From:	Robert Payton
To:	Crown Casework
Cc:	calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; Frank.Mahon@buckinghamshire.gov.uk; clerk@marshgibbon-pc.gov.uk
Subject:	Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A - RESENT WITH FULL CONTACT DETAILS FOR SUBMISSION
Date:	11 September 2026 16:32:38

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a resident of [redacted] to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for accommodation of up to 1,256 people at MOD Bicester Site A.

My objection is not to those who may be accommodated there, but to the scale, location and fundamental suitability of this particular site.

I understand the Government's rationale for using former military bases for asylum accommodation, particularly where existing accommodation and infrastructure can be reused. However, Site A is not an established residential barracks and has no history of substantial MOD residential accommodation. It is a former defence storage and distribution site, requiring extensive new buildings and infrastructure, the site cannot support.

In my view the site is inappropriate for development of this scale because of:

- poor highway accessibility and additional pressure on already congested roads; particularly A41
- inadequate pedestrian infrastructure and unsafe walking routes
- its isolated rural location and limited access to services and public transport;
- unresolved water, electricity and other utility requirements;
- unresolved foul-water, wastewater and drainage provision;
- flooding and surface-water management concerns;
- potential ground contamination and incomplete investigations;
- outstanding ecological and fire-safety matters; and
- the absence of existing residential infrastructure that might otherwise justify reuse of a military site.

As a [redacted] resident, I regularly use the A41, which is already extremely busy and, in my experience, hazardous. The alternative route into Bicester through Blackthorn and Launton is also congested and heavily used as a rat run. Additional staff, deliveries, servicing, shuttle buses and other traffic would inevitably increase pressure on these routes and surrounding villages.

I am particularly concerned about the infrastructure required to accommodate 1,256 people. Water supply, drainage, wastewater, waste disposal and power are fundamental requirements and should be fully demonstrated before permission is granted, not left dependent upon future investigation.

The B4011 serving the site also lacks adequate pedestrian infrastructure. Locating more than 1,200 people at an isolated rural site without safe pedestrian access to surrounding services seems fundamentally unsuitable.

A smaller proposal at this site was previously examined at a full public inquiry, where the Planning Inspector recommended against approval. The substantially larger proposal now deserves rigorous scrutiny.

Taken together, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that this site or the surrounding infrastructure can sustainably accommodate development on this scale.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Payton

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]