From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 16 September 2026 22:03:46

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a resident of [redacted] to formally object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A.

I have reviewed a significant amount of the technical information submitted with the application. My objection is not based on the proposed residents themselves. It is based on whether the application has actually demonstrated that this site can safely and adequately support a development of this scale for the proposed ten year period.

There are several areas where I believe the information submitted is either incomplete, inconsistent or requires further clarification before a properly informed planning decision can be made.

1. Transport assessment and highway information

The Transport Assessment contains repeated references to the B1104, despite the site being accessed from the B4011.

The correct identification of the surrounding highway network is fundamental to any assessment of access, traffic movements and highway safety. This raises a reasonable question as to whether the assessment has consistently considered the actual road network serving the site.

The B4011 also has limited pedestrian infrastructure and no dedicated cycle provision along the relevant section, despite the road having a 60mph speed limit. There is a history of injury collisions in the surrounding area.

The assessment should therefore properly consider how people will safely travel between the site and surrounding settlements and services. It should not rely solely on an assumption that the proposed shuttle transport arrangements will remove the need for people to use the surrounding highway network.

2. Ground conditions and contamination

The site has a history which gives rise to potential land quality and contamination concerns.

Previous investigations identified potential contamination issues, but the current submission does not appear to be supported by the level of ground investigation necessary to properly establish the condition of the site, including the outstanding borehole investigation.

This is proposed accommodation for up to 1,256 people over a ten year period. I do not consider it appropriate for fundamental questions about ground conditions and contamination to remain unresolved and simply be dealt with through future investigation after permission has been granted.

3. Flood risk and drainage

There are also significant outstanding questions regarding surface water and drainage.

The application identifies areas of surface water flood risk and existing ponding, while parts of the proposed drainage solution remain dependent on further investigation and detailed design.

For a development of this scale, the application should demonstrate clearly how surface water will be managed,

including during extreme rainfall events, what attenuation is required, where water will discharge and how the proposals will avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere.

In my view, the current information does not provide sufficient certainty on these matters.

4. Electricity capacity and infrastructure

The utilities information does not appear to provide firm confirmation that the existing electricity infrastructure has sufficient capacity to support the proposed development.

There are also elements of the existing infrastructure whose condition and capacity still require verification.

Electricity is a basic requirement for the proposed accommodation and associated facilities. Capacity and connection arrangements should therefore be established as part of demonstrating that the development is deliverable, rather than being left as an unresolved matter following a planning decision.

5. Wastewater treatment

The proposed wastewater arrangements raise similar concerns.

The application appears to rely on a new on site wastewater treatment facility because there is insufficient evidence that the existing network can accommodate the additional demand.

That introduces a further piece of infrastructure which needs to be designed, constructed, operated and appropriately regulated. There must also be a suitable discharge arrangement and the necessary regulatory approvals.

I do not believe the application has demonstrated sufficient certainty around these arrangements to establish that the proposed development can be properly serviced.

6. Ecology and outstanding survey work

The ecological information identifies the requirement for further survey work.

Where additional surveys are necessary to properly understand the ecological effects of a development, those surveys should be completed before the decision is made rather than relying on conditions to establish the baseline position afterwards.

The scale of the proposed development makes this particularly important, given the extent of the associated buildings, infrastructure, access arrangements and external works.

7. Accuracy and consistency of the application documents

A further concern is the number of inconsistencies and matters requiring clarification across the supporting documentation.

The repeated incorrect reference to the B1104 is one clear example. There are also unresolved questions relating to electricity capacity, wastewater, drainage, ground conditions and ecology.

It is possible that individual issues could be corrected through additional information. However, when a number of fundamental areas remain subject to clarification, it becomes difficult to establish whether the application as submitted provides a sufficiently reliable basis for determining the proposal.

8. Emergency access, lighting, noise and site operation

The application also needs to demonstrate that the wider operational requirements of a development accommodating up to 1,256 people can be safely managed.

This includes emergency access, lighting, noise, traffic movements, security infrastructure, servicing and the day to day operation of the site.

These matters are interconnected with the transport, infrastructure and site layout issues already identified. They should not be considered in isolation or assumed to be capable of being resolved later without first establishing that the overall site arrangement is workable.

9. The claimed urgency and the state of the application

I also have concerns about the use of the Urgent Crown Development procedure in circumstances where the proposal has been under consideration and subject to feasibility and due diligence work for a considerable period.

The Government's own information describes the planning application as part of wider feasibility and due diligence work.

Against that background, it is concerning that an application being progressed through an accelerated planning route still contains apparent errors and inconsistencies and leaves a number of significant technical matters requiring further investigation or clarification.

The issue is not simply the length of the consultation period. It is the imbalance between the amount of time available to develop and assess the proposal and the very limited period given to local residents to examine the resulting technical submission.

The representation period runs from 7 September to 17 September 2026, and a request for an extension has been refused.

If the application needs to be determined urgently, that should not reduce the level of technical certainty required before a decision is made.

10. Overall suitability and deliverability

The proposal is considerably more than simply the provision of accommodation within existing buildings. The application includes new modular accommodation together with health and welfare facilities, roads, access ways, security infrastructure, parking, staff facilities, open space, recreational areas and a wastewater treatment plant for up to 1,256 people.

That represents a substantial development with significant demands on transport, utilities, drainage, land, ecology and supporting infrastructure.

In my view, the application has not yet demonstrated to the necessary degree that all of those elements can be safely and reliably delivered and operated for the proposed ten year period.

I therefore ask that the application is refused on the basis that the information currently submitted does not adequately demonstrate that the proposed development is suitable and deliverable on this site.

If the Secretary of State is minded to grant permission, I would ask that no decision is made until the outstanding matters have been properly investigated and evidenced, including the accuracy of the transport assessment, highway and pedestrian safety, ground conditions and contamination, surface water and flood risk, drainage, electricity capacity, wastewater provision, ecological survey work, emergency access and the operational implications of lighting, noise, traffic and site management.

The fundamental issue is that these are not minor matters of detail. They relate directly to whether the proposed development can function safely and sustainably at the scale proposed. Until the evidence is complete and the outstanding issues have been properly resolved, I do not believe the application provides a sufficiently reliable basis for granting planning permission.

Kind regards,

