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 09:02:55

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

To the Secretary of State,

As a member of the public and UK citizen, I am writing to you 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. I have read the application and am concerned that the evidence submitted with the application is incomplete and not transparent.

Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding. 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.

Ground conditions - especially surface water flooding and drainage. In times of heavy rainfall and flooding, the sewage will surface (we have this problem in Cookham, Berkshire every year without fail). Parts of the site at Site A MOD Bicester are at high risk of flooding. These areas are not fully addressed on the application and are therefore unresolved.

Significant questions also remain unresolved around fire safety, and the suitability of the site.

The transport evidence raises serious questions. The Transport Assessment REPEATEDLY refers to the WRONG road! The B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions.

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, (which I think has also been misrepresented and looks now to be double that number) 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 very few services within walking distance.

I am extremely concerned that the incredibly
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.

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

