From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; greg.smith.mp@parliament.uk; Clerk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 10 September 2026 15:51:54

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 Site 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 on the basis of location suitability / fit for the intended purpose and cost

The Numbers:

The numbers of asylum seekers that this application is for is unclear 1,250 or 3510? And are these numbers based on the current immigration policy rather than a revised policy of reducing the influx of migrants and their asylum assessment following the recent UN's report on the UK process? These numbers impact the planning application process and the longevity of the sites use, together with the impact on local infrastructure and communities.

The application:

The location and the site is unsuitable for any number but the lack of clarity around the numbers is alarming, considering the village adjacent to the site has only 350 residents (47 of them are children) and most villages in the rural area around the site no more than 1,000.
The application to be fully considered and costed requires confirmation of the numbers of asylum seekers and the duration of the site to be operational.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.
- The sites isolation from appropriate everyday amenities, more than 6 miles by road to Bicester, the nearest town
- there is no adequate pedestrian infrastructure and most of the surrounding villages have no pavements
- The absence of footways and lighting around the site access
- The rural nature of the site limits pedestrian access and the applicant's own conclusion that walking is not recommended for local trips and so resulting on the dependance of organised shuttle transport, the cost and logistics that incurs and to where?
- Most of the surrounding villages have a limited bus services and do not benefit from organised shuttle transportation

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.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

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 and therefore sufficient cost analysis

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved. Thames Water are already under severe pressure to deliver fresh water and waste solutions locally and will not support new housing developments

despite planning consent so my concern is to how a development of this size could have sufficient clean water and sewage

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 local amenities for existing residents are already under strain from the supply of water, sewage management, condition of the roads together with the lack of wellness facilities for doctors and dentists.

Importantly This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

The location of this site is right on the border of Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire so an opportunity for a cross community representation is vital and 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.

There is no evidence in the documents that consideration has been given to the impact of local communities including the increase in policing and security need, additional traffic etc

Ordinary planning applications, nothing like the scale and impact of this application 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.

Until a proper public consultation with the local communities has been formalised including impact of local communities and the rural location together 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 - Site A application should be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Melissa Wright

