From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Objection to Proposed Asylum Accommodation Development at Site A, MOD land located on the A4011 (MOD Bicester)
Date: 16 September 2026 17:31:46

[redacted]

Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

16th September 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed development at the above site.

Having reviewed the available information, I believe this proposal represents unsustainable development in an unsuitable location and raises significant concerns relating to highway safety, flood risk, infrastructure provision, environmental impact and compliance with national and local planning policy.

1. Unsuitable and Unsustainable Location

The proposed site is fundamentally in the wrong location for residential accommodation. National planning policy promotes sustainable development in locations where occupants have safe access to services, facilities, public transport and supporting infrastructure.

This site appears isolated, heavily dependent on vehicle travel and lacks the infrastructure expected for residential use. Future residents would face considerable challenges accessing services safely and sustainably. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the principles of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2. Highway and Pedestrian Safety

One of the most significant concerns is the site's direct access onto the A4011, a high-speed and heavily trafficked road.

There are insufficient pedestrian facilities in the immediate vicinity, including a lack of suitable footpaths and safe crossing points. The proposal would inevitably increase pedestrian movements to and from the site, creating a serious risk to public safety.

The NPPF requires developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users and states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there is an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Given the road speed, traffic volumes and absence of adequate pedestrian infrastructure, I do not believe the proposal demonstrates a safe means of access for future occupants or visitors.

3. Lack of Essential Infrastructure Capacity

The site currently lacks the necessary infrastructure to support the proposed use.

Questions remain regarding:

- Water supply capacity.
- Foul drainage and sewerage provision.
- Electrical supply and network capacity.
- Heating and hot water provision.
- Impact on local utility services.

Residents of the village already experience low water pressure. No evidence has been provided demonstrating that Thames Water has confirmed sufficient capacity within the existing network to support the proposed development without adverse impacts on existing customers.

Similarly, there is insufficient information regarding electrical capacity. If temporary generators were required, this would create additional impacts relating to noise, emissions, fuel storage and operational costs.

Without clear and robust evidence demonstrating adequate utility provision, the proposal risks placing unacceptable strain on existing infrastructure and is therefore premature.

4. Flood Risk Concerns

The site and surrounding area have a well-established history of flooding.

Local residents regularly experience significant surface water issues, and flooding events occur frequently. On several occasions floodwater levels have been severe enough to cover roadways and impede vehicle movements.

Local drainage infrastructure is often overwhelmed, with blocked drains and watercourses contributing to recurring flooding problems. In view of these existing conditions, serious questions arise regarding the suitability of the site for residential occupation.

National planning policy seeks to direct vulnerable development away from areas at risk of flooding and requires developments to remain safe throughout their lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

The application has failed to provide sufficient reassurance that future residents would be adequately protected from flood events or that the development would not exacerbate existing flooding problems within the village.

5. Impact on Ecology and Biodiversity

The site supports a variety of wildlife, including protected and priority species.

Local observations indicate the presence of:

- Bats
- Birds
- Great crested newts and other amphibians
- Diverse ecological habitats that contribute to local biodiversity

The NPPF requires developments to protect and enhance biodiversity and secure measurable biodiversity net gain. Protected species and their habitats are afforded significant protection under environmental legislation and planning policy.

Without comprehensive ecological surveys and mitigation strategies, there is a substantial risk that the development would result in habitat loss, disturbance of protected species and degradation of the local natural environment.

6. Insufficient Evidence and Premature Development

The proposal appears to have been brought forward without adequate supporting evidence regarding:

- Infrastructure capacity
- Flood resilience
- Ecological impacts
- Highway safety
- Long-term sustainability

Given the significance of these unresolved matters, it is difficult to see how the Local Planning Authority can properly conclude that the development complies with national or local planning policy requirements.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses this application.

The proposal represents development in an unsuitable location, fails to demonstrate safe and sustainable access, raises serious concerns regarding flooding and infrastructure capacity, and risks causing unacceptable harm to local ecology and biodiversity.

Until robust evidence is provided demonstrating compliance with national and local planning policies in these areas, permission should not be granted.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Sent from my Galaxy

