From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 07 September 2026 20:06:17

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public and resident of neighbouring Ludgershall village, to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I ask that planning permission be refused.

My objection is not to the principle of providing safe and appropriate accommodation for people seeking asylum. It concerns whether a development of this scale is suitable for this particular rural location and whether the surrounding villages have the infrastructure and services necessary to accommodate such a substantial change.

Ludgershall and Piddington are small rural communities. A very large residential facility would represent a significant increase in the number of people living in the immediate area and could fundamentally alter the character and functioning of the locality. Any planning decision should therefore examine carefully whether the scale, density and nature of the proposed use are proportionate to its surroundings.

Of particular concern is local infrastructure. Rural roads in and around small Oxfordshire villages were not designed for substantial additional traffic, frequent service vehicles, staff movements, deliveries and potentially increased demand for public transport. The authority should require robust evidence about anticipated vehicle movements, pedestrian safety, public transport provision and the ability of the existing road network to accommodate the development safely.

The potential effect on public services should also be properly assessed. The proposal could create additional demand for GP and healthcare provision, emergency services, transport and other local facilities. Before permission is granted, the application should demonstrate how those requirements would be met without placing unreasonable additional pressure on services already relied upon by existing residents.

There should also be a rigorous assessment of drainage, sewage capacity, utilities, environmental effects, landscape impact, noise, lighting and biodiversity. A development accommodating a large number of people cannot reasonably be treated as though its effects were comparable to a small residential proposal.

The council should also consider whether a remote rural location is appropriate for the people who would themselves be accommodated there. Access to healthcare, legal and support services, education, shops and reliable public transport is important. A site that leaves residents dependent on organised transport or isolated from essential services may be unsuitable both for the surrounding community and for asylum seekers.

I therefore ask the planning authority to refuse permission unless the applicant can demonstrate, through detailed and independently scrutinised evidence, that the scale and location of the proposal comply with the development plan and relevant national planning

policy, that the necessary infrastructure is available, and that unacceptable impacts on highways, public services, the environment and the character of the surrounding rural communities can be avoided or adequately mitigated.

I would also ask that the views of residents in ludgershall, Piddington and other directly affected communities are given proper consideration and that any significant evidence submitted by the applicant is made available with sufficient time for meaningful public consultation.

This is a major proposal with potentially long-term consequences for a small rural area. It should be determined on the planning merits of the site and on clear evidence of its suitability, rather than simply on the urgency of finding accommodation.

Yours faithfully,



