Comment for planning application 19/02550/F

Application Number	19/02550/F	
Location	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 Whitehead	
Organisation		
Name	Megan Davies	
Address	28 Fortescue Drive, Chesterton, Bicester, OX26 1UT	
Type of Comment	Objection	
Туре	neighbour	
Comments	28 Fortescue Drive,Chesterton,Bicester,OX26 1UT Objection	

seeking employment. It may result in employees travelling from further afield, by car as the site is not served by public transport, in order to work at the resort. This again will be contrary to the Cherwell strategy of reducing car usage. The design of the resort is completely out of keeping with the local area. Having already accommodated a substantial development in the Bicester Hotel and spa other developments in this area should be small scale, detached buildings at low height enhancing the character of the local area as outlined in the Cherwell Council's Countryside design summary 2008. The low rise design to make it less visible means that the buildings and car park will create a substantial footprint in a rural location. The site will sit right next to the M40 motorway and is totally unsuitable for a public outdoor spaces accommodating two thousand visitors a day due to already existing poor air guality and noise pollution to which the development will add even more. This planning application is a purely speculative application in the wrong location and with a potential two thousand visitors a day will have a significant negative impact on the local area as outlined above. Great Wolf should have worked with Cherwell through the correct local plan process in order to locate a suitable site for this development. This development is not wanted by local village residents or the local Bicester population. It will only have a negative impact in the area and on this basis I believe this application should be refused.

Received Date 23/12/2019 19:23:43

Attachments