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: 10 September 2026 16:44:17

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

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, which proposes a 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

I have a number of concerns about the application and, in particular, whether there is enough information available to properly understand the impact and suitability of the proposal.

There appears to be important ecological and technical work that is still outstanding, and there are also significant questions around fire safety, ground conditions, drainage and the overall suitability of the site.

I am particularly concerned about ground contamination. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, but I understand that no borehole investigation has been carried out to properly establish the extent of any risk. I do not feel this should be left unresolved for a development of this scale.

There are also flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, and aspects of the proposed drainage arrangements still appear to require further work and clarification.

The transport arrangements also concern me. The Transport Assessment appears to contain repeated references to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a history of serious collisions. Given the number of people who could be living at the site, I believe pedestrian safety and access need to be properly understood and addressed.

I am also concerned that there does not appear to be a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. It seems difficult to justify approving accommodation for up to 1,256 people when fundamental infrastructure requirements have not yet been fully resolved.

The proposed development is also exceptionally large for what is a relatively isolated location. There is limited public transport, little surrounding infrastructure and relatively few services within walking distance. I am concerned about whether this is genuinely an appropriate location for a development of this size and whether the wider impacts on the surrounding area have been fully considered.

I am also concerned about the very short period being provided for representations. This is a substantial and complicated application, with documents running to well over 1,000 pages across a number of technical disciplines. It is simply not realistic to expect local residents,

councils and technical specialists to properly review and understand all of this information within such a short period.

Ordinary planning applications generally provide a minimum 21-day consultation period, and the standard Crown Development process provides 21 days at each stage. I therefore respectfully ask that the representation period is extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, until 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 this previous history should also be taken into account when considering whether this is an appropriate location.

Taken together, these concerns leave me unconvinced that the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

I therefore respectfully ask that the application is refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I would ask that no decision is made until the outstanding issues relating to drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning have been properly addressed and the relevant information made available for public and technical scrutiny.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns.

Yours faithfully,

Louise Bridge
[redacted]