

As a resident of Lower Heyford I am writing to express my views on this shocking planning application in advance of the planning committee tomorrow.

Even as a layman it is clear to me that the supporting Environment Assessment is a highly subjective document and one that cannot be relied upon to provide a true picture. Its reports have been commissioned by the developer so it is only natural that it will try to present a positive case for development.

The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping report says the EIA regulations require consideration of the effects of a scheme on climate change. However it goes on to say that "*the Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the operational phase of the proposed development will be reduced. **Therefore the contribution to climate change (in relation to greenhouse gas emissions) will not be considered further in the ES***"

The obvious reaction to this statement is why not? The council have recently announced a state of climate emergency and the government have pledged to zero emissions by 2050. Surely now more than ever, major planning applications such as this one should have their environmental impact in relation to climate change considered as the regulations already suggest?

The ES contains a mass of in-depth technical analysis on how the development can be constructed and operated to higher environmental standards. This makes it all the more extraordinary why the overall impact of this development is not considered. It also appears that the chapter on 'Sustainability, Energy and Waste' has been scoped out of the Environmental Statement'. Why?

I seriously question the claim that this development will produce environmental and ecological net gains. The development will use 400,000 litres of water per day in an area of water stress. What about the significant energy requirement of a hotel with 500 bedrooms? And what about the carbon emissions from an estimated 2,761 vehicles each day of the weekend and 1,977 each weekday from a radius of 150 miles?

Because the resort is out of town, almost half a kilometre of natural verge will be destroyed and covered in tarmac to provide a cycle lane for this resort. This is presented as an 'improvement' despite the fact that it will be of no use to visitors who will be families with luggage and young children and unable to cycle there. It is interesting to note that a number of Chesterton's neighbouring parishes within the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan are in the process of restoring verges with native wildflowers and natural habitat for invertebrates/small mammals as part of their Community Action Plan.

Construction alone will take two years and involve a staggering 31,000 vehicle trips. Earth will be removed to a depth of 2 metres from the entire site - an area of 25,408 square metres. This will not only destroy habitat but will mean that 3,388 lorries will potentially be needed just to remove this material off site before any foundations are laid. Just think about this number and imagine each lorry thundering through a village and how that might affect roadside buildings

and the health/quality of life for those who live there? These vehicles are planned to route through villages.

It is also true that construction vehicles ignore routing agreements. My village, Lower Heyford, lies on the Bicester to Enstone road and our data shows that two thirds of our traffic comes from Middleton Stoney. This does not sit comfortably with the TA's assertion that out of a forecast 1,977 vehicle trips per weekday and 2,761 at weekends, not one will come from the west?! We have many lorries through our village from Bicester construction projects despite the fact that they are subject to routing agreements.

When it becomes operational, the Traffic Assessment estimates that 30% of the total traffic volume will pass through the Middleton Stoney junction. Why does the TA only quote peak hour traffic numbers of 34 and 46? The fact is that, by the TA's own forecast figures, it can be calculated that an extra 800 vehicles will pass through this junction each day of the weekend.

Furthermore, the TA only analyses vehicle numbers in terms of their impact on other road users - not on surrounding villages and on the health/quality of life for local communities. Why not? Eleven neighbouring parishes have objected on this basis. Please will decision makers recognise that this is important?

The design of the building is ugly and in architectural plan looks like a prison. Whilst it may be acceptable on the outskirts of a US town it is overbearing and alien to this part of the North Oxfordshire countryside.

There is so much more ...but I will refrain in the hope you will read this.

Yours sincerely,

Emily Daly