

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PlanningPolicy](#)
Subject: NE THATCHAM DEVELOPMENT - Regulation 19 Consultation
Date: 03 March 2023 12:23:13

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

I am writing to object to the planning for 2,500 houses in N E Thatcham on the grounds that the plan is fundamentally unsound. Key objections are listed below:

Traffic – I believe there will be increased traffic through Upper Bucklebury and surrounding villages at busy times of the day. The A4 is already extremely busy during the morning ‘rush hour’ – with an additional number of cars from the new site people will be finding other routes to Reading and Newbury. The wait at the level crossing can take 20 minutes at the present time – additional traffic heading south will only increase this. (I believe another development plan – on a brown field site – included a bridge over the railway, which seems to me to be far more suitable.)

Schools – Kennet school in Thatcham is already over-subscribed. Will there be a new school on this site and will it be built BEFORE the houses are occupied (should this plan go through). The same applies to primary schools.

Doctor – There will be additional pressure on all medical practices in the area – additional GP surgeries are not part of the NHS strategy for the future.

Environment – The area is a green field site – abutting an AONB with no evidence nor strategy for positive impact and overall biodiversity gain. In fact, in my opinion, it will be detrimental. There is likely to be damage to Bucklebury Common with increased footfall which will increase damage to an ecosystem of national importance. The three small, isolated areas inside the proposed settlement boundary have no meaningful environmental value or commitment to exclude subsequent development and, surely, cannot be described as ‘Country Parks’. There will be a lack of strategic gap between Thatcham and Bucklebury and they will effectively merge and Upper Bucklebury will lose its identity.

I find it hard to comprehend how the planning department passed this application.

Helen Relf,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]