

Ref: Great Lakes UK Ltd- Planning Application No: 19/02550/F

Thatchover
Alchester Road
Chesterton
Oxon
14.12.19

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

Dear Ms Whitehead,

I write to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the above planning application.

This is a speculative application for hugely destructive building project which is justified by no need at either a local or national level. It meets none of the requirements of Cherwell District Council's development plan.

1 Location

This is a totally unsuitable location for this project.

It is on the edge of the village of Chesterton and only two miles from the town of Bicester. The village identity of Chesterton is already under considerable pressure from new housing developments in the village itself, the encroachment of huge housing developments at Kingsmere on the west side of Bicester and the gradual ribbon development of ground on either side of the A41 on the west side of Bicester.

The site itself is currently a Greenfield rural area in use as a golf course but also a contiguous part of the surrounding countryside therefore supporting the ecological welfare of the area.

This obscene proposal to erect 500,00 sq ft of buildings and to tarmac over virtually the rest of the area for car parking etc is just unsustainable from any point of view.

2 Traffic

The proposed development will bring a huge increase in traffic volumes to an already overloaded area. The Cherwell local plan allows development only where public transport will be used for access. There is no public transport to this area. None.

The proposed development will encourage 1000+ daily traffic movements from all parts of the UK. This traffic will approach the area using the A34, the A40, the A41 or the A43. All of the highways already have major issues and must be considered barely fit for purpose with current traffic volumes.

Virtually all of this traffic will use the M40 either to Junction 9 or to Junction 10. Both of these junctions are inadequate for current traffic volumes. There is standing traffic on the M40

approaching J9 southbound and J10 northbound at peak times almost every day of the week and often for extended periods at other times.

The local roads, particularly around Chesterton, Weston-on-the-Green and Middleton Stoney are already heavily used as 'escape' routes from the congestion on local highways and it is totally unacceptable to propose significant extra traffic movements on to these routes.

3 Local Considerations

There is already considerable development in the Bicester area; what was a small market town with a population of less than 20,000 will become a much larger population centre approaching 60,000 over the next decade. There will be very little improvement in infrastructure to cope with this; as described above there are already huge traffic problems in the area.

Bicester already has to cope with the huge movements of employees and visitors to Bicester Village Retail park which brings large traffic influxes and parking problems to the area.

There will be little economic benefit to the local area from the proposed development .

All visitors will be encouraged to remain on site for the duration of their visit and hotel rooms will not be available on a casual basis. There is little unemployment in the Bicester area, largely due to the success of Bicester Village which employs similar workers to those likely to be required by this development, and therefore the majority of employees would have to travel by car to the site.

This development will entail the loss of a local sporting facility. As the local population increase more facilities such as this will be required. The current 18 hole golf course is a harmonious use of land which lies close to the M40 motorway for recreational purposes and also of local ecological benefit.

4 Health Issues

As just mentioned, this proposed development is for land which lies alongside the M40 motorway.

It is on the windward side of the motorway and lies just where the traffic is very often stationary because of the congestion at Junction 9. While this is acceptable for golfers who pass through the area in less than two hours I find it difficult to believe that children should be exposed to that level of pollution for periods of several days.

In conclusion I would suggest that this proposal is entirely unsustainable on grounds of location, lack of infrastructure and total lack of benefit to the area.

Yours sincerely,



Stuart M Weston