

12 Bunyan Road
Kings Meadow
Bicester
Oxon
OX26 2YB

18 Oct 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND S106 OBLIGATIONS

Reference A. Planning Application 19/02550/F
B. Planning Obligations 21/03164/OBL

As you will know, at Ref A Great Wolf Resorts (GWR) made a full application to build a Water Park on the Golf Course at Chesterton. That application was refused but was later allowed at appeal.

The appeal had a number of caveats and Sec 106 obligations. As I understand it building of the said Water Park can not begin until all of the Sec 106 obligations have been discharged by CDC in accordance with the signed agreement.

Recently a request for discharge, of the Golf Element only, was made by GWR at Ref B. However the supporting documents have failed to address a number of vital details needed for this request to be considered. You of course may already be aware of that which I detail below.

1. In particular they fail to properly address the matters of Health and Safety regarding the crossover points of golfers on the proposed new golf course layout. They do not provide any plan for the holes 10 to 18 where conflict when playing different circuits occurs. The only course plan provided is for holes 1 to 6. It seems their plan has not been submitted to Golf England for over-site and approval, yet the designer say it's an improved golfing facility. This is insufficient information for discharge to proceed.
2. They do not specify precisely which trees are to be removed and how, where and when these will be replaced. This is a specific element of the Sec 106 obligations.
3. They say new lakes are to be made but there is no information as to from where the water will come, and that any potential water extraction is acceptable to Thames Water.
4. They say the new golf course will use a Starter to ensure players safety and security but there is no provision for a starters to be located on holes 1 and 10. Players starting a circuit at 1st and 10th tee must be monitored closely from these holes or it cannot be considered safe.
5. The practice area of 12 separate bays was to have one bay with a Laser Ball Tracking device (Track-Man or similar) but there is nothing on the discharge plans to confirm this obligation will be met.

6. The proposed action plan to develop the new golf course says work is to begin on 1 Dec 21 but the obligations have a target decision date by CDC of 14 Dec 21. The Sec 106 says nothing should begin until CDC agrees to discharge all obligation, is this correct?

There are other obligations to be met within the Sec 106 agreement such as roads and footpaths, employment plans etc, but other than the Golf matters nothing else has yet been requested for discharge and no documentation has been submitted for CDC perusal.

Surely this is a matter whereby nothing can be discharged until all items within the Sec 106 obligations agreement have been addressed and can be discharged as one undertaking. If it is allowed to proceed piecemeal some matters may not be completed, or be deliberately overlooked, by the developer. This is the last and only opportunity to ensure that the Sec 106 obligations are met.

Unless and until the above, and perhaps other points, are addressed by the developer the discharge of obligations must be withheld.

I would appreciate your confirmation that the points I raise will be considered and evaluated before any obligations are discharged.

Yours faithfully

Bernard Smith