

KIRTLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

*Mrs R M Powles
Clerk to Kirtlington Parish Council
West House, South Green
Kirtlington, Oxfordshire OX5 3HJ
01869 350995
kirtlingtonclerk@gmail.com*

20th December 2019

Ms Clare Whitehead
Development Management
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury OX15 4AA

Dear Sirs

Ref: Great Lakes UK Ltd – Application Ref: 19/02550/F

Kirtlington Parish Council objects to this application and urges Cherwell District Council to refuse planning permission.

1. The Transport and Access analyses are deficient: the site is wholly inappropriate in terms of traffic impacts.
2. The site is contrary to the adopted Development Plan.
3. There is no established need case for this development ; the analysis of the economic need is deficient.

Transport and Access

The site is wholly inappropriate in terms of traffic impacts. A development of these proportions which is anticipated to generate large volumes of traffic movements should be accessed directly from a motorway junction and not via rural roads.

The *Transport and Access Section 6* of the planning submission attempts to assess the likely significant effects of the site during the construction and operational phases and uses traffic survey data provided by Oxfordshire County Council for current and future movements for light vehicles and HGVs.

The disruption during the construction phase will be significant, but it is the operational phase that is of concern, for which, the scale of the proposal notwithstanding, the impact of change upon all receptors is assessed as negligible.

It should be noted that the only planned highways upgrade is a single entrance to the site from the A4095 and a cycleway from the site to Chesterton.

The more detailed *Transport Assessment* projects journeys based upon occupancy rates but essentially states the same and reaches the same conclusions. However the key assumption for both studies is that traffic leaving the site heading west on the A4095 will reach the junction with the B430 and then head either north to M40 J10, or south to the A34 to the M4 or A34 to M40 J9. **Absolutely no** traffic is projected to cross the B430 and continue further west on the A4095 and pass through Kirtlington and beyond.

Equally, the catchment area is projected as a 123 mile radius from the site and **all traffic** by percentage will flow from the following routes; please see attached *fig 3.1 Visitor Distribution*.

16% via M40 North; 14% A43 North to then head South from M40 J10 on B430 to A4095	= 30%
7% from the North east via A4421 and A421; plus 1% via the A41 through Bicester	= 8%
20% via M40 (South) and A41; 20% via M40 (South) and A34, both to M40 J9	=40%
Finally, 10% via A34 South; 12% via A34 and M4 = 22% ;	Total 100%

This means that 62% will travel north through Weston-on-the-Green on the B430 and 30% south on the same road, and all converge at the crossroads junction with the A4095, but this is not mentioned.

This also confirms that although there is a projection that a mere 1% of guests will travel from the east on the A41, they project **absolutely no** traffic approaching from the west or southwest on the A4095 and passing through villages en route such as Kirtlington.

This is clearly wrong and misleading. Satnavs guide drivers coming from the M4 to avoid the worst of the A34 to Woodstock, Kidlington and the M40 by leaving the M4 before the A34 junction on to the A420 or A429, and travelling thence via the A4095 (Eynsham, Bladon and Kirtlington), as well as across the Cotswolds from the A40.

It is also well known that when there are major events at Blenheim, peaks in traffic load at Bicester Village, or problems on the M40 or A34, drivers divert to the A4095; at such times, the traffic load through Kirtlington and neighbouring parishes on the A4095 is already unacceptably high. In addition, the existing increase in traffic at rush hour co-incides exactly with the projected peak arrival and departure times at the site.

To note also : the photomontages prepared from the two road crossings of the M40 and from the north-bound M40 suggest that the water slides will not be visible from these locations as the proposed planting matures, which raises a question as to why they are exposed at all and not enclosed within a building (where, moreover, they can be insulated properly). From a commercial point of view, the visibility of the slides from the M40 is critical in advertising the presence of the resort to the passing public, therefore to suggest that the applicant wishes to screen them is disingenuous.

The Cherwell District Development Plan

The proposed site is not located within any defined settlement boundary, and thus is within the open countryside. The site is not allocated for any development in the adopted Development Plan and thus is contrary to an adopted and up to date plan, which commands full weight in the decision making process. The site is also shown on the Green Infrastructure theme map (maps at Appendix 5 of the Local Plan) as an existing Outdoor Sports Facility (protection of existing sites falls under Policy BSC 10). The proposals would be contrary to Policy ESD 13 in as much as they would cause, at the very least, undue visual intrusion into open countryside. The preamble to this policy also highlights Bignell Park and the Roman roads around Bicester as features of value; the proposals would affect these directly and the setting of the park.

Need case

As the local area appears to enjoy full employment, particularly in the leisure/service industry, but struggles with housing shortages and transport networks which are at breaking point, it appears the need case for this development is ill-considered.

Yours faithfully



Ruth Powles
Clerk, Kirtlington Parish Council