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 11:06:05

[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. **Site A is simply the wrong location and not suitable for purpose**

I have looked in detail at the application submitted by the Government. I have many concerns about the completeness and fairness of the evidence submitted in the following areas

- Historically Site A was refused by an independent Planning Inspector in 2003 and subsequently cancelled. Nothing has changed since 2003 except further deterioration. The site has deteriorated since 2003 so the cost of making good this site today is excessive for such a large complex project. Given that the Planning Application was refused on the basis of cost in 2003, I cannot see the logic of this Planning application in 2026.

- A detailed ecological assessment of its potential effects on wildlife is required. This area houses many unique wildlife species including bats using nearby hedgerows and woodland. The application does not mention that these assessments have been completed.

- The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the **B1104**, rather than the **B4011** which actually borders the site. The objection evidence also identifies a history of injury collisions on the nearby B4011 and the lack of a continuous footway or lighting along much of the route. There are no pavements so investment will be required and has not been mentioned.

- The application does not demonstrate a confirmed, reliable permanent electricity or wastewater solution. It needs to.

- The Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment says the condition and capacity of the existing electricity network cannot presently be relied upon, while questions also

remain over sewage capacity and the proposed wastewater arrangements. The site housing so many individuals that require these fundamental services should not be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved. Costs will be a huge consideration here.

- Large amounts of inflammable substances like diesel are expected to be housed on site and will require licences. The application does not mention that these licences have been obtained, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site for such purposes. The effects on pollution have not been mentioned and the impact especially the ecological and surrounding areas.

- Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet the assessment does not mention any borehole investigation which is required has been carried out to resolve those risks. I am concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. An assessment is required to assess toxic, flammable, corrosive and radioactive substances to ensure site A is possibly liveable in given these conditions.

- The designated area is notorious for 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. I did not see any assessment of this in the application.

- 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. I did not see any data or records from the past regarding fatalities, which locally have been obtained and are significant already

- The Home Office by its own admission states that parts of the evidence base remain incomplete. They therefore need to tell us what is incomplete and requires completion. The representation period of 11 days is also too short and for such an incomplete application there is a lot to do and assess prior to any decision is taken.

- The assessment does not disclose the cost of housing asylum seekers in hotels verses site A. It is clear that with so much needing to be done on the site for completeness, the cost of housing these asylum seekers is many times the cost of housing them in hotels.

- The application does not mention any conversations or discussions with the Local authorities such as Cherwell District Council, the commissioner of police, emergency services or local health authorities. Since the proposal is exceptionally large, complex and requires considerable investment these conversations need to

take place urgently. For an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport, health services and policing all of these key stakeholders need to be completed, and assessments provided in the application. To date they are not mentioned.

- I note that the application's unexploded ordnance assessment remains preliminary and says a more detailed risk assessment cannot yet be completed. This needs to be completed urgently.

- Site A does not form part of the development for which Cherwell's existing Infrastructure Delivery Plan was prepared, raising questions about how the additional infrastructure requirements would be accommodated. This needs to be taken into consideration.

- A field archaeological evaluation needs to be completed. There are historical Roman and medieval remains in the wider area around Alchester which could be affected.

I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

For fairness, 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. If this does not happen, I am certain this will go to Judicial review which has been discussed in the region and funding is now being made available.

I hope it will not have to go to these lengths to resolve. As it stands it is clear that the application stands on weak grounds, there is good evidence both past and looking forwards that reinforces the view that Site A is not suitable, is more expensive to construct than it was in 2003 and this is not a good fit for government purposes.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]