

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PlanningPolicy](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** WBC LPR Regulation 19 Objection - SP17  
**Date:** 01 March 2023 18:52:24

---

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

---

Dear Sir/Madam

This is a joint email from Malcolm Darvell and Tammy Darvell of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (contact details below). We are objecting to the North East Thatcham Development as, in our opinion, it has not been well thought through and, in areas, is unsound.

We have lived in Upper Bucklebury for [REDACTED] years and all three of our children have attended the Kennet School and local scouts groups. We have been concerned about the overdevelopment of Thatcham for a number of years. The High Street is limited in what it offers the existing sizeable population such that trips into Newbury/Reading are required if a person wishes to undertake anything other than food shopping. This has a significant impact on congestion and pollution through increased road traffic. The catchment area for the Kennet is shrinking which is forcing children in outlying villages to travel further for their education. So the current proposed expansion of Thatcham will only compound the existing problems.

Our objection can be summarised as follows:

#### Environment

- The plans originally referred to two 'country parks' being contained within the Bucklebury Plateau Biodiversity Opportunity Area but we understand that this has been downgraded to community parks only. This is not consistent with protecting Bucklebury's ancient woodlands and heaths, nor the rich biodiversity of the land encompassed by the proposed development. Promoting biodiversity requires resources and planning, we assume that the downgrade reflects the lack of these basic requirements.
- We also understand that the development is going to be located in the Wessex Downs AONB which will render it less 'Outstanding' and less 'Beautiful'.
- Upper Bucklebury is likely to lose its independence and identity and therefore damage the community from siting the development on its doorstep, closing the gap between village and town.
- The common is to be preserved and protected – we already have fly-tipping, burnt out cars and motor vehicles not keeping to the by-ways so a substantial increase in the population is likely to worsen the negative effects of anti-social behaviour.

#### Transport

- An extra 4,000 people will generate a substantial increase in car ownership and travel.
- The railway station is already challenged – the level crossing already impedes traffic flow and the A4 will become far more congested.
- Of greater concern is the increased flow of traffic through Upper Bucklebury. Harts Hill Road is a narrow road with poor sightlines. We already have vehicles travelling the road that are too wide for the lanes. The development will have a negative impact on traffic flow (and therefore pollution) and the safety of pedestrians in the village. There is also the risk of creating 'rat runs' to avoid traffic on the A4 for drivers wishing to travel to the

M4 or Newbury.

#### Education and Healthcare

- As mentioned in our opening the Kennet School catchment area is already shrinking and will have a direct impact on the children in outlying villages and their ability to access the closest schools.
- Our understanding is that the increase in the number of children in the estate is unlikely to be sufficient to make a new school sustainable – so where are these children to go?
- Our understanding is that existing medical infrastructure (dentists and surgeries) is already under pressure. It is not certain that the NHS will agree to establish a new surgery for the extra people, so where are 4,000 people to go?

#### **Malcolm Darvell**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

#### **Tammy Darvell**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]