

# Comment for planning application 21/02467/F

<b>Application Number</b>	21/02467/F
<b>Location</b>	OS Parcel 0005 And Part OS Parcel 1300 0878 And 7566 Banbury
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of mixed-use development including a 240-bed hotel, 4-storey office building and roadside services including 2 no hot food restaurant drive-throughs, a coffee shop drive-through and a petrol filling station with ancillary retail store
<b>Case Officer</b>	Bernadette Owens
<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Rona Murray
<b>Address</b>	22 Thornhill,Chacombe
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I vehemently object to this 21/02467/F on many levels. It is bad enough having two huge warehouses blighting the landscape, but the further development would be catastrophic. a) Petrol station the previous objections remain the same - with two motorway services with less than 28 miles between them, as well as several petrol stations less than a mile from the junction (one of which belongs to the applicant!), another petrol station is totally unnecessary. Mentioning EV charging points at least 10 times in the application was perhaps a little excessive. Adding retail outlets will only compete with those in Banbury town and is unlikely to be of benefit to local communities. b) Office block I fail to see the necessity of a 4-storey office block at a time when working habits are changing to allow for more remote working, so the number of jobs created is misleading. There are also plenty of empty buildings in Banbury town itself which could be used as offices. c) Fast-food/coffee outlets with an over-abundance of these already in place in Banbury town, these are totally unnecessary. I also don't believe the numbers of job vacancies is correct unless these outlets are particularly large - one allegedly creating 40 full-time jobs, one 30 and the coffee outlet creating 13 jobs. In addition, I imagine this will also create a large volume of litter around the immediately countryside. d) Hotel - this is an even worse idea! With one large hotel directly across the junction, and a new one just opening in the town centre (as well as other hotels in the town) there is no need. And I note that, with 240 beds, this hotel would be even larger than either of the two Premier Inn hotels already in Banbury. e) The comment "no single element seeks to rival existing provisions within Banbury" is completely false. This hotel would certainly not benefit Banbury, as visitors would most likely be travellers just breaking their journey, and continue on their way without visiting Banbury. Visitors to Banbury would surely prefer to stay in Banbury. Nor would it bring in businesses but, as stated in the application, it is intended for "people who are travelling to Bicester Village"! There is already an hotel on the way in to Bicester, and why would people want to stay over 15 miles from the Village? If they did, they would still travel by car to get there! Surely we want to benefit Banbury, not Bicester! And the comments regarding "existing budget hotels" is extremely condescending. There are several inconsistencies within the application, in that it talks about "the exceptionally good transport services" and a park &amp; ride, neither of which actually exist. The local bus services passing this development run one per hour during daytime Monday to Saturday, and not at all on Sundays. In addition, it talks about "a large amount of trade from passing motorists", and then contradicts that by "seeking to reduce the need to travel by personal vehicle". The comment about "the visibility being obscured by the large commercial warehouse buildings" makes no mention of the fact that it is actually the Applicant who is building these warehouses and would obviously ignore the effects on the surrounding countryside. Does the phrase "existing development has already established the precedent of development within the open countryside" imply further development nearby? And how patronising to say that "the scale proposed will have a lesser relative effect"! Relative to what or who? As for the development not being in the flood plain, then why have we had to have a Flood Relief System installed, and had the A361 raised to prevent flooding! All in all, this development is detrimental to the good of Banbury, and to the local countryside. It will also bring even more traffic to the area, and cause huge problems to the local communities.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	20/08/2021 21:37:55
<b>Attachments</b>	