

Kerry Renfrew

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

19 February 2023

Dear Sir/ Madam

**Re: WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection**

I am writing to object to the LPR Regulation 19 as I find it unsound due to the following reasons:

**Increased traffic**

- If this site goes ahead with a minimum of 1500 new homes being built, it will result in increased traffic flow in Thatcham, Bucklebury, Chapel Row and Cold Ash. Traffic flow is believed to exit onto Floral Way and the A4. I live just north of Harts Hill Road [REDACTED] [REDACTED] At busy times, we can be waiting over 5 minutes to turn right to head towards Harts Hill Road. We believe that this development will negatively impact access out of Foxglove Way onto Floral Way, and traffic backing up in Foxglove Way waiting to turn onto Floral Way.
- Alternatively, cars will divert through the estate rather to exit onto Floral Way at the other end of Foxglove Way where there is a roundabout, causing Foxglove Way to become a “rat run” and potentially dangerous for children and pedestrians in a residential estate.
- At busy times, queues form on Floral Way for cars joining the A4 towards Reading. Queues can be backed up to beyond Simmonsfield. This will only get worse if these homes are built on this land.
- If traffic leaves the site onto Harts Hill Road, it will head through the local villages on Chapel Row and Bucklebury – these roads weren’t built to withstand the volume of traffic that will end up using them, and could lead to a serious accident.
- As there are no new jobs to be created in the area, a large number of people living on the estate will need to commute to other areas, which will increase traffic flow on already congested roads. For example, cars travelling towards Basingstoke or Greenham that head over the level crossing can already face long waits with traffic queuing up Pipers Way and along Station Road.
- From a personal perspective, I commute into Reading by train. At times, it can be tricky to get parked unless you are at the station before 0745. What provision is being made to increase parking at the station? The station is not served by local buses from the Floral Way/ Dunstan Park area and therefore commuters either need to walk (from the Harts Hill

Road junction this would be a 25 minute walk each way which is not necessarily feasible for all commuters) or drive, but without extra provision of car parking, this will mean existing commuters may struggle to park at the station.

We note that the Council's assessment is that there will be increased opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport. Floral Way and Dunstan Park are not currently served with public transport; I'd like to question how the Council will ensure that there will be increased opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.

### **Pollution / environment**

- With the increased volume of traffic on the roads, this will lead to more air pollution. Living close to Floral Way, I am concerned that the air pollution levels will rise in my area, and this will have a negative impact on me.
- The additional traffic going up and down Floral Way to access the new site will cause additional noise pollution both inside and outside my property.
- Loss of open space used by walkers and the habitats of many wildlife being lost.
- With the loss of so much open space, the risk of flooding once again is increased. I understood from the Project Manager of the Floral Way flood defence that the flood defence was built to protect the existing developments in Thatcham against a 1 in a 100 year flood. He advised at that time, that if new developments were built on this site that they would need their own flood defences. What are the plans for this? Or are you just expecting the current flood defences to be sufficient? A stream that flows into the flood defence and goes under Floral Way runs through my front garden. I am naturally concerned that if no plans are made for further flood defences, my property will at a higher risk of flooding.

### **Healthcare**

- The development plan proposes a primary healthcare facility for a GP surgery. Existing GPs in this area are unable to recruit new GPs to cover existing patient lists, so I would question how the planners expect to be able to open a new GP surgery. Getting a GP appointment is near on impossible at the current time; having 1500 more homes means this will become even more difficult, and puts the existing GP surgeries under even more pressure.

### **Schools**

- With the additional homes, the school provision in the area will need to be increased. There are no details in the LPR for Nursery or Early years provision. Nurseries are already full and with waiting lists so provision has to be made before the houses are built.
- Secondary provision in the area is already limited with many children in Thatcham having their catchment school in Newbury. With 1500 more homes on this site, unless more secondary places are made available, more Thatcham children will need to go to school in

Newbury or Bucklebury children will need to go to The Downs, creating more traffic and pollution with children having to travel further to school.

Due to the many reasons listed above, I wish to object to the LPR Regulation 19.

Yours faithfully

Kerry Renfrew