

N Mentipty
18 Nicholas Mead
Great Linford
Milton Keynes
Bucks
MK145EN
31/12/19

Development Manager
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
OX15 4AA

Ref Great Lakes UK Ltd Application Ref 19/02550/F

Dear Ms Whitehead

I am writing as a regular visitor to Chesterton and its golf club. I believe that the development is wholly inappropriate for this location and will have a huge detrimental effect to the community. Having read the reports I would like to make the following observations:

The site in question is currently the back 9 holes of the Bicester Golf Club which is greenfield land covering 18.6 Hectares that includes a variety of differences species of trees, diverse ecological habitats and lakes.

The site has no planning designation and is located in the countryside. There is a presumption against development in the countryside under Policy ESD13 in the Cherwell District Council Local Plan amongst many other policies. The site has never been promoted for development through the Local Plan process and selection of such a sensitive site in the Oxfordshire countryside for such a large-scale urbanizing development is unacceptable.

The proposed development is only 500m at its nearest point from the existing Chesterton Conservation Area. The urbanization of a green field site within 500m of a conservation area is not acceptable.

The report is correct in that there were an estimated 255 unemployed people in Cherwell in December 2017. However, the dataset contains data for all following months up to June 2019. The figures Contribution to Local Leisure Offering It is still very unclear as to the local offering of leisure facilities to residents of the area. Great Wolf in a presentation to CDC on the 5th February 2019 used Center Parcs as a comparison to their offering and in the context of 'Requires Hotel Stay to Enjoy Resort Offerings' denoted it as similar. Center Parcs ONLY allow day visitors to purchase a pass if they are visiting guests staying at the resort.

The lack of clarity also has an impact on the local traffic if, in fact, they do allow day visitors from the local area. I believe that a statement should be made by Great Wolf indicating exactly what their offering is so a proper assessment of the benefits and impacts can be made.

The reduction of any golf course from 18 holes to 9 should not be underestimated in its impact as most members will only play 18 holes. There are currently 250 members at the club and 200 of those members have indicated that they would leave to play at another course should the 9 holes be lost. This therefore presents further concern that with only 50 members this would not likely be sufficient to support the cost of maintaining the remaining 9 holes and that would result in closure of the course, entirely with the possibility of further urbanization development taking place. I can only view this as a long term, total loss of a picturesque 18-hole golf course and not a reduction as stated.

This statement clearly states that 'Best Endeavors' will be made to ensure the data is accurate and up to date. This NOMIS database used to gather the data referenced is accurate and up to date. However, the selection of December 2017 was clearly not the most appropriate use of the data available when the latest data would be the most appropriate.

With an estimated 500,000 visitors to this development per year and given the current traffic situation in the local area and that of the committed developments I struggle to see how the sensitivity can be set to medium for cars and believe this should be set to High.

Given the already concerning consideration above it is difficult to see how the effect on cyclists can be any different to that of cars. The statement that cyclist will use 'quieter back roads' demonstrates the lack of understanding of existing village road network and its use. The sensitivity should, at a minimum,

The documents submitted by the applicant are very detailed covering numerous technical areas which CDC/OCC's relevant technical departments will need to review and comment upon. The submission of an EIA is wholly appropriate for a large scale, unsustainable development such as this.

The site in question has never been developed upon and contributes to both the local landscape and provides a valuable local amenity use as a golf course. The proposal will create a significant urbanization of the site and impact on the local area which is irreversible and will only enable further urbanization of this area in the future. As such, the environmental impact of this proposal must be robustly analyzed by CDC to demonstrate the irrecoverable harm this proposal will have on this site and surrounding area which completely outweighs the questionable benefits the applicant suggests the proposal will bring.

This proposal should be dismissed by the planning committee. It is ill conceived plan with a complete disregard for planning regulations and it lacks joined-up thinking and is littered with misleading and nonsensical statistics. It is an attempt to exploit a community based on the desire to make profit.