

Comment for planning application 19/02550/F

Application Number	<input type="text" value="19/02550/F"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Land to the east of M40 and south of A4095 Chesterton Bicester Oxon"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="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	<input type="text" value="Clare Whitehead"/>
Organisation	<input type="text"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Adina Pestritu"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="8 Jaspers Row, Ambrosden, Bicester, OX25 2AT"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="See attached"/>
Received Date	<input type="text" value="08/01/2020 20:32:04"/>
Attachments	<p>The following files have been uploaded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">scanned-81245208-2020-01-06_17-03-56-986.pdf

8 Jaspers Row
Ambrosden
Bicester
Ox25 2at

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

Date 5th January 2020

Dear Clare Whitehead,

Objection to Planning Application Ref: 19/02550/F – Proposed Water Park by Great Wolf

I wish to object to the above mentioned planning application. I currently live in Ambrosden in Cherwell District and have witnessed the impact the significant developments delivered in Bicester (Kingsmere, the Eco town, Bicester Village and Tesco etc) has had on the associated infrastructure, in particular the highway network.

I am concerned that this significant development is purely speculative from the developer and for such a impactful development, the applicant should have made representations to Cherwell District Council through the local plan process to be allocated a site – this should have made much more sense rather than just submitting a planning application that hasn't been fully thought through.

It appears to me that there are significant negatives relating to this proposal (unsustainable, impact on highway, loss of open space, impact on landscape, loss of golf course) and negligible positives (perceived economic benefit which will mostly go to Great Wolf) so on this basis I think the application should be refused and Great Wolf should seek an alternative and more sustainable and appropriate site for this development.

In addition to the above, my objection is on the following grounds:-

1. Unsustainable form of development

This is a significant development that will attract high levels of visitors every day and Cherwell District Council's (CDC) Policy SLE3 states that such developments should be located in highly sustainable locations adjacent to a multitude of transport modes to reduce the reliance on car usage. Policy ESD1 also seeks to distribute new developments to sustainable locations to tackle Cherwell's commitment to climate change. The site is on the edge of Chesterton village in an inherently unsustainable location with low accessibility to public transport and the scheme provides for 900 car parking spaces (therefore promoting car usage) and is therefore contrary to Policy SLE3 and ESD1.

The site is currently greenfield, open space and policy BSC10 seeks to ensure there is sufficient quantity and quality of open space, sport and recreation provision by protecting and enhancing existing provision. The planning system should be supporting the redevelopment of previously developed, brownfield sites, or allocated sites in sustainable locations adjacent to public transport modes, not on a greenfield site that will irreversibly remove valuable open space. This is totally the wrong location for such a proposal and whatever gestures or promises the applicant provides for in terms of improved access, bus services or cycle routes, the site is in an inherently unsustainable location and not appropriate for such a development.

2. Landscape Impact and Design

The proposed scheme is not in-keeping with the local area which is characterised by 2/3 storey buildings which are detached and in clusters. The Countryside Design Summary (2008) published by CDC provides guidance for developments in locations such as this and supports developments of small scale, low height and detached. Also saved Policy T5 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 states that new

hotels in rural locations will only be approved where they would largely be accommodated in existing buildings of totally replace an existing commercial operation.

Policy ESD13 states that successful design should contribute to an area's character representing the traditional form, scale and massing of buildings. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The development consists of a large bulk of 500,000 sq.ft of built form and mass and at a significantly greater height than any of the other buildings in the vicinity of the site and this is all to be delivered on what is currently greenfield site with no buildings on it. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Countryside Design Summary, saved Policy T5, ESD13 and paragraph 170 of the NPPF.

3. Traffic

Policy ESD1 supports new developments that reduce the need to travel by car and Policy SLE4 states that new developments should facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. CDC's 1996 saved Policy TR7 states that developments that will attract a large number of vehicles onto minor roads will not normally be permitted.

The existing road infrastructure cannot cope with the projected extra 1000 – 1,500 daily car movements. Chesterton is already a 'rat-run' and experiences major congestion as an escape route during the many traffic issues on the M40 and A34. The applicant is seeking to re-route traffic down the A34 particularly and doesn't appear to appreciate the issues that we already encounter on the A34. The slip road at Weston on the Green is notorious for accidents due to the short length of the slip road. Great Wolf is directing traffic to use this slip road so will exacerbate the already significant issues. There is no reference or consideration for this aspect in the Applicant's Transport Assessment.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SLE4 and saved policy TR7.

The proposal is not in accordance with the development plan and represents an unsustainable form of development delivering 500,000 sq.ft of built form on a greenfield site whilst also putting significant pressure on the existing road network. It is totally the wrong location for such a significant development and as such this planning application should be refused.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Adina Pestritu.

Adina Pestritu