From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A
Date: 16 September 2026 23:06:23

[redacted]

Dear Crown Casework Team,

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the Urgent Crown Development application for MOD Bicester (Site A), reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843. My objection is based strictly on material planning considerations. I am a neighbouring resident of [redacted] and this development would directly affect my family and community.

1. Transport and Highway Impact The proposal would introduce up to 1,256 residents on a site accessed primarily by rural roads with no pedestrian walkways along the B4011 and Palmer ave which already experiences serious collision history within the site area. No adequate transport assessment has been provided to demonstrate that local roads, junctions, or public transport can safely and sustainably accommodate the increased pedestrian demand. The application lacks modelling of peak-hour flows, cumulative impacts, and mitigation measures.

2. Impact on Nearby Communities The scale and nature of the development would significantly alter the character of nearby villages, including Piddington and Upper Arncott. The application does not sufficiently assess noise, lighting, amenity impacts, or how the development will be integrated without harming the wellbeing of existing residents.

3. Pressure on Local Services and Infrastructure The application does not provide sufficient evidence that essential services—healthcare, policing, waste services, and community support—can meet the needs of a large, concentrated population. Cherwell District Council has already highlighted gaps in information regarding local service capacity and required mitigation. The proposal risks overwhelming existing provision in Arncott, Ambrosden, Piddington, and Bicester.

4. Environmental, Drainage, and Wastewater Concerns The proposal includes new modular accommodation, demolition works, and a wastewater treatment plant. However, the Drainage Design Statement is partially redacted, preventing public scrutiny of foul drainage capacity, flood risk, environmental impact, and wastewater treatment arrangements. The Utilities Assessment confirms that no existing wastewater treatment works are present and that upgrades or new on-site treatment are likely required, yet no complete assessment has been provided. Insufficient Drainage Information Due to Redaction Key sections of the Drainage Design Statement are blacked out due to MOD security redactions. This prevents the public from understanding foul water treatment capacity, surface water management, flood risk, environmental impacts, and odour and discharge risks. A planning authority cannot rely on a drainage strategy that is incomplete, partially withheld, and not publicly reviewable.

5. Clean Water & Mains Water Capacity The Utilities & Infrastructure Assessment identifies existing potable water infrastructure on the site but provides no evidence that it can support a concentrated development of over 1,200 residents. The assessment itself states:

"Site inspection suggests that the site network is of limited capacity relative to any concentrated development"

This is a critical material planning issue. The application does not include modelling of peak clean water demand, confirmation from Thames Water regarding supply capacity, assessment of required upgrades, or evaluation of impacts on nearby villages already experiencing supply pressure. Without a full mains-water capacity assessment, the planning authority cannot determine whether the development can be safely and sustainably supplied, this is a critical welfare issue.

6. Energy & Emissions Impact The Utilities & Infrastructure Assessment identifies an estimated maximum electrical demand of approximately 2.16 MVA for the proposed development. The application provides no evidence that the local electrical network can support this load, nor does it include a confirmed connection agreement with the Distribution Network Operator. The applicant states that temporary power solutions may be required, but does not assess their environmental or amenity impacts.

Supplying 2.16 MVA would require either a single ~2000 kVA industrial diesel generator or multiple generators in parallel. Generators of this scale typically consume around 400 litres of diesel per hour, equating to 9,600 litres per day, 3.5 million litres per year, and over 9,000 tonnes of CO_2 annually. Over the proposed 10-year operational period, temporary generation would therefore produce more than 90,000 tonnes of CO_2, this will have a high negative impact on the UK governments NDC target to reduce all greenhouse gas emissions by 81% by 2035.

The application includes no air-quality assessment, carbon impact assessment, noise modelling, fuel storage risk assessment, or evaluation of impacts on nearby communities. These omissions are significant and material to the planning decision.

7. Site Safety, Security, and Management Arrangements The proposal raises unresolved questions about site security, emergency access, and operational management. Cherwell District Council has stated that these issues remain unclear and require further detail before any decision can be made.

8. Insufficient Consultation Period The consultation window is extremely short, limiting the ability of residents and stakeholders to review extensive technical documents. This undermines meaningful public participation in the planning process.

Given the substantial gaps in evidence, redacted documentation, unassessed environmental impacts, and unresolved infrastructure concerns, I respectfully request that the Secretary of State does not approve the application unless and until full assessments, mitigation strategies, and complete, publicly accessible evidence are provided.

Please confirm receipt of this objection.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]