From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Objection – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A
Date: 16 September 2026 18:20:09

[redacted]

Dear Crown Casework Team,

I am writing to object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A. My objection is based on material planning considerations concerning the scale, location, infrastructure and safety of the proposed development, rather than the identity or immigration status of its prospective residents.

The proposal would accommodate up to 1,256 people for a period of ten years. For a development of that scale and duration, I do not believe the information presently submitted demonstrates that the site can operate safely, sustainably or without unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area.

Transport and pedestrian safety are a particular concern. The site is in a rural location with limited access to everyday services by foot, bicycle or public transport. Cherwell District Council's planning assessment records that there is no continuous safe pedestrian route from the proposed northern access, that the B4011 is subject to a 50 mph speed limit and has a history of road traffic incidents, and that the applicant's own Transport Assessment identifies limited walking, cycling and public-transport accessibility.

This is particularly important because this is proposed as non-detained accommodation. Residents would therefore reasonably need access to shops, appointments and other services outside the site. Before permission is granted, there should be clear evidence of how potentially substantial and repeated pedestrian and transport movements can be accommodated safely.

I am also concerned that the application does not provide sufficient detail for a full planning permission of this scale. Cherwell's assessment identifies the absence of a detailed proposed site layout, floor plans, elevations, lighting proposals and detailed access and servicing arrangements. Without these, the effects on neighbouring communities, drainage, emergency access, noise, landscape, ecology and living conditions cannot reliably be assessed.

There also appear to be unresolved infrastructure issues concerning foul and surface-water drainage, healthcare and emergency-service capacity, power, waste, fire safety, contamination and ecology. These matters should be established before the principle and scale of the development are approved rather than being left largely to conditions after permission has been granted.

I am additionally concerned by inconsistencies in the submitted material. The

planning parameters permit development up to 12 metres high, while other assessments appear to have considered buildings of approximately 6 metres/two storeys. Similarly, the drainage documentation contains differing assumptions about impermeable surfaces and runoff. The environmental and technical assessments should assess the same development that is actually being authorised.

Given the scale of the proposal, its ten-year duration and the unresolved issues identified above, I ask that planning permission is not granted on the information currently submitted. At minimum, the missing technical information should be provided and independently assessed, followed by a further opportunity for consultees and the public to comment before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]