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 18:35:10

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 formally object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed asylum accommodation centre for up to 1,256 people at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

Although I live in Scotland and am not a local resident, I nevertheless feel strongly that a proposal of this scale should only be approved where the suitability and safety of the site have been properly demonstrated. Having considered the information available, I do not believe that has happened in this case, and I would ask that planning permission is refused.

One of my main concerns is the number of important matters that appear either not to have been fully investigated or to remain unresolved. For a development intended to accommodate more than 1,200 people, I would expect these issues to be properly addressed before any decision is made.

In particular, I am concerned about the condition of the land. Previous land-quality work has identified potential contamination issues, but as I understand it, no borehole investigation has yet been carried out to establish the extent of any contamination or the risks involved. Given the proposed use of the site, I find it difficult to understand how its suitability can be properly assessed without this work being completed.

Flooding and drainage are another concern. Parts of the site are identified as being at high risk of surface-water flooding, while elements of the drainage strategy still appear to be unresolved. This is surely something that should be established with confidence before permission is granted.

I also have concerns about access and road safety. The Transport Assessment apparently refers repeatedly to the wrong road, which raises questions about the reliability of the assessment. The B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. A development of this scale will inevitably have implications for pedestrians, traffic and highway safety, and these need to be properly considered.

There also does not appear to be a confirmed permanent solution for some of the

most basic infrastructure required to support the site, including electricity and wastewater. I do not believe permission for accommodation for up to 1,256 people should be granted while essential services of this kind remain uncertain.

The location itself also concerns me. This is an exceptionally large proposal for an isolated rural site with limited public transport, little surrounding infrastructure and relatively few everyday services within walking distance. The size of the proposed development makes those limitations particularly significant.

I am also concerned about the very limited amount of time allowed for representations. The application documentation runs to well over 1,000 pages and covers numerous specialist and technical areas. Local residents and councils, as well as relevant specialists and other interested parties, should have a realistic opportunity to examine that material and make properly informed representations.

For an application of this size and complexity, the current representation period does not seem reasonable. Ordinary planning applications have a minimum 21-day period, and the standard Crown Development process also provides for 21 days at each stage. I therefore ask that the representation period is extended to provide at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking the deadline to Monday 28 September 2026, as the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

I am also aware that this site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector and subsequently cancelled. I believe that history deserves serious consideration when assessing whether an even larger proposal at the same location is appropriate.

There also appear to be outstanding questions concerning ecology, fire safety and other technical matters. Taken together with the concerns over contamination, flooding, drainage, highways, infrastructure and the suitability of the location, I do not believe sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Site A is appropriate for a development of this nature and scale.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that planning permission is refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I would ask that no decision is taken until all outstanding work relating to drainage and flooding, wastewater, ground contamination, ecology, highways and pedestrian safety, electricity supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and eventual decommissioning has been completed, published and allowed sufficient time for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully

Vivien Gracie

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android