Comment for planning application 19/02550/F

Lacation Land to the east of M40 and south of A4095 Chesterton Bicester Oxon Proposal 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 Case Officer Clare Whilehead Organisation Name Address Red Cow Cottage, Alchester Road, Chesterton, Bicester, OX26 1UW Type of Comment Objection Type neighbour Comments Please record my strong objection to this scheme which is unsustainable and not in keeping with the local plan, my objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overfoaded minor rat run roadways and continuous raffic issues even before the other planing activities such as BXA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howse Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No on who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with shorstays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the addit	Application Number	19/02550/F
Incorporating waterpark, family entertainment centre, hotel, conferencing facilities and restaurants with associated access, parking and landscaping Case Officer Clare Whilehead Organisation Name Name Tracey Walker Address Red Cow Cottage, Alchester Road, Chesterton, Bicester, OX26 1UW Type of Comment Objection Type neighbour Comments Please record my strong objection to this scheme which is unsustainable and not in keeping with the local plan, my objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the plande be tester sited on throws lane before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howse Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who have as stated streds of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole goif course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; yoo Jarking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to Varee will be on steed of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strately or travel in every day due to a lack local accommandation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse willdlife on site provisin a green race of rel	Location	Land to the east of M40 and south of A4095 Chesterton Bicester Oxon
Organisation Name Tracey Walker Address Red Cow Cottage, Alchester Road, Chesterton, Bicester, 0X26 1UW Type of Comment Objection Type neighbour Comments Please record my strong objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues are before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Cateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues with sime traffic suces are so the loff course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from all the expansion seen already in the village and around Bicester, replacing this with 500K sq fo t tarmac and buildings is not a sustainable replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildlife will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local people resources with employeers struggling to recruir retail and or lessure typeroles, these jobs	Proposal	incorporating waterpark, family entertainment centre, hotel, conferencing facilities and
Name Tracey Walker Address Red Cow Cottage, Alchester Road, Chesterton, Bicester, OX26 1UW Type of Comment Objection Type neighbour Comments Please record my strong objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues even before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues arequite traffic casues, pl. 19, 10, A41 into Bicester. Roads are already in place state of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from areas with hower houses corts which will increase strugging to recruit retail and or leisure type roles, these jobs are guereally lower plate or replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildlife will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local people resour	Case Officer	Clare Whitehead
Type of Comment Objection Type neighbour Comments Please record my strong objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues even before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues with hilte success seens of rin improving the traffic e.g. 19, 110, A41 into Bicester. Roads are laready in poor state of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employeer traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from all the expansion seen already in the village and around Bicester, replacing this with 500K sq ft of tarmac and buildings is not a sustainable replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildlife will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local people resources with employers s	-	Tracey Walker
Type neighbour Comments Please record my strong objection to this scheme which is unsustainable and not in keeping with the local plan, my objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues even before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues with little success seen so far in improving the traffic e.g. 19, 110, A41 into Bicester. Roads are already in poor state of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from all the expansion seen already in the village and around Bicester, replacing this with 500k sq ft of tarmac and buildings is not a sustainable replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildlife will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local people resources with employers struggling to recruit retail and or leisure type roles, these jobs are generally lower p	Address	Red Cow Cottage, Alchester Road, Chesterton, Bicester, OX26 1UW
Comments Please record my strong objection to this scheme which is unsustainable and not in keeping with the local plan, my objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues even before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues with little success seen so far in improving the traffic c.g. (9, 1)(1). All into Bicester. Roads are already in poor state of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield witi diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from all the expansion seen already in the village and around Bicester, replacing this with 500k sq ft of tarmac and building is not a sustainable replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildlife will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local economy is doubful as the resort is set up as a one stop destination and the need for guests to leave stare will be	Type of Comment	Objection
with the local plan, my objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues even before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues with little success seen so far in improving the traffic e.g. j9, j10, A41 into Bicester. Roads are already in poor state of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from all the expansion seen already in the village and around Bicester, replacing this with 500k sq ft of tarmac and buildings is not a sustainable replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildliffe will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local people resources with employers struggling to recruit retail and or leisure type roles, these jobs are generally lower paid and with no onsite accommodation the development will either increase current issues for employers in	Туре	neighbour
		with the local plan, my objections include but are not limited to the points below: 1. This is the wrong development in the wrong place, it would be better sited on brown field land with appropriate sustainable local resources, the planned site is green field on the edge of a village with already overloaded minor rat run roadways and continuous traffic issues even before the other planning activities such as BSA and the Gateway Warehouse on Howes Lane add further stress. Adding on the further traffic stresses of this developments scale as stated in their proposal is unacceptable. No one who has any knowledge of the reality of the local traffic issues already in place could claim this impact will be minimal. These traffic issues are subject to continuous attempts at revision to relieve the issues with little success seen so far in improving the traffic e.g. j9, j10, A41 into Bicester. Roads are already in poor state of repair due to excessive and heavy traffic movement. 2. You have a stated strategy of reducing car usage, this scheme will increase car movements as follows; current users of the 18 hole golf course travelling further distances to find a suitable alternative; 900 parking spaces on site - the identified need for provision of guests cars with short stays of just over 2 days meaning frequent turnover and the additional employee traffic having to travel in every day due to a lack local accommodation. 3. The site is greenfield with diverse wildlife on site proving a green area of relief from all the expansion seen already in the village and around Bicester, replacing this with 500k sq ft of tarmac and buildings is not a sustainable replacement. The proposal with take two years to develop how much wildlife will survive that length of disruption? 4. The area lacks sustainable local people resources with employers struggling to recruit retail and or leisure type roles, these jobs are generally lower paid and with no onsite accommodation the development will lotthe local economy is doubtful as the resort is

Attachments