

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection  
**Date:** 03 March 2023 16:28:11

---

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

---

Hello,

I would like to object to this application, which I believe to be unsound.

I now understand that there is going to be an exit from the site to the north, on to Harts Hill. The road from here all the way through Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row and Bradfield Southend is already busy with farm traffic, commercial traffic (e.g. delivering to McVeigh Parker and of course the quarry traffic), school traffic and parcel deliveries. This is a road that used to be used by cyclists and occasional cars and it is sized for that; not the large vehicles using it already. The area on Union Road, as it approaches Common Hill is incredibly narrow and often results in blockages, e.g. when a truck meets a tractor. This road is not suitable for the current traffic load and certainly could not cope with a large additional load. This new exit from the site wasn't on the original plan and adding it will provide a rat-run for traffic from the site, that would normally have gone along the much wider A4, through these narrow rural roads. It's really unsuitable and unsafe; and the way it has been added without reference and without consultation is unsound and very concerning. I drive along the road from Chapel Row to Theale or from Chapel Row to Thatcham most days; the frequency of near-misses I have witnessed (involving cars, bicycles, tractors and wildlife) is already too high and adding a significant amount of additional traffic makes me fearful of the likely impact.

I am particularly concerned about the impact on GP services. It already takes a long time to get a GP appointment at my local practice, Chapel Row Surgery. The plan suggests that a new GP surgery will be built but suggests that people will be moving in before the new GP surgery is built and health staff are recruited. Site residents are not going to wait for the new surgery to be built before accessing health services. That will put a much greater demand on existing supply. The right way to do this is to put the supporting services (not just for health, but that is the one I am focussing on) in place first and only after that, build the properties to allow the residents to move in. The current plan is unsound as it doesn't do that – it should be changed. I am a [REDACTED] pensioner who had [REDACTED] and I need GP support. My wife will also be a pensioner by the time this site is accepting residents. It is a frightening prospect that access to a GP could get even worse than it is at present.

I have other concerns which I am happy to share later, but I believe that the description above identifies the two issues that affect me most. I would like to object because the current plan doesn't take any account of my needs (and the needs of many others) as a local resident and, as such, it is unsound.

I am prepared to appear at the public enquiry, if invited.

Regards,  
Andy Spriggs

Andrew Michael Spriggs

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]