From: James Baughan
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 08:35:58

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public 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 please.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

I am particularly concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

This site will also impact local wildlife and disrupt the animals living there.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

The transport evidence also raises serious questions. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions.

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

The proposal is also extremely large for a very isolated rural location with little to no surrounding infrastructure, very limited public transport and few services within walking distance. For instance the only shop close by is in Arncott.

I am concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a substantial and complicated application.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled but not before significantamounts of money were spent in 2003.

Taken together, these issues mean I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale, in fact quite the opposite!

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be strongly refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

Mr James Baughan

