

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#): [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** WBC LRP Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 26 February 2023 19:56:50

---

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

---

I wish to register an OBJECTION to the local plan review.

Name: Catherine de Lara

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Reason for objection:

The plan is unsound, rushed, takes no account of the needs of the local population and has not been subject to sufficient public or regulatory body consultation.

Transport:

The local plan includes a massive increase in the number of houses as part of the new town being proposed for the NE of Thatcham. The residents of these houses will all have cars and will all need to drive out of Thatcham to places of employment including London, Reading and Newbury as employment opportunities are limited within Thatcham. WBC have suggested that this extra traffic would be funnelled towards floral way and the A4, which at certain times of the day is already at a standstill due to traffic volumes. Due to the rushed nature of the document the junction at the top of Harts hill was not mentioned, this junction will funnel additional traffic towards upper Bucklebury and Cold ash. WBC in their own Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) state their objective to be to increase safety and reduce accidents, how can funnelling large numbers of additional vehicles towards these villages (including vehicles trying to avoid the A4), which have many roads without pavements be safer? This will also have the effect of reducing the likelihood of local people being able to walk or cycle due to increased traffic, the complete opposite of objective 4 of WBC's SEA.

Healthcare:

Thousands of new houses will mean many thousands of people moving into the area, these people will all need access to healthcare and to dentists. The planned development proposes a new primary healthcare facility, but with NO DETAIL of who will pay for the building of this, or at what point in the development this will happen. At the moment it is difficult to obtain an appointment with a GP, unless there is a new, fully staffed GP surgery able to cope with the numbers of new residents its going to become almost impossible. This needs to be planned BEFORE any houses are built, something that does not seem likely.

Local dentists are also at, or near to capacity (The WBC endorsed Thatcham vision 2016 showed that 40% of Thatcham residents are not registered with a local dentist) The plan has no details of where the new residents of all these houses are expected to find a dentist.

In my opinion the plan is unsound as it does not take into account the basic medical needs of the new population.

Schools:

My comments with regard to schools provision is broadly similar to those for healthcare. The local schools are already oversubscribed and the detail of the number of additional school places

that will be provided by this development and at what point they will become available does not appear to have been planned for. All that has been suggested is a sum of money and no detail of whether this will be adequate. If a new school is not provided before the families move in then they will either be forced to drive long distances to find an available school (adding to the traffic problems in the area) or the already resident families will be forced to do the same. This cannot be regarded as sound planning.

Environment:

When protection of the environment is coming more to the forefront, the idea that building thousands of houses on farmland and right up to the border of the ANOB is totally unsound. With food prices increasing it is shocking that a local council will even consider a development such as this.

The estimated 4000+ extra residents will have easy access to the ANOB, the plan even states that there is the intent to drive both people and cars towards the ANOB. This cannot be sustainable and without doubt will have a negative impact on the local environment and the nature trying to live there. The local plan (SP17) even concludes that this new town will have a negative impact. The mitigation of this by way of the vague suggestion of "country parks" is a joke, these are just areas where it is hard to build because of the shape of the land, it has nothing to do with a desire to provide either useable green spaces for the residents or to increase (or even maintain) biodiversity. This is just a box ticking exercise on behalf of the developers with no consideration for the environment.

In conclusion this plan is unsound because WBC have not thought through the delivery of healthcare, dentists or schooling to the new residents. There is no consideration for local residents in terms of the increased traffic flow through the villages and no protection for the ANOB or regard for the environment.

Finally, in December 2022 Michael Gove announced a major change to the volumes of housing that local councils would be required to build yet WBC has not taken this into account and has ploughed on regardless.

The whole plan needs to be reconsidered putting the needs of local residents before the profits of the developers.

Catherine de Lara