[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 09:48
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

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I live in F[redacted]a rural parish within 10 miles of Site A, and I chair [redacted] Council. I write in a personal capacity to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843. My objection is not about who would live at the site. It is about whether this application, as submitted, has actually shown that the site can support what is being proposed.

Reading the application, the thing that struck me most was the transport work. The Transport Assessment repeatedly names the wrong road. That is not a typo I am willing to wave through. If the document that is supposed to demonstrate this site can safely absorb the traffic of a 1,256-person development cannot even correctly identify the road it is assessing, I have no confidence in the modelling behind it. And the road that does serve the site, the B4011, is not a road built for this. It has poor pedestrian provision and a history of serious collisions already, before a single additional vehicle movement from this scheme. I know this part of Oxfordshire very well as I am a keen cyclist. Its roads are narrow, unlit in places, and already carry more than they were designed for. Adding a development of this scale onto that network deserves a transport case that actually holds up, and this one does not.

The same pattern runs through the rest of the application. Ground contamination was flagged in earlier work on this site, but no borehole investigation has been done to find out whether that risk is real. Parts of the site sit in an area of high surface-water flood risk, and the drainage strategy submitted does not show how that would be managed at this scale. There is no secured, permanent arrangement for power or wastewater. These are not minor gaps to be tidied up after permission is granted. They are the basic evidence base a decision-maker needs before approving a development of this size on a rural site with limited existing infrastructure.

I also have direct experience of how planning consultation is supposed to work, and this one falls well short of it. The representation period for an application running to well over a thousand pages of technical documents is a fraction of the 21 days that applies as standard practice, including under the Crown Development route itself. A parish council would not be expected to properly consider a document of this size and complexity in this timeframe, and neither should the public. I ask that the period be extended to a time that allows a small rural Parish Council time to make and informed decision. Also please consider the cost involved to a small council.

It is also worth putting on record that a smaller scheme for the same purpose on this same site was previously refused by an independent Planning Inspector. The problems that led to that refusal — contamination, flooding, access, and whether an isolated rural site is right for a use of this kind — have not gone away. They have simply been resubmitted at a larger scale, and I have seen no published explanation of why this site was chosen over any alternative.

None of this is a reason to dismiss the application on principle. It is a reason to say it is not yet ready for a decision. I ask that planning permission be refused, or, failing that, that no decision is made until the outstanding contamination, drainage, transport, infrastructure, and decommissioning evidence has been completed, published, and properly examined.

Yours Faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]