From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: Calum Miller MP; [redacted]
Subject: Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 08:15:16

Dear Secretary of State,

We are writing as members of the public to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, for the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

We would ask that planning permission is refused.

We have a number of concerns about the application:

- drainage
- flooding
- wastewater
- contamination
- ecology
- highways
- pedestrian safety
- power supply
- lighting
- noise
- fire safety and decommissioning

In particular, we are concerned whether all of the necessary evidence and investigations have actually been completed. This is a very large and significant development, yet important ecological and technical work still appears to be outstanding. There are also serious questions around fire safety, ground conditions and whether this is an appropriate site for a development of this scale.

One of our particular concerns is ground contamination. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, but we understand that no borehole investigation has been carried out to properly establish and resolve those risks. We do not think this can simply be left unresolved given the size and intended use of the site.

There are also significant concerns about flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, while elements of the proposed drainage strategy remain unresolved. These are fundamental issues which should be properly addressed before any decision is made.

We are also concerned about the transport evidence submitted with the application. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, which raises questions about the accuracy and reliability of the assessment. The B4011, which serves the site, has limited pedestrian infrastructure and there is a recorded history of serious collisions. This seems particularly important when considering a development accommodating up to 1,256 people.

Another concern is the lack of a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure, including electricity and wastewater. We do not believe a development of this size should be approved while such basic requirements remain uncertain or unresolved.

The scale of the proposal is also a major concern. This is an exceptionally large development for what is essentially an isolated rural location, with limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and relatively few services within walking distance. We do not think the application has properly demonstrated that the location is suitable for accommodating up to 1,256 people.

We are also concerned about the extremely short period allowed for representations. A proposal of this size and complexity requires residents, local councils and technical specialists to have sufficient time to properly

examine the information and respond. We do not believe the time allowed has been adequate for that to happen.

There is also some relevant history here. This site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. Given that history, we believe particular care should be taken before approving an even larger scheme.

Taking all of these issues together, we do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

We therefore respectfully ask that planning permission is refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, we would ask that no decision is made until the outstanding work relating to 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



