

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 03 March 2023 13:22:50

---

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

---

I am objecting to the NE Thatcham development on the basis that the plan is unsound in the following areas:

1. Transport: There will be increased traffic both in Thatcham and in Upper Bucklebury [REDACTED]. I think this has been underestimated in the plan. The plan for an exit site on Harts Hill will increase traffic congestion. This impacts me negatively as I now drive my children to Kennet school since the council school bus has been cancelled. I regularly pass pedestrians on Harts Hill and the junction where there is already no pavement would add to safety concerns on this road. There are no modelling results for this junction. Why is this? The council assessment is that there will be an increase in walking, cycling and public transport use but our bus route in Upper Bucklebury has been cut and this proposal will increase the traffic and safety concerns so I would be even less likely to use this road walking or cycling. In addition, crossing the Thatcham level crossing can take up to 20 minutes already, let alone with significant additional traffic coming through the area, which regularly becomes a bottleneck today. There is also inadequate parking today at Thatcham station, so this problem will simply be made worse.

2. There is no detail of healthcare provision for those living in the new houses. The local surgeries in the area are already over stretched. This impacts me negatively as further pressure will mean appointments at Chapel Row surgery will be even less available.

3. It will have a significant negative impact from an environmental point of view. Damaging heathland and woodland with additional footfall. The site is a major greenfield development in the broader area of the North Wessex Downs ANOB and it will have a detrimental effect on legally protected wildlife. The original country park has now been downgraded to a community park and there is no evidence that it will have a positive impact on the environment as claimed and no significant analyses of the consequences to the environment of the plan. The heath is a fragile environment and additional footfall will damage plants, threaten ground nesting birds such as nightjars and fragmented habitats of reptiles such as adders. I have walked these fields regularly and it is beautiful countryside that will be destroyed forever.

4. There is no coherent plan for school provision. My children currently attend Kennet school which is full! Where are the initial children living in these houses going to go to school? Or will the proposed secondary school be built before the houses. Unlikely given a location for this school has not been established. To this end I cannot see how the impact on traffic can be assessed accurately. Traffic around Kennet school at the beginning and end of the school day is already very congested. Another school will significantly add to traffic at these times. The number of entries is not defined so an additional secondary school may not be feasible but where else would these children go? I predict one of the consequences will be young people living in Upper Bucklebury will no longer be in catchment for Kennet school which is just down the road but they will have to go to The Downs on a long bus route and have friends living far away. This plan would have a negative impact with additional traffic on school runs, more strain on my children's school and less connection with Thatcham if children in our village can only go to The Downs.

Several Local Authorities have put their plan making on hold given changes so that

planning inspectorate will no longer necessarily override local decisions so why are West Berkshire not taking this approach given the strong objections to such a large development and the significant lack of detail on health provision, school provision, traffic numbers and environmental impact?

Jeremy Shearn

