From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 11:09:44

[redacted]

Dear Crown Casework Team,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at Site A under reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

My objection is based on material planning considerations relating specifically to the suitability of this site, the scale of the proposed development, highway and pedestrian safety, drainage and utilities, ecology, infrastructure and the amount of important information that appears still to be unresolved.

I am particularly concerned that approval is being sought for a development accommodating up to 1,256 people for a period of ten years, while significant matters appear either undetermined or dependent upon future investigation.

Highways and pedestrian safety

The site is in a rural location with no adequate pedestrian infrastructure serving it. The submitted documents themselves appear to acknowledge that walking to nearby bus stops would not be a realistic option.

I am therefore extremely concerned about the safety of people who may nevertheless leave the site on foot.

Measures such as shuttle buses and providing high-visibility clothing do not, in my view, adequately address the underlying highway safety problem.

If the proposed off-site works provide no new continuous footway, suitable pedestrian crossings or lighting, I do not believe it has been demonstrated that the development can operate safely for pedestrians or other road users.

For a development of this size and duration, safe access should be an integral part of the

proposal rather than something dependent upon people choosing not to walk.

Drainage and flooding

I am concerned that important details relating to drainage infrastructure remain unresolved, including the precise location of some infrastructure.

For a development accommodating more than a thousand people, the planning authority and Secretary of State should have clear evidence that foul and surface-water drainage arrangements are deliverable, appropriately located and capable of operating safely before permission is granted.

These matters could have consequences beyond the boundary of the site, including for neighbouring land and surrounding communities.

Utilities and infrastructure capacity

The submitted information appears to indicate that existing utility capacity is still to be determined.

That is a fundamental issue.

A development of this scale will create substantial demand for water, electricity, sewage treatment and other essential services. I do not believe such significant questions should simply be left to be resolved after planning approval.

There should be clear evidence that the necessary capacity exists, or that appropriate upgrades are deliverable, before a decision is made.

Ecology and biodiversity

I am also concerned that ecological work remains outstanding, including surveys relating to protected or important species such as bats, breeding birds, reptiles, dormice and great crested newts.

The purpose of ecological surveys is to establish what species and habitats are present so that the impact of a development can be properly understood.

If these surveys are incomplete, I question how the full ecological consequences of the proposal can currently be assessed or how appropriate mitigation can confidently be determined.

This is particularly important given the rural setting and the scale and proposed duration of the development.

Scale and location

The proposal is not a small or short-term use. Accommodation for up to 1,256 people for ten years represents a substantial development.

The suitability of the location therefore needs to be assessed against the infrastructure actually available around the site.

The absence of pedestrian infrastructure, dependence on shuttle transport, unresolved utility questions and incomplete environmental information all raise concerns about whether this rural location is capable of safely and sustainably supporting development at this scale.

Insufficient information at the point of determination

My overriding concern is that too many fundamental matters appear to remain unanswered.

I appreciate that planning permissions routinely contain conditions dealing with detailed matters. However, there is an important distinction between matters of detail and fundamental questions affecting whether a development is safe, sustainable and acceptable in principle.

In my view, questions concerning safe pedestrian access, utility capacity, drainage and

ecological impact go directly to the suitability of the site.

I therefore respectfully ask the Secretary of State to consider whether sufficient evidence has actually been provided to make a properly informed decision.

Given the scale of the proposal, its ten-year duration and its potential consequences for the surrounding area, I do not believe permission should be granted while such significant matters remain unresolved.

I therefore ask that the application be refused, or at the very least not determined positively until the outstanding evidence and surveys have been completed and their implications fully assessed.

I would be grateful if this email could be recorded as my formal representation in relation to:

Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]