

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection - SP17  
**Date:** 27 February 2023 16:56:30

---

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

---

I think the plan proposed by WBC is unsound for several reasons.

The traffic in Upper Bucklebury has grown massively in the last ten years and this proposal will make it intolerable, particularly for those of us who live on the main road. 1500 houses means possibly 3000 more cars and a proportion of them will use Harts Hill and Broad Lane as an alternative route to the A4. The noise and pollution will be unacceptable. Cycling or walking on Harts Hill is not safe at present and this proposal will make it far worse and will cause environmental damage and damage to health.

It is not clear that you have given any consideration to infrastructure. Last summer we had water shortages and this will only be exacerbated with possibly 5000 more people all needing water. And what of the sewerage and surface water drainage? Have you consulted with Thames Water?

The proposal to build partly on usable agricultural land which may be needed in the future does not make sense. Once it's built on it's gone. I am not convinced that the WBC have given adequate consideration to alternative brownfield sites.

I am concerned about the effect on healthcare in the area, which already is vastly overstretched. The burden of an additional 3000-5000 more people will be insupportable for our current doctor's surgeries. Again, what consultation has taken place?

Geoffrey Mahoney

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]