From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: Calum Miller MP; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 10 September 2026 19:00:47

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

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident 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.

I have lived in and around this area for many years and I have children, so this proposal is something that concerns me personally and very deeply. I am extremely anxious about the thought of such a large accommodation centre being placed so close to our town, particularly given the sheer number of people it would accommodate and the additional pressure this could place on an area that is already struggling with declining services and infrastructure.

My concerns are primarily about whether this particular site is suitable for a development of this enormous scale, and whether the impact on the local community has been properly considered.

I have serious concerns about the information and evidence submitted with the application. It appears that important ecological and technical work is still outstanding, while significant questions remain about contamination, drainage, flooding, fire safety, ground conditions, highways and infrastructure.

One of my particular concerns is the possibility of ground contamination. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet I understand that no borehole investigation has been carried out to properly establish and resolve those risks. I do not feel comfortable with a development of this size going ahead when such fundamental questions about the site have not been fully answered.

There are also concerns around flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, and aspects of the proposed drainage arrangements appear to remain unresolved. With accommodation for up to 1,256 people, I believe these matters need to be properly investigated and resolved before permission is considered.

I am also concerned about transport and pedestrian safety. The Transport Assessment repeatedly appears to refer to the wrong road, while the B4011, which serves the site, has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a history of serious

collisions. This is particularly concerning when you consider the number of people who could potentially be travelling to and from the site every day.

There also does not appear to be a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development of this scale should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

The proposed development is, in my view, completely out of proportion to its surroundings. This is an isolated site in a predominantly rural location, with limited public transport, limited pedestrian infrastructure and relatively few services within walking distance. Accommodating up to 1,256 people in one location would inevitably have an impact on the surrounding area and on the existing community.

As a parent living locally, I cannot ignore how anxious this proposal makes me feel. The thought of such a significant number of people being accommodated so close to where my children live, go to school and spend their time is genuinely worrying to me. I believe the concerns of local families need to be properly acknowledged and considered when making a decision of this magnitude.

I am also very concerned about the extremely short period that residents have been given to respond. The application runs to well over 1,000 pages across numerous technical disciplines. It is simply not realistic to expect ordinary residents, local councils and technical specialists to properly read, understand and respond to such a substantial application within such a short period.

I understand that ordinary planning applications provide a minimum 21-day representation period, and that the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at each stage. I therefore ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking it to **Monday 28 September 2026,** as the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

I also understand that this site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation, with a smaller proposal being refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. I believe that previous decision and the reasons behind it should be properly considered when assessing this much larger proposal.

Taking everything together, I do not believe that the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is an appropriate or suitable location for accommodation of this scale.

I therefore respectfully ask 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 all outstanding matters relating to drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply,

lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning have been fully investigated, resolved where necessary, and made available for proper public scrutiny.

As someone who has lived locally for many years and has children growing up in this community, I sincerely hope that our concerns will be properly listened to and that the scale and suitability of this proposal will be given the careful consideration it deserves.

Yours faithfully,

Joanna Cannon
[redacted]

Kind regards

Joanna