

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

Kevin Lloyd  
3 Flavian Close  
Chesterton OX26 1Df

10<sup>th</sup> December 2019

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

Dear Ms Whitehead,

In my opinion, this is not in accordance with the local development plan and there are no material considerations that would warrant planning permission being granted.

My objections are centred on:

1) Unsustainable

- unsustainable in an inappropriate location on the edge of a village. The development includes 900 parking spaces with a significant reliance on car travel which goes against the Cherwell strategy of reducing car usage
- The 18 hole golf course users will now have to drive to other alternative 18 hole golf courses, therefore unsustainable and increasing car usage
- The site comprises 500,000 sq ft of built form, on what is currently a greenfield site irreversibly removing important green infrastructure and disrupting ecological habitats.

2) Landscape Impact

- the applicant is looking to put 500,000 sq ft of buildings on this greenfield site which will have a significant and irreversible impact on the landscape and views of the site

3) Traffic Impact

- the existing road infrastructure (and that of surrounding villages) can't cope with the extra 1,000 plus daily increase in traffic volume, plus construction traffic. Chesterton is already a "rat run" and experiences major traffic congestion as an "escape route" during the many traffic issues on the M40 and A34
- unacceptable routing plans via already stressed routes, such as Middleton Stoney, Weston-on-the-green and Wendlebury. This proposal would also direct traffic onto the A34 which already encounters significant traffic problems
- it adds to numerous other significant proposals that have been approved in Bicester recently (Kingsmere, Bicester Gateway & Bicester Heritage) The road networks cannot cope with this additional traffic and this proposal is in the wrong location.

4) Lack of economic benefits

- this proposal is contrary to Cherwell's strategic aim of prioritising Knowledge Based business investment as a priority, offering employment supporting the knowledge economy
- hotel rooms only available to Great Wolf Resorts guests. This does not assist the growth of other businesses in the area providing employees with accommodation overnight.
- Not a single local business supports the scheme to reinforce Great Wolf Resorts (GWR) suggestion of economic benefits, as GWR aims to keep all guests onsite to use their restaurants, bowling alleys and retail shops etc retaining all profits for GWR and not shared with other local businesses.

- Local businesses already find it hard to recruit the employees GWR will target. GWR will therefore take employees from local business or will have to recruit and increase travel density by employees travelling to the site.
- 5) Design
- It is an inefficient and bad design. The low-rise design to ensure less visibility means that buildings and parking have spread across the site having significant urbanising impact on this rural location.
  - This scheme of over 500,000 sq ft of two or three overbearing large blocks is not in keeping with the local area nor with Cherwell Council's Countryside Design Summary, 2008
- 6) Loss of Sports Facility
- Why close 9 of 18 holes? Company accounts show financial strength and a viable golfing complex.
  - How will the remaining 9 holes continue to be viable; as a golfer I would not join or remain a member of a 9-hole course.
  - With the loss of North Oxford 9-hole course, for similar reasons, the area has suffered the plight of more housing to the detriment of well-being and community inclusion
- 7) Lack of consultation
- With potentially over 2000 daily visitors, GWR should have been more actively engaged with Cherwell Council to potentially identify a more suitable site through the local plan process. This is a speculative planning application, ushered along without due process, almost by the back door, in the wrong place and should be refused on this basis alone

In summary, I voice my objection on the many grounds above and perhaps more importantly, as I did go along to GWR's presentation evening their total apathy and dismissal of local views and input was beyond belief. I found them most arrogant and almost assumptive that their belligerent manner that this was a forgone conclusion. I implore Cherwell Council to do the right thing, reject this application and demonstrate that neither local communities, individuals nor their represented elected councillors can be shoved about with ill thought through rhetoric

Yours sincerely

Kevin Lloyd