

# Comment for planning application 19/02550/F

<b>Application Number</b>	19/02550/F
<b>Location</b>	Land to the east of M40 and south of A4095 Chesterton Bicester Oxon
<b>Proposal</b>	Redevelopment of part of golf course to provide new leisure resort (sui generis) incorporating waterpark, family entertainment centre, hotel, conferencing facilities and restaurants with associated access, parking and landscaping
<b>Case Officer</b>	Clare Whitehead
<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Howard Robinson
<b>Address</b>	Spring Well Farm, Kirtlington Road, Chesterton, Bicester, OX26 1TW
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Comment
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I have three issues which I think will adversely affect the residents of Chesterton Bicester and surrounding villages IF this proposal is approved. a) Surface water drainage and increased risk of flooding b) Traffic c) Reduction of an environmentally friendly local amenity to be replaced by a less green facility not designed for local visitors (average stay 2.6 days) Surface Water I quote from the summary of the proposal dealing with this subject This will ensure that post development flows are no greater than the anticipated greenfield run-off rates. Easy to say but is it feasible, and is the existing run off rate , slow enough to prevent flooding in Wendlebury ? Traffic Again I quote from the summary of the proposal dealing with this subject A signage strategy has been developed which will direct drivers onto appropriate routes to access the Site and, in particular, direct drivers to avoid passing through Chesterton when approach and leaving the Site. The use of modern day Sat Nav will ignore signed routes and lead visitors to the quickest direct route avoiding traffic, this will lead to vehicles accessing the proposed site through Little Chesterton , the Hale , Green Lane, and the village of Chesterton, these roads are just not suitable for even small amounts of extra traffic. The B 430 has two of the most dangerous cross roads (Akeman street and the A4095 ) both within a mile or two of the proposed entrance to the site. The M40 Motorway junctions at 9 and 10 are simply not designed well enough to cope with the volume of traffic now using them (despite recent alterations) At junction 10 the north bound traffic has to cross traffic coming off the North bound carriageway to use the Service area, which is on one side of the Motorway only, there is only one exit lane on the Southbound carriageway and this has to cross Northbound A43 traffic and Southbound A43 traffic. The A43 being the main trunk route from the M1 and onward via the M40 to West London or to the A34 bound for the South Coast and the major Ports of Southampton and Portsmouth. Junction 9 is prone to Gridlock due to the short distance between the traffic lights and the volume of traffic trying to get up and down the A34 , when this happens more traffic finds its way onto the B430 taking a detour through Chesterton or continuing through Middleton Stoney. The A34 is already notorious for traffic jams accidents and delays. As well as being major trunk routes between the North and the South there are already major attractions using the exits at Junction 9 ( Bicester Village, Blenheim Palace and Oxford) and Junction 10 (Silverstone, Stowe and the Service area). The proposal also envisages guests arriving by train, I think this unlikely as if travelling with children and luggage for two or three nights visitors are most likely to want the convenience of having their own transport. I think those responsible for approving this proposal need to have the traffic statistics independently verified because I fear that the assumptions that they have used to reach the conclusion that " With regard to the operation of the Proposed Development, it has been demonstrated that the Proposed Development is likely to result in a negligible (not significant) residual effect on the highway network local to the Site. " MAY NOT BE VALID.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	03/12/2019 14:40:21
<b>Attachments</b>	