From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 16 September 2026 22:26:16

[redacted]

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed development at Site A, MOD Bicester.

My name is [redacted]
My family and I have lived in [redacted] 2019. We have three [redacted], and this is not an abstract planning issue for us. The roads, paths and green spaces surrounding Site A are part of our everyday lives. We walk our dog here, I run here, our children cycle here, we drive these roads on the school run every day, and we regularly use the recreation ground which shares a boundary with the proposed site.

What I find particularly difficult to understand is that this has effectively been tried here before. A smaller scheme was subjected to detailed independent scrutiny and found to be unsuitable. It seems extraordinary that we are now being asked to accept a substantially larger proposal with less scrutiny, not more.

An independent Inspector has already rejected a similar scheme at this location. In the early 2000s, an accommodation centre capped at 750 people, well under the number now proposed, was put forward nearby. It went through a fourteen-day public inquiry. Following that process, an independent Inspector found the location unsustainable, citing its isolation, the risk to community cohesion and the strain on local services. Pedestrian road safety was one of only three reasons given for recommending refusal. The scheme was subsequently abandoned within about two years as uneconomic, after the national demand used to justify it fell away.

Those findings feel particularly relevant to me as someone raising three children here.

The current proposal is larger, yet appears to be receiving less scrutiny. More than a thousand people would be accommodated at this site. Once again, the justification rests heavily on urgent national need. Yet instead of the fourteen-day public inquiry afforded to the earlier, smaller proposal, this application is being pursued through the fast-track "urgent Crown development" route, with no statutory public consultation and no guaranteed period for residents to respond.

I find that deeply concerning. Surely the greater the scale of a proposal and the greater its potential impact on the surrounding communities,

the greater the scrutiny it should receive.

The concerns identified by the previous Inspector have not disappeared. The site has not somehow become less isolated. Our local roads have not suddenly become suitable for large numbers of additional pedestrians. Our villages have not acquired the services and infrastructure necessary to absorb such a significant increase in the local population.

Pedestrian safety worries me particularly because I know these roads so well. My family uses them every day. I know how fast cars travel along them, how narrow they are in places and how little protection there is for people walking or cycling. These aren't hypothetical concerns on a map. They are roads my daughters travel along, places where we walk our dog, run and cycle, and the routes we use as part of ordinary family life.

The fact that pedestrian road safety was specifically identified by an independent Inspector as a reason to refuse a smaller scheme here should surely carry enormous weight when considering a substantially larger one.

I also struggle to understand how a proposal of this scale can be considered without fully examining its impact on the character and cohesion of the surrounding villages. Piddington is a very small rural community. We have no shop, no pub and no school. A development accommodating more than a thousand people immediately beside a village of this size is not a minor change. It would fundamentally alter the relationship between the site and the community around it.

I appreciate that there are national pressures behind this proposal. But urgent national need cannot mean that the suitability of a particular location ceases to matter. Nor should urgency mean that the findings of a previous independent inquiry can simply be sidestepped.

As a resident, and particularly as a [redacted] I find it very difficult to accept that a larger version of a scheme previously found to be unsustainable could now proceed through a process offering considerably less independent examination.

I therefore ask that this application is subjected to proper independent scrutiny and that the findings of the earlier inquiry, particularly those relating to isolation, community cohesion, pressure on local services and pedestrian safety, are addressed fully rather than bypassed.

I would be grateful for acknowledgement that my objection has been received and placed on the official case file, and I would like to be kept informed of the next steps.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

