

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: Comments on Reg19
Date: 26 February 2023 21:53:55

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

Dear Planning policy team

I wish to make the following observations on the Reg19 consultation.

I have represented Bucklebury on WBC since [REDACTED] and broadly support the Local Plan, it is essential that we remain a "plan lead" authority but I need to comment specifically on SP17 and its impact on all rural villages to the north of the proposed site especially Bucklebury.

1. Traffic. When developments in North Thatcham took place in the 1990s there was a considerable increase in "rat-running" traffic on our unsuitable rural road network. Unless planned and managed carefully SP17 will add considerable volumes of such traffic, a lot of work has been undertaken to provide road improvements to the A4 but it is essential that there should be no direct access to Harts Hill Road which would encourage traffic through Bucklebury even more. There should be no carparks on Harts Hill Road as this is totally unnecessary!

2. Bucklebury Common is common land open to all, we welcome careful visitors, but it is a fragile ecosystem carefully managed. It is not a playground for new development and should not be used as such. Access to the AONB must not be enhanced or directly encouraged, recreation space for any development should be contained on site.

3. For many years we had a "strategic gap" between Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury, a policy that no longer exists. It is essential there is a "defined gap" identified in the Plan as suggested elsewhere between settlements.

4. A proposal for development at Siege Cross was submitted in 2016 for around 850 houses just after the current Local Plan was adopted, this was refused but a Planning Inspector was minded to approve the proposal. The Secretary of State refused the application so there could be a case for a number of houses to be built on a small part of SP17 but I firmly believe the "Colthrop" site should be reconsidered, this would provide a much needed bridge over the railway line and canal/River
In any case since the proposed number of homes on SP17 has been reduced from 2,500 to 1,500 there should be a significant reduction in size of the proposed site clearly defined,.

I would wish to be invited to the public enquiry to expand on the points I have raised and to answer any questions.

Yours sincerely

Graham Pask
and Mrs Hilary Pask

[REDACTED]