From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 10 September 2026 17:10:35

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Sir/Madam,

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, Oxfordshire.

I request that the planning permission be refused.

This site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation in 2003 to house 750 asylum seekers. That application was declined by the Planning Inspector for a number of reasons which still remain pertinent today. The infrastructure at Site A has not changed since the 2003 application was declined, so why is Site A being reconsidered for such use now and also with increased numbers of asylum seekers to be housed?

The current planning application notes that the site's use, together with portable housing accommodation proposed, is for temporary use over a 10 year period. How can it be justified to consider such use as 'temporary' when it is proposed for a 10 year period? Immigration, whether via legal or illegal routes, is not going to stop, so once the precedent for such a use of this site has been set then the site's use will not be 'temporary' but become permanent and no doubt for many years beyond the initial 10 to come.

The application and supporting documents has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. The current planning application infers that basic utilities at Site A, such as electricity and water, will not be sufficient and it is therefore planned to run at Site A electricity generators, plus transport in/out clean water and foul drainage, presumably by lorry tankers. How is such a proposal cost effective compared to housing asylum seekers in hotels/private housing, as they are now, where appropriate mains electric, water and mains foul drainage are already linked to those properties? This is without factoring in the cost of the clearance of Site A and installation and ongoing site maintenance costs. The proposed electricity generators will also be noisy and discharge into the local environment, plus lorry tankers will impact negatively on the local and main road structures and also add to CO2 emissions.

Site A, is located next to a busy road, the B4011. The Transport Assessment supporting the current proposal repeatedly refers to the wrong road. The B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. The boundaries of Site A have no footpaths to speak of. The B4011, has no footpaths back to the nearby villages of Piddington, Arncott, Ambrosden, Oakley, Blackthorn or even most of the way to the nearby town of Bicester. Street lighting surrounding Site A, and also along the B4011, is all but non existent in the area. We are told that the asylum seekers to be housed on the site will not be secured within Site A at all times, but will have freedom to leave the site and come and go as they please. Therefore, there will undoubtedly be numerous individuals walking around the grass verges and roads at various times of the day adding inevitably to the risk of accidents in the area.

Adjacent to Site A, on one of the boundaries, is a children's playing field leading to the village of Piddington, which has a population of c.350 persons. The current proposal notes 1,256 asylum seekers will have the freedom to come and go at the site as they please and their sheer number will outnumber the villagers c.3.5 times. This is in addition to the perceived risk to the adults and children in that village, and also those in the wider community, of any of the proposed 1,250 asylum seekers breaking the Law, which is likely to happen, considering asylum seekers are not versed in our Laws which has been widely reported over the last several years and more.

The village of Piddington has no shop or pub and is residential. The villages of Arncott, Ambrosden, Oakley and Blackthorn are also residential with part-time shop and pub.

Upon further reading the documents supporting the proposed current application:-

a) parts of Site A are at high risk of surface-water flooding with poor drainage noted. The cost of remedial works will be expensive.

b) ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Bearing in mind this site has been in Army use for many years contamination from ordinance storage etc. may be in evidence.

c) important ecological and technical work remains outstanding. What will be the effect on the wildlife locally if this site goes ahead?

d) significant questions remain around fire safety.

e) local Policing in the area has not the capacity to control an additional 1,256 people from one location in addition to its normal commitments in the current area.

Considering Site A is in an isolated and rural location, with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance, I don't believe such a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

Therefore, I request that the planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Henderson

[redacted]

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.

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 application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly considered in so short a time. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so I ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

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,

[YOUR NAME]
[YOUR ADDRESS]
[YOUR POSTCODE]