

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection-SP14 and policy RSA13  
**Date:** 03 March 2023 13:32:49

---

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

---

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to object about the Local plan and specifically policy RSA13 / Land north of A4 Bath Road, Woolhampton (Site Ref MID4)

This site has previously been refused for development by WBC ( Application reference 20/03028/OUTMAJ ), being unsuitable for residential development and outside the defined settlement boundary.

Also advising a satisfactory conclusion could not be found to overcome the above.

Nothing has changed and this proposed development site should finally be removed from the list of potential development sites.

I wish to repeat a number of strong objections that I have in relation to the proposed development of greenfield space, at the western edge of Woolhampton village, application reference as above.

As a close neighbour of the site of the proposed development, I am of the view that this will have a severe negative impact on the village and its inhabitants, detracting from their standard of living, and enjoyment of residing in Woolhampton.

1/ Visual impact on village / character of the area. This paddock / open space forms part of the defined rural landscape on approach to the village from the West, creating clear definition between the village and open countryside. To develop / expand housing on this site will certainly detract from the small village feel currently enjoyed.

2/ Greenfield site / Wildlife. My understanding is that this is a greenfield site, which borders ancient woodland, to develop this site can only have a negative impact on the local wildlife and their habitat, regardless of any mitigating efforts put in place by the developers. Surely it would be better to develop a brownfield site locally, within a defined settlement boundary, where these issues would not be encountered.

3/ Overdevelopment. Woolhampton is a small village and would think most of the residents like it this way, that is why they live here. We currently have the new Reed Gardens development of 34 properties, ( mainly 3 & 4 bedroom homes ) along with new housing by Midgham station This will roughly equate to 150 more people in the village, a massive increase considering the village has less than 1000 inhabitants. To then add another 16 dwellings, roughly 50 more people added to the 150 above, is just not wanted, viable, or sustainable. It will have a large negative impact on local facilities and amenities.

4/ Noise and light pollution. There will be a significant increase in noise and light pollution both during any development and after completion. New Road Hill does not have street lights, and a lot of people prefer it like that for it's rural feel + it's much better for stargazing. Any development from a rural paddock will increase noise and light pollution, regardless of any

mitigating action taken by developers, which will impact existing local residents. Sure this will not be good for the local wildlife in the paddock / adjoining woodland, and local area either.

5/ Parking issues. There are already parking issues with not enough parking spaces for existing Woolhampton residents. This is even more evident when friends and families are visiting. Locals who reside along the Bath Road and New Road Hill have been forced to park on the corner of the Bath Road and New Road Hill junction due to the lack of parking. ( by the sub station ) I have seen up to 8 vehicles parked there, and would have concerns if this space was no longer available, that people would be forced to park somewhere less safe and cause obstruction to others( pedestrians and road users ).

6/ There is a plan to develop a significant site in Thatcham ( SP16 & 17 ) of 3000 new houses, less than 2 miles away, which will more than cover requirements for any new housing in the immediate area.

In conclusion, I believe that this development is neither needed or wanted. I would be grateful if the council would take these objections into consideration, I will be happy to provide any further information should you have any questions.

Sincerely Daniel & Victoria Marsh

[Redacted signature block]

**CHIEF TO CDS MIGRATION**  
Get ready for the move

**UNISERVE**  
your global business

[Download your free guide here](#)

**30th September 2022**  
Import declarations to close on CHIEF

**31st March 2023**  
Export declarations to close on CHIEF and the National Exports System (NES)

The information contained in this message and or attachments is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and / or privileged material. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any system and destroy any copies. All business is transacted subject to the terms of the British International Freight Association Standard Trading Conditions (latest edition). A copy will be supplied upon request.