From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Ref: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 14:59:10

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I object to the planning application for Site A, MOD Bicester, for the following reasons:

1. A biodiversity net gain statement and metric which is required by statute is **absent.**
2. A lighting assessment for this application which has external lighting is **absent.**
3. Contaminated land assessment is provided in **part only.** No soil, ground water or ground gas sample has been taken on a former ordnance depot.
4. Noise impact assessment is provided in **part only**. There is no assessment of the generators or sewage plant.
5. Air quality assessment is provided in **part only**. There is no point-source combustion assessment.
6. Odour impact assessment is **absent**. This in spite of the proposal to put bedrooms 45 metres from the sewage works.
7. Energy statement, BREEAM, CHP/district heating and renewables feasibility is **absent.**
8. Flood evacuation and emergency response plan is **absent.**
9. Tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment is **absent.**
10. Parking and servicing details including a servicing schedule is available in **part only.**
11. Legible drawings, elevations, floor plans, sections, layouts is available in **part only.**
12. Waste management strategy is **absent.**

Furthermore, only one ecological survey was carried out between 26 March and 10 April 2026 with restricted access and outside the optimal window. Surveys relating to bats, badgers, great crested newts and others (a total of 9) are **absent.**

A planning application which contradicts itself, has numerous redacted core components and the absence of so much required information would be rejected by any local authority. Surely, the government will not want to be less efficient than the country's local authorities?

A site of 1,256 people needs power, heat, water and a way to get rid of sewage. Most towns connect to the mains. This site proposes to make its own electricity, treat its own sewage, and, in the meantime, tanker the waste away by lorry.

Regarding power, there is no gas supply and none is proposed. All heating, hot water and cooking is electrical. Peak demand is estimated at ~2.16 MVA. The existing network 'cannot be relied upon' according to the applicant, so generator compounds are built in Phase 1 and again in Phase 2. Diesel generation in open countryside will take place for a

minimum of ten years. There is no air-quality dispersion modelling of the generators. There is no noise model of the generators. No fuel storage, bunding or spill containment is described, on ground over a Secondary A aquifer inside a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone.

Regarding sewage, a new on-site wastewater treatment works of 3,105 sqm plus a 359 sqm pumping station, discharging treated effluent to a watercourse, is proposed. In Phase 1, an interim cesspool with the waste tankered away by lorry. No outfall identified. No environmental permit applied for. The three outfall options are redacted in full. The interim tankering is conceded to be 'not a viable option' at full capacity, and the resulting lorry movements are not assessed in the Transport Assessment. The sewage works sits about 100 metres from Phase 1 receptors, and in later phases the residential and welfare units are intended to be about 45 metres from it. The applicant's own standard odour boundary for such works is about 250 metres. Sleeping accommodation is proposed at 45 metres. An existing community sports ground, Launton FC, sits about 130 metres away. No odour impact assessment has been carried out.

Regarding waste, general and recyclable waste are to be separated on site; no recycling is to be carried out on site. No waste management strategy has been submitted. No assessment of the volume or disposal route of municipal, food or clinical waste from a facility feeding 1,256 people three meals a day and running a medical centre. Neither waste authority has been consulted.

Reading through this application, it is clear time and again, that this is a totally wrong site which lacks the necessary infrastructure for a development of this size.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]