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 19:48:41

[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.

The completeness of the evidence submitted with the application is not comprehensive and contains missing information. Some key ecological and technical work remains missing and there are unanswered information and the documents leave open questions on fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

Considering the nature of the site and what it has been used for previously 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. We only need to look at Heyford nearby to see that proper assessment needs to be made of this land as Heyford appears to have contamintion issues that are now coming to light. Therefore it is imperative that this information is collected for this site before housing people there to ensure the land is safe.

The documents also show there are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. And in our current climate where we see more flooding events. 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. This is a busy road that connects to thame and it is simply not safe for pedestrians.

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 exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. It is a very remote location and completely wrong for this number of people to be supported in this location.

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. The missing information highlighted in this email is also testament to the short period being unsiffiencet to properly assess the appropriateness of this location.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller

proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. I feel that this also leads weight to the argument that this site is not appropriate. Nothing has materially changed since this last proposal so why is it being proposed again?

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.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be 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,

[redacted]