From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework; planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 12 September 2026 22:43:36

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Objection to Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I am writing to you today, Saturday 12th September 2026, to object to this application because I have serious concerns about the safety of the B4100, pedestrian access to the site, and whether there is enough reliable electricity to support a development of this size.

[redacted] I have genuine concerns about how the proposed development could affect the safety of people using this road on a daily basis.

The B4100 is already a very busy road, with approximately 3,000 vehicles travelling in each direction every day. Traffic is travelling at around 53–54 mph immediately outside the proposed site entrance. There have also been three collisions on this stretch of road in the last five years.

With those existing conditions, I am very concerned about the safety of vehicles entering and leaving the site. Adding a development of this size will inevitably mean more vehicle movements, and I do not believe the current road conditions provide a safe environment for this.

I am even more concerned about pedestrian safety. The footpath is only around 1 metre wide in some places and does not exist at all in others. This is a major concern when you have a road carrying this amount of traffic at speeds of around 53–54 mph. The Department for Transport recommends a 2-metre minimum footway width in appropriate circumstances, yet the existing provision falls well short of this in places.

The number of people walking to and from the site also needs to be properly considered. The proposed accommodation is for around 1,250 people, and many of those residents will not have their own vehicles. It is therefore reasonable to expect increased pedestrian movements along the B4100. I am concerned that the existing footpaths simply cannot safely cope with this.

[redacted] I am particularly concerned about the impact this could have on children, families and other vulnerable pedestrians using the area. Putting a large number of pedestrians alongside a busy road travelling at over 50 mph, with sections where there is little or no footpath, creates a real and foreseeable safety risk.

I also have serious concerns about the electricity supply.

There is no gas supply to the proposed site, meaning that heating, hot water and cooking for approximately 1,250 people will all depend on electricity. That is a very substantial demand.

My understanding is that the capacity, condition and configuration of the existing electrical network have not been established or independently verified. If the available capacity is uncertain, I do not think it has been demonstrated that the site can be supplied safely and reliably.

I am particularly concerned about the possibility of the development having to rely on temporary or permanent generators if the electricity network cannot provide the required capacity. Generators should not simply be treated as an easy solution to an unconfirmed electricity supply, particularly for a site of this size. They could bring additional noise, air quality, fuel storage, maintenance and vehicle movement issues.

In my view, these matters should be properly resolved and demonstrated before planning permission is granted, rather than being dealt with after the development is approved.

The combination of high traffic volumes, speeds of around 53–54 mph, three previous collisions, inadequate and missing footpaths, potentially significant pedestrian movements, and an unverified electricity supply for a site of approximately 1,250 people raises serious questions about whether this is a suitable and safe location for the proposed development.

For these reasons, I strongly object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 and ask that planning permission is refused unless and until the highway, pedestrian and electricity concerns have been fully investigated and independently demonstrated to be safe and adequate. I do not believe permission should be granted on the basis of assumptions about future highway improvements or an electricity connection that has not yet been properly verified. The safety of people using the B4100 and the reliability of essential services for a site of this size should be established before, not after, permission is given.

I would also appreciate written confirmation that this objection has been received and formally recorded against the application. I would be grateful for a response to the concerns I have raised and would also like to be kept informed of the next steps in the planning process, including any further consultations, assessments or changes to the proposal that may affect these issues.

Please also confirm how I will be notified of the eventual decision on the application.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to receiving your confirmation and response.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]