From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: Planning Objection – Site A, MOD Bicester Application Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 16 September 2026 20:58:31

[redacted]

Planning Objection – Site A, MOD Bicester
Application Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted]

Date: 16th Sept 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at Site A, MOD Bicester, for Home Office accommodation for up to 1,256 single adult men.
I ask that this objection is given full consideration and placed on the official case file.
I have lived in this [redacted] for my whole life and my family has been part of this community for over 150 years and five generations. I have consciously decided to stay here and raise my family here. My daughter amd grandparents are buried here. This is not simply somewhere I live; it is our family home and the community in which our children are growing up.

I also have a very personal connection to this proposal. When I was 14 years old, I remember my own parents objecting to a shockingly similar proposal for accommodation on this site. That is etched in my memories, not for any good reasons. That proposal was ultimately not taken forward, following concerns about the suitability and sustainability of the location.
What concerns me profoundly is that the fundamental problems identified then have not disappeared. If anything, they have been magnified enormously by the scale of the current proposal. I certainly didn't expect to be having to object, again, as my parents did when I was a teenager.
The earlier proposal was for a substantially smaller number of occupants. The current proposal is for up to 1,256 people. The earlier scheme was capped at 750 people and an independent Inspector identified isolation, strain on local services, community cohesion and pedestrian road safety among the reasons for recommending refusal.
The fact that these concerns existed over 20 years ago, when the proposed

population was considerably smaller, makes the scale of the current proposal particularly concerning.
So here is my extensive list of valid reasons of why to refuse. Reiterating the same objections that stand from over 20 years ago and to reaffirm some new concerning ones. Please consider each point carefully.

1. The application is not sufficiently complete or reliable to enable proper consideration.
One of my strongest objections is that I do not believe residents, consultees or the decision-maker can properly understand or assess the full consequences of this proposal from the information currently provided.
There are significant omissions from the application, even with whole sections redacted, but also exclusions of the absence of a proper site layout plan, floor plans, elevations, external lighting layout, boundary/security fencing plan and drainage layout. It also identifies matters apparently being left to be resolved after permission rather than being properly assessed now. How is that acceptable on a proposal of this scale and repercussions!
The submitted Site Parameters Plan is reported to contain no dimensions, heights, access points, parking numbers or key.
There are also numerous discrepancies between the applicant's own documents, including differences in stated floorspace, the number of structures to be demolished, site levels, the description of the site's existing use and the proposed length of stay.
There are also documents and correspondence which are redacted or unavailable.
How can residents be expected to make meaningful and informed representations about a development of this unprecedented scale when fundamental information is missing, redacted or contradictory?
How can the decision-maker properly assess the planning merits when basic aspects of the proposal have apparently not been resolved?
For any other major development of this scale, I would expect the applicant to demonstrate a robust, sustainable, technically feasible and economically credible solution before planning permission was granted. I do not believe that has been demonstrated here.
I therefore ask that the application is refused, or at the very least that no decision is made until the missing information, discrepancies and outstanding assessments have been fully resolved and made available for public scrutiny.

2. The scale of the development is wholly disproportionate to the village and surrounding infrastructure.
The proposed population of 1,256 people is extraordinary in the context of this rural area.
Piddington has a population of approximately 304 people. The proposed

accommodation would therefore represent more than four times the population of the village. That is staggering!
This is not a modest addition to an existing community. It would fundamentally change the demographic and physical character of the area.
The scale is disproportionate.
The consequences would extend beyond the boundary of the site, especially as the service users are free to sign in and out and it would affect roads, utilities, healthcare, emergency services, recreation, policing, the environment and the daily lives of existing residents.
This is an unprecedented scale of development for this location, and I do not believe the infrastructure exists to absorb it safely or sustainably.

3. Highway safety and pedestrian safety is one of my greatest concerns.
People living here routinely have to travel along the local roads towards Bicester for shopping, appointments, school, work and other essential services. Residents also walk these roads, including people walking dogs, parents with children and people using local facilities such as our playing field.
There are sections of road with no suitable footway, and this is particularly concerning given the proposed population.
The application material records traffic levels of around 3,000 vehicles per day in each direction, with 85th percentile speeds of approximately 53–54 mph. Where footways exist, they can be approximately one metre wide, despite the Transport Assessment referring to inclusive design guidance recommending a two-metre minimum.
Even more concerning, the Transport Assessment apparently does not provide a proper safety assessment of Widnell Lane, despite this being the direct route towards Piddington.
The same road corridor has already experienced a fatal incident involving a young child in 2024.
That should surely demonstrate why pedestrian safety cannot simply be assumed to be acceptable.
I ask the decision-maker to consider what it will actually mean in practice when hundreds of additional people need to travel between the accommodation, Bicester and surrounding facilities, including people walking along roads that were not designed for this level of pedestrian activity. Sadly, issuing HiVis jackets to the service users will not solve this issue. Especially on those foggy, icy and dark periods when the roads are treacherous. The outcome could be fatal for service users and motorists.

I regularly consider the practical safety of walking with a baby in a pram, walking the dog, taking children out, and travelling along these roads within the village. These are ordinary activities that should be possible without residents having to feel that they

are taking an unacceptable risk but all the additonal road traffic this would bring could change that.

4. My own family home has flooded, so this is not an abstract concern to me. I know personally what flooding can mean for a family and how devastating it can be.
The applicant's own Flood Risk Assessment reportedly identifies approximately a quarter of the site as having a high chance of surface-water flooding in any given year, with additional areas at medium and low risk. The assessment also relies on modelling which does not take account of the site's private drainage ditches and pipework, the condition of which has not been surveyed.
Furthermore, the drainage strategy had not been finalised when the assessment was submitted.
This is completely unacceptable for a development of this scale.
The consequences of inadequate drainage would not necessarily stop at the site boundary. Increasing hardstanding and occupation on a site with known surface-water issues has the potential to exacerbate existing flooding problems.
Before any decision is made, I believe there must be a robust, independently scrutinised drainage strategy demonstrating that the development will not increase flood risk to neighbouring properties or the wider area.

5. Water supply, sewage and infrastructure capacity is not fully supported in this application.
I am deeply concerned about whether the local infrastructure can support 1,256 additional residents.
The applicant's own utilities assessment apparently states that potential headroom may exist at Bicester Wastewater Treatment Works but that capacity and permit compliance require confirmation. No written confirmation from Thames Water demonstrating that the network can accommodate this additional demand appears to have been provided.
That is a fundamental issue.
A development of this size cannot reasonably proceed on the basis that there might be sufficient capacity.
There must be clear evidence that water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment and associated infrastructure can safely accommodate the proposed population.

6. Electricity, generators, noise, air quality and fuel storage poses an alarming red flag within this proposal.
The electricity situation is equally concerning.
The applicant's assessment reportedly states that the condition and capacity of the electrical network are currently unknown and that the primary intake capacity has not been verified. The proposal therefore includes reliance on temporary and permanent generators, with an estimated maximum demand of approximately 2.16

MVA.
This raises obvious questions about:
• generator noise;
• vibration;
• air quality;
• emissions;
• operating hours;
• impact on neighbouring residents;
• impact on wildlife;
• emergency arrangements;
• fuel storage;
• the quantity of fuel required;
• fire risk; and
• the long-term sustainability of the arrangement.
The application should demonstrate precisely how these matters will be controlled rather than leaving fundamental infrastructure questions unresolved.
The applicant's own noise modelling reportedly indicates that part of the site would exceed recommended external sound levels, with no specific funded noise-insulation measures secured at this stage.

7. The site and surrounding area support wildlife, including protected species.
I am particularly concerned about bats, newts and protected birds, as well as the wider ecological impact of construction, lighting, noise, vibration, traffic and increased human activity.
The applicant's ecological assessment reportedly states that it cannot be regarded as comprehensive and that protected-species surveys remain outstanding. The guide also identifies the apparent absence of a biodiversity net gain assessment and refers to redacted Natural England correspondence.
Again, I do not understand how a decision can responsibly be made when important ecological assessments remain incomplete.
The ecological consequences should be established before permission is granted, not discovered afterwards.

8. Contamination, asbestos and unexploded ordnance is a clear risk at this site.
The history of this site also requires particularly careful consideration.
This is a former military ordnance depot with a history of handling and storing munitions.
The applicant's preliminary assessment is reportedly desk-based, with no intrusive ground investigation apparently having been carried out before submission. The geo-environmental assessment also identifies asbestos-containing material as a contamination risk within made ground.

This raises serious questions about the safety of construction workers, future occupants, neighbouring residents and the environment.
I do not believe these risks should simply be dealt with at a later stage, they need proper investigation, now.

9. The scale of the proposed population makes emergency planning particularly important.
The Fire Strategy reportedly does not appear to set out fundamental information such as travel distances to escape routes, exits or the firefighting water supply available on site.
A development accommodating more than a thousand people must have a demonstrably robust emergency response.
The applicant should demonstrate that the site can be evacuated safely, that emergency services can access it, that adequate firefighting water is available and that emergency response times and access arrangements are appropriate.

10. Safeguarding, security and the safety of existing residents has not been considered in this proposal.
I want to be very clear that my objection is to the location, scale, infrastructure and planning consequences of this proposal, not to individuals seeking accommodation.
However, I am deeply concerned about safeguarding and security.
This is a rural, largely unlit community. There is limited infrastructure, limited pedestrian provision and no level of urban surveillance or security infrastructure comparable to a large town.
The proposal would introduce a population several times the size of our existing village.
The applicant therefore needs to provide robust, site-specific assessments addressing safeguarding, security, policing, emergency services and the relationship between the accommodation and the surrounding community.
The application should not simply assume that these matters can be managed after occupation.
The is an absence in the application of site-specific capacity assessments agreed with Thames Valley Police, the NHS Integrated Care Board, Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service, South Central Ambulance Service and the county council in its relevant roles.
I need to know how my family is expected to remain safe.
I need to know how my children can walk, play football, walk the dog or travel through the village safely.
I need to know that I can walk to visit my daughter's grave, visit elderly parents and grandparents and go about ordinary family life without having to live in fear.
These are not unreasonable expectations.
Our safety and security in our homes and community matters.

I therefore ask for robust, independent and transparent risk assessments addressing these issues before any decision is made.

11. The effect on children's lives and the character of the community needs to be considered here.
One of my greatest fears is what this proposal would mean for my children's childhood.
Our parish owned green space where my children play at least 3 times a week, and where I walk my dog shares a boundary with site A. I worry that will not be possible if the proposal goes ahead. I am a mother and this worries me, it would change everything. Change their childhood beyond recognition.
We live here because of the rural character, community, open space and ability to allow children some freedom.
I do not want to reach a point where I feel I have to parent my children through screens because I am frightened to allow them to walk or play outside independently.
Children should be able to walk to local facilities, play football, walk with their families and enjoy their community.
A development of this magnitude could fundamentally alter that experience.
The planning system must consider the impact of development on the character and functioning of the existing community. This is not simply about numbers on a spreadsheet; it is about what happens when a population several times the size of a village is placed on its edge.

12. Pressure on local services
Our local services are already under pressure.
The NHS and other public services are struggling to meet existing demand. I see this when I have to use these services. I do not believe it has been adequately demonstrated that the additional demands generated by up to 1,256 occupants, plus staff and visitors, can be accommodated.
There is nothing in the application that references any agreed site-specific capacity assessments from several relevant public services.
There should be a clear and evidenced assessment of the impact on healthcare, emergency services, policing, highways, drainage, water and other infrastructure.

13. As previously touched on, what in the 2003 has changed to make this one even a possibility?
I find it extremely difficult to understand how a site that was considered unsuitable for a smaller proposal in the past can now be considered appropriate for a substantially larger development.
Like I said, I remember my parents fighting this proposal when I was 14.
More than 20 years have passed, but the fundamental problems have not been

solved.
Indeed, the proposal is now substantially larger, while the surrounding rural infrastructure remains fundamentally rural.
If anything since then the changes have amplified the rejection concerns. There have been more demands placed on local services, roads and infrastructure over those years. The fact that the site has remained unsuitable for pedestrian access and sustainable connectivity is particularly important. And the site will now be hime to more established wildlife and the building inside the site fallen into more disrepair.
The previous Inspector's concerns about isolation, local service pressure, community cohesion and pedestrian safety should not simply be disregarded because the current application is being brought forward under a different planning procedure.
If anything, those historic concerns should be revisited in light of the much greater scale now proposed.

14. I am also concerned about the true intended duration and ultimate scale of the proposal.
There are inconsistencies in the application regarding the intended length of stay and also notes that the preliminary Unexploded Ordnance Risk Assessment refers to accommodation for 3,510 service users, despite the application elsewhere stating 1,256 bedspaces.
This is extremely concerning.
Residents need to know precisely what is being proposed.
Is this genuinely a temporary development? For how long?
What is the maximum population?
Can it subsequently be expanded?
If the applicant's own documentation contemplates a substantially greater population, that needs to be explained clearly before any decision is made. It is not acceptable for a proposal of this scale to have these discrepancies.

15. Human impact and our right to family life
I appreciate that planning decisions must be based upon planning considerations and that wider immigration policy is not itself a planning matter.
However, the practical consequences for existing residents are very real.
My family's roots here span five generations.
This is our home. This will change my family's life after all that time.
We have built our lives here because of the community, rural setting, environment and sense of safety.
I am already experiencing considerable distress about what this proposal could mean for my family and my community. It has really effected my mental health, I dread to think how much worse it could get.
I am particularly concerned about the effect on children's lives, family relationships,

elderly relatives and our ability to continue using our local environment freely and safely.
These impacts should not simply be dismissed as subjective concerns. They arise directly from the scale, location, access arrangements, infrastructure limitations and safeguarding requirements of the proposed development.

16. The proposal conflicts with the principles of sustainable development, we have identified concerns regarding the proposal's compatibility with the adopted Cherwell Local Plan, including Policy PSD1, Policy SLE4 concerning safe and suitable access, Policy INF1 concerning infrastructure, and environmental and heritage policies.
National planning guidance requires national importance and urgency to be demonstrated at the level of the individual site.
In my view, this proposal has not demonstrated that this particular location can sustainably accommodate the proposed population.
The site is isolated.
Pedestrian infrastructure is inadequate.
Flood risk is established.
Drainage arrangements remain unresolved.
Utilities capacity has not been fully demonstrated.
Ecological surveys remain outstanding.
The application contains significant inconsistencies.
Fundamental plans and assessments are missing.
There are concerns regarding contamination, asbestos and unexploded ordnance.
There are unresolved questions about generators, noise, air quality, emergency access, security and safeguarding.
Taken together, these are not minor matters that can reasonably be dismissed or left to future conditions.

17. This is an unprecedented experiment with real consequences for real people.
This proposal feels like an experiment being undertaken in a community that has not been given adequate information about the full consequences. We should not be guinea pigs, or collateral damage to this.
If it goes ahead and the assumptions made prove wrong, the consequences cannot simply be reversed.
The population will have changed.
The character of the village will have changed.
The pressure on roads and services will have changed.
My children's childhood will be gone, they only get one!
The environmental impact will have occurred.
The effect on neighbouring properties and residents will have happened.
And families like mine will have to live with the consequences.
That is why the burden should be on the applicant to demonstrate, before permission

is granted, that the development is safe, sustainable, properly serviced and appropriate for this particular location.

Conclusion-
For all of the reasons above, I strongly object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.
I respectfully ask the decision-maker to refuse the application because:
1. The scale of the proposal is disproportionate to the village and surrounding area.
2. The application contains significant omissions, redactions and discrepancies.
3. Residents cannot meaningfully assess the proposal without the missing information.
4. Highway and pedestrian safety have not been adequately demonstrated.
5. The local roads and pedestrian infrastructure are unsuitable for the additional population.
6. Flood risk and drainage have not been adequately resolved.
7. Water supply, sewage and wastewater capacity have not been conclusively demonstrated.
8. Electricity infrastructure is uncertain and reliance on generators raises additional noise, air-quality, vibration, fuel-storage and safety concerns.
9. Ecological assessment is incomplete and protected-species surveys remain outstanding.
10. The site's history creates significant contamination, asbestos and unexploded-ordnance concerns.
11. Fire and emergency arrangements have not been adequately demonstrated.
12. The impact on policing, healthcare, emergency services and other local infrastructure has not been properly assessed.
13. Safeguarding and security risks require robust, transparent and site-specific assessment.
14. The proposal risks fundamentally altering the character and functioning of our village.
15. The historic concerns identified in relation to the 2003 proposal remain relevant and have been magnified by the substantially greater scale now proposed.
16. The proposal has not demonstrated that this particular site is a sustainable and suitable location for accommodation on this scale.
Most importantly, I ask the decision-maker to consider the severity and irreversibility of getting this decision wrong.

Can you honestly reassure me, as a resident and a parent, that my children and I will be safe walking along these roads, walking the dog, visiting family graves, visiting elderly parents and grandparents and allowing our children to enjoy the freedom of their own community?
What specific, funded and enforceable measures would guarantee that safety?

Where are the robust risk assessments demonstrating this?
Where is the evidence that our infrastructure can cope?
Where is the evidence that the site can safely accommodate this number of people?
And how can any of those questions be properly answered while fundamental elements of the application remain missing, redacted or contradictory?
I therefore respectfully request that this application is REFUSED.
My family has called this [redacted] home for over 150 years. I want my children and future generations to be able to say the same.

Yours faithfully,
[redacted]

Date: 16th Sept 2026

Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843