

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection
Date: 01 March [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear sir

I object to the WBC LPR Regulation 19 proposal as it is unsound and, on a number of levels, directly impacts me.

Education - lack of relevant infrastructure for a 6FE facility

The provision of any education infrastructure is either unclear or contradictory. There is no complete description of provision from preschool through to sixth form.. The plan is unsound.

Where is there no research on the impact of traffic levels during term time?

No definition for the structure of the Nursery education plan

The detail on Primary schooling appears to have no basis on research, therefore how can any plan or budget be developed?

The development will adversely affect secondary school education choice in Bucklebury. Currently children can opt for Kennet or the Downs. Where there is oversubscription to a school those closest are given priority. This will effectively mean that Bucklebury pupils will have no choice but to be sent to The Downs.

My family have lived here since the 60's. I am concerned that our choice of secondary school will be severely constrained by this proposal. Plus The strain on schooling may have a negative impact on the QUALITY of education provision to my family and others.

The planning for provision of a secondary school appears to be a mess and is therefore unsound

There is no modelling on pupil numbers

The location for the school has not been identified

Any school with less than 6 Form Entries is NOT sustainable

Funding is not clear on whether or how the council's obligations can be met

The chronology of funding provision is not clear

West Berks Council is an Education authority and has a duty to make arrangements for suitable school provision. The LPR shows nothing covering the requirement.

The provision of sports fields by WBC and the proposed development has NOT been met. There has been no evidence provided for funding OR suitable locations.

Sportfield Provision -

Where is the flat ground for the sports fields? The proposed development area is on the side of a ridge. How does the plan propose to provide FLAT playing fields?

Where is the funding for the fields as the developer has retracted their offer on the

secondary school?

Transport - Unsound modelling, planning and evaluation

The scale of the development will introduce a large number of new vehicles to the roads. The planned exit to the North, onto Harts Hill will funnel large quantities of vehicles onto small village roads. Where is the modelling on traffic impact? The impact on safety, pollution and quality of life will be immense.

The Transport Assessment says at paragraph 3.26 : 'The access arrangements for the northern end of the NET site proposes new priority junctions (with right turn lanes where appropriate) on both Floral Way and Harts Hill Road. Where is the modelling for this conclusion?

Why has a new car park been planned for Harts Hill? What is the rationale and who is it supposed to serve? Was there any review on possible antisocial behaviour?

The Sustainability Appraisal Objective 4 / Strategic Environmental Assessment includes the statement: "To promote and maximise opportunities for all forms of safe and sustainable transport." The Council assessment is "The policy is likely to have a Positive Impact on road safety as safe travel will be critical to the design of the site". How can this be so when we know that there will be a large increase in traffic down narrow country roads? Where are the traffic calming policies?

Another Council Transport Assessment states: The policy is likely to have a significant impact on walking, cycling and public transport as the development should be designed with these in mind. Looking at the plans I see little evidence to support the assessment. How is the positive impact being measured and attained? It looks like fine words, but once again no policy or planning.

Healthcare - no strategic planning or matching proposals to the plan therefore the plan is unsound on this matter

Healthcare in the area is already on its knees. I have long waits for hospital and GP appointments. For example blood test appointments can be weeks in the future. Adding 1500 dwellings to the area is almost beyond belief in terms of medical support. Where is the **Health Impact Assessment?**

There is no realistic chance of a new surgery being established in Thatcham, The proposed 450 sq m. surgery cannot be viewed as viable. It is too small for a standalone operation and too expensive to be a satellite office. Even the satellite office would be unable to cope with the demand from the planned development.

The development appears to believe that existing surgeries can take the new patients. This is woeful, there needs to be engagement with health providers PRIOR to the plan being completed.

Dental Care planning is as poor as the general health items above.

Personal Note: One of my sons is at present UNABLE to register with a dentist.

How can dentists deal with the proposed demand?

Why has there been no dialogue with the local dental practices?

There will be a significant NEGATIVE impact on the environment. There is no evidence of serious investigation or mitigation planning

The proposal claims a positive impact on the environment. How can that be?

Massive pressure on the Bucklebury Plateau Biodiversity Opportunity Area through

increased traffic and a 4000 increase in population.

A development crammed right up against the North Wessex Downs AONB is obviously going to have a damaging effect on the AONB as there will be a loss of major areas of adjoining open countryside. The North Wessex AONB was not envisaged as an island of green surrounded by housing.

Legally protected wildlife is known to be present on the site. Minor areas of grassland will not mitigate the impact of 1500 houses and probably 4000 new residents.

The LPR's own Sustainability Appraisal accepts that SP17 will have a negative impact on environmental sustainability. Especially as the plan is, as stated by SP17, to have new routes into the AONB.

Water and sanitation

The Thames Water infrastructure is at its limit serving the existing community.

Where is the planning to provide for the 1500 new homes?

Where is the modelling on water and sanitation usage and the impact on sewerage, river water quality and drinking water?

Alternative development sites

Where is the evidence that existing brownfield sites will not meet the requirements?

In conclusion, the Regulation 19 Proposal has a massive lack of planning, clarity, funding and explanation and is therefore unsound

I am happy to become involved in the discussions on the proposal should the council wish to involve me.

Yours sincerely

John Stephenson