[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 20:00
To: Crown Casework
Cc: MILLER, Calum (MP)
Subject: MOD Bicester Site A Application

Importance: High

> [redacted]t

Dear sir or madam

This is a brief response to the application by [redacted] Given the short timeframe and limited documentation, it has not been possible to scrutinise this application with the level of detail that is normal for planning applications. [redacted] objects to this application on transport grounds due to the almost total lack of infrastructure to support sustainable transport.

The application does not refer to, or engage with, the Bicester Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure plan.

Contrary to the applicant's claims, none of the routes relied upon within the transport assessment at [3.5] 'Cycling Accessibility' are accessible. According to the LTN1/20 standard, referred to by the applicant, all of these routes would be deemed suitable for few people / exclude most users and/or have safety concerns [see Figure 4.1].

The site is located on the busy B4011 which is extremely dangerous and totally unsuitable for cycling. One of our committee members witnessed a near fatal collision here in late 2025 which is not identified by the applicant, but reported in the media. BBUG considers that the applicant's statistics are incomplete.

None of the surrounding roads are suitable for cycling due to high vehicle speeds and/or volumes. There is no suitable cycling connection along the B4011, or using any other highway (including public rights of way) to any other village or town. In particular, the cycling links to Bicester are incomplete, as set out below.

There is a potential cycle link from HMP Bullingdon to Upper Arncott via Ministry of Defence and/or Home Office controlled land, but the legality of this route is uncertain, infrastructure along parts of the connection is incomplete, and the surface is poor.

Vehicle speeds along Palmer Avenue are too fast (60mph) for this route to be safely shared with cycle users.

There is a legacy path from Lower Arncott to Bicester, but this is very narrow, and poorly surfaced. To be realistically suitable for cycling, the entire length (2.5 miles) would need to be widened and resurfaced. It is not clear whether there is sufficient highway width to permit this given a horizontal buffer would be required.

There is a bridleway on which cycling would be lawful that runs from Blackthorn to Ambrosden, but this is not surfaced. To facilitate cycling, this 1.5 mile distance would need to be surfaced. While this right of way is highway and would not require landowner or planning permission, it would still require a connection along the B4100 to link it to the planned asylum centre.

There are also bridleways across Otmoor towards Oxford, but these would also need to be surfaced to make them suitable for cycling.

No suitable pedestrian or cycle access is proposed by the applicant. The junction design is rudimentary and provides no provision for cyclists to access the development safely.

The applicant's proposed measures to encourage residents or visitors to cycle to or from the planned development are, in the absence of any suitable infrastructure, ridiculous.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]