From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework; greg.smith.mp@parliament.uk; Calum MILLER; [redacted]
Subject: OBJECTION: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.
Date: 16 September 2026 22:25:09

OBJECTION: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.
Objection submitted 16/9/26.

To whom it may concern;

I am writing to lodge my objection to the planning application posted in reference to the change of use and development of Site A, MOD Bicester, for Home Office accommodation for up to 1,256 single adult men.

I hold a number of concerns for the acquisition and use of the site going forward, and also a number of concerns regarding the application posted.

Firstly, I would like to raise my concern with the use of the 'urgent Crown Development' process. For a long term project, that has evidently been in the works for some time, an explanation of the requirement to use this process - as opposed to any standard and consultatory means of application - should be addressed. The decision to bypass all local consultation, governing bodies, relevant organisations and national concerns is both irresponsible and unreasonable, and it should be important to allow the people to understand how this decision has been reached.

As the [redacted] itself, a short distance from proposed site, I have a number of concerns regarding road safety.
Currently, the road experiences a heavy volume of traffic. The junction from the A41 often struggles to handle the traffic safely. No consideration for the management of additional traffic has been published.
An increased influx of traffic on the B4011 will, of course, impact our safety when entering and leaving the property. As the manager of an equestrian yard on the property, I rely upon this road regularly for riding and training horses - needless to say, a heavy increase in road and pedestrian traffic will impact my safety greatly.
I am also hugely concerned for the safety of the potential service users with pedestrian access to the B4011. There are no provisions made for this road to accommodate pedestrians. Where a footway exists at all, it is roughly one metre wide; the Department for Transport's own inclusive design guidance, which the Transport Assessment says it has followed, recommends a minimum of two metres. There are no streetlights, the verges are not regularly maintained and often overgrown, and the road follows a series of blind bends that make it very difficult - in places, impossible - for a driver to predict or assess pedestrian movements in daylight or in the dark. The report pertains to a significant number of road traffic accidents and collisions, including fatalities, but indicates no measures being taken to mitigate this added risk.
As the owner of a small farm that contains a footpath and bridle path that would be likely routes from the B4011 for the aforementioned potential users, it is inevitable that the increased pedestrian traffic will greatly increase the likelihood of wear and tear and damage to the land and associated gates and fencing, as well as potential trauma to the horses - some in active rehabilitation - who are not accustomed to a high level of traffic or noise along the footpaths. I ask that no decision be made until a thorough and detailed assessment has confirmed, in writing, that the B4011 and associated routes can be used safely for both local residents and the proposed service users, and that provisions can be made to support landowners with the upkeep and management of access routes within private property.

Another matter that cannot be ignored; the rich and diverse ecology, sited within and immediately surrounding the site. The report shows incomplete and missing surveys - ecological consultants are cited stating that the ecological surveys cannot be considered comprehensive assessments, and species surveys remain outstanding. Local experience shows a number of nationally and internationally protected species, including some species known to be endangered and/or protected by European Habitats Directive or the Wildlife & Countryside Act. With no surveys detailing the impact that this development could have on the protected species on site and nearby - known and suspected to include various species of plant, bat, rodent, newt, bird and other mammals - how can the application accurately detail the risks and mitigation? This application shows no merit to be made exempt from nationally and internationally binding agreements to protect and preserve the ecology and biodiversity. I ask that no decision be made until it can be guaranteed that all of the needs of the ecology and habitats have been met, preserved and protected.

In the interests of providing and maintaining adequate welfare provisions for the local residents and the potential service users, it is important to query why no site-specific capacity assessments appear to have been agreed with the NHS Integrated Care Board, Thames Valley Police, Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service, South Central Ambulance Service, or the county council as highway and flood authority? As an area that has very little access to local policing - 2 PCSOs assigned to oversee 42 Oxfordshire villages, and a very steady response time when making emergency calls (from personal experience), it would be important to understand what solutions can be raised to provide adequate cover for an additional 1256 potential service users, plus associated staff or site visitors. This also applies to the already extremely strained health and ambulance services, including emergency responses and treatment, and very small local fire and rescue services.
Little to no detail is given in the report, which is entirely inadequate when considering adding a very large development where 1256 service users are close to four times the entire recorded population of Piddington itself (304 residents), and close to the combined population of Piddington, Upper and Lower Arncott and Blackthorn together - not including the associated staff and services also attending daily.
I would urge that detailed plans are required to manage the increase in need for all of these provisions before any plan can be approved.

In this objection, I discuss only a few of the reasons why this planning application is entirely inappropriate. Littered with inaccuracies, inconsistencies, missing and omitted information - how can this be substantial to even understand the plans proposed, let alone be considered a complete and valid planning application?
This MUST be explored, dissected, and correct and complete information provided before a decision can even be considered.



