[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 14:36
To: [redacted] Crown Casework; planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: OBJECTION – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Site A, MOD Bicester

[redacted]

[redacted]

Subject: Objection – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Site A, MOD Bicester

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to this application. My objection concerns the planning merits, scale of the development and adequacy of the evidence submitted.

I am particularly concerned that permission is being sought for accommodation for 1,256 people while significant planning matters remain unresolved or incompletely assessed.

The application appears to lack important detailed plans, including a full site layout, elevations, lighting, boundary/security fencing and drainage. Significant matters are proposed to be dealt with after permission, including contamination, long-term power supply and foul and surface-water drainage.

There are also substantial concerns about the supporting assessments. The ecological assessment states that it is not comprehensive, with protected-species surveys outstanding. The transport evidence contains no traffic count, collision search or safety assessment for Widnell Lane, and some baseline traffic data has been taken from a road in Essex rather than the local network.

Drainage, sewage capacity, flood risk, electricity capacity, contamination and unexploded ordnance also remain subject to significant uncertainty. These are fundamental planning and safety considerations for a development of this size and should, in my view, be properly established before permission is granted rather than left to be resolved afterwards.

I am also concerned that a previous, smaller proposal for 750 people at this location was found unsustainable following a public inquiry, including concerns about pedestrian safety and local services. The present proposal is substantially larger.

I therefore do not believe sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this development complies with relevant planning policy or can be accommodated safely and sustainably, and I ask that permission be refused.

I am also concerned about the scale of the proposal in relation to the surrounding rural communities and local services. Accommodating 1,256 people represents a very substantial increase in the population using local infrastructure and services, yet there appear to be no agreed site-specific capacity assessments from the NHS, police, fire and rescue, ambulance service or county council. I do not believe a development of this scale should be approved without clear evidence that GP and healthcare provision, emergency services and other local infrastructure have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand.

Yours faithfully,

Alison Schofield

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

13 September 2026