From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Date: 17 September 2026 23:08:42

You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning application: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A

I wish to formally object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A.

I live in [redacted] approximately five miles from the proposed development. My objection is principally based on the fact that the scale of the proposed development is not adequately supported by the existing infrastructure of the surrounding area.

The application proposes accommodation for **up to 1,256 people for a period of up to 10 years**, together with associated healthcare and welfare facilities, catering, recreation, roads, parking, staff accommodation, security infrastructure and a wastewater treatment plant.

This is effectively the creation of a substantial new population in a predominantly rural area. The relevant question is therefore not simply whether infrastructure can be provided within the boundary of the former MOD site, but whether the **wider network of roads, public transport, healthcare and other services in the surrounding communities has sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand**.

Existing transport infrastructure is limited

The Government's own transport documentation recognises that the site is in a rural location and that there are limited facilities within walking distance. The lack of pedestrian infrastructure is particularly significant.

This means that people accommodated at the site will be dependent to a considerable extent upon vehicles and organised transport to reach services and facilities outside the site.

That has implications for the wider road and transport network serving the surrounding villages, including Langford Village.

Langford already relies on a relatively limited public transport network. Current timetables show the 108 service connecting Langford Village with Bicester, with only a limited number of scheduled journeys, while the 107 also connects Bicester with Langford, Ambrosden, Arncott and other surrounding villages.

It is therefore important that the cumulative effect of the proposed development on this

wider transport network is properly assessed rather than considering the site in isolation.

The scale of the development is disproportionate to the surrounding infrastructure

A population of up to 1,256 people is comparable to the population of a substantial village. It is therefore difficult to reconcile the scale of the proposed development with the rural nature of the location and the relatively limited infrastructure serving the surrounding communities.

The Government's own application documents identify limitations and uncertainties concerning infrastructure capacity. The application has had to make provision for significant new infrastructure on the site, including wastewater treatment, roads, access arrangements and other utilities.

I am particularly concerned that this demonstrates that the existing infrastructure is not sufficient to support the proposed development without substantial intervention.

Water, drainage and utilities

There are also important questions regarding the capacity and condition of existing infrastructure.

The application documentation identifies the need for further investigation and verification of aspects of the existing utility and drainage infrastructure. The proposed development would introduce a population of up to 1,256 people and consequently a substantial additional demand for water, electricity, foul-water treatment and surface-water drainage.

These are fundamental requirements rather than minor technical matters.

Before permission is granted, I believe there should be clear evidence that:

- sufficient water supply capacity exists;
- sufficient electricity capacity exists;
- foul-water infrastructure has adequate capacity;
- the proposed wastewater arrangements are technically and operationally robust;
- surface-water drainage will not increase flood risk elsewhere;
- existing drainage infrastructure is capable of dealing with the additional demand; and
- any required infrastructure improvements are fully funded, deliverable and secured through enforceable conditions or other appropriate mechanisms.

Impact on surrounding communities

Although the development is located at the former MOD site, its effects will not be confined to that site.

Residents of the development will require access to healthcare, transport, shops, leisure facilities and other services. The applicant's own assessment recognises the limitations of the site's location and its reliance on transport arrangements to access facilities elsewhere.

Those services and transport networks are already used by residents of Langford, Ambrosden, Arncott, Piddington and other surrounding communities.

The fact that [redacted] is approximately five miles from the site does not mean that it is unaffected. It forms part of the same interconnected network of settlements and services.

The planning assessment should therefore consider the **cumulative impact across the wider area**, rather than treating the former MOD site as an isolated location.

Outstanding information should be resolved before a decision is made

I am particularly concerned that the application appears to rely on a number of matters being addressed through further surveys, detailed design or future infrastructure arrangements.

Given the proposed scale and 10-year duration of the development, I do not consider it sufficient to assume that these issues can be resolved after planning permission has been granted.

The Secretary of State should have sufficient evidence before making the decision to demonstrate that the necessary infrastructure is genuinely available and deliverable.

Conclusion

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Secretary of State to **refuse planning permission** because the application has not demonstrated that the existing and proposed infrastructure is sufficient to support a development of this scale without placing unacceptable additional pressure on the surrounding communities.

In particular, I ask that consideration be given to:

1. the limited capacity of the existing rural transport network;
2. the limited public transport and pedestrian connectivity;
3. the additional demand that the development would place on services in surrounding settlements;
4. the capacity of water, electricity, foul-water and drainage infrastructure;
5. the cumulative impact on the interconnected communities surrounding the site; and
6. whether all necessary infrastructure improvements are sufficiently evidenced,

funded and deliverable before the development proceeds.

I am not objecting simply to the principle of temporary accommodation at the site. My objection is that **a development accommodating up to 1,256 people for up to 10 years has not demonstrated that the infrastructure of this rural location and the surrounding communities is capable of supporting it safely and sustainably**.

I therefore ask that my objection is taken into account as a material planning consideration when determining application **PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843**.

Yours faithfully,

