traffic to travel off-site to a shop.
- There is a significant risk of vehicles being backed up, with queues already at Thatcham Train Station backing up to Sony roundabout, and additional passengers could exacerbate this. A bridge is required before homes are built.
- Traffic in Floral Way at peak hours can already result in 15–20-minute delay with frequent queues from roads in Dunston Park turning onto Floral Way
- The A4 is not designed to take the volumes of traffic it currently does, and therefore cannot cope with additional traffic this development will cause;
- No matter what WBC/developer say the common road through Upper Bucklebury, and Bradfield Southend will be used as a rat run. This will be exacerbated by the traffic backing up on the A4 and drivers seeking an alternative route through the villages on roads not designed for this volume of traffic.
- There is not enough local employment for future occupiers of this development, and which will require people within the development to travel to work locations adding to traffic problems

4) Flooding based objections

- The Risk of local flooding remains very high and will have local and strategic implications. The new development will have a deleterious impact upon local greenfield drainage rates which will impact on potential future flood events on existing housing "downstream" to the south in the local water catchment
- The technical aspects of the scheme have a number of real shortcomings which, if implemented, will still mean flooding is a serious potential risk for the existing homes and proposed homes. .
- Flooding risks and the Thatcham Flood Forum of 2014 indicated that Thatcham

should be 'ruled out' for large scale development due to ground water emergence;

- The flood event of 2007 affected over 1000 houses, with a volume of water coming from the north of Thatcham and the siphon on Pipers Way not coping with the volume of water. More houses in this location will add pressure to that siphon

5) General objections

- The planning process as this is being manipulated by Developer to their own advantage and the council are complicit in allowing the developer to manipulate this process. By the very fact that the developer has paid in excess of £100,000 for the planning documents which the council has adopted lock stock and barrel is clearly bias towards the developer.
- I would also question whether the above is lawful and WBC should produce evidence that says this approach is lawful.
- The councils planners are being lazy allowing this plan to be proposed, there are numerous sites especially brownfield sites that are available around west Berkshire that if allowed for development would spread the development across many areas and reducing the impact upon 2 communities and the environment.

Regards

