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 12:29:31

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as 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.

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.

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. [redacted], this land like Piddington is flooded most years up to your knees. It is totally unsuitable to consider this site to place up to 1250 men on this

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.

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 proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

[redacted] I am worried that the proximity of the new MOD site will have an impact on staff getting to work. Staff work in shifts and if 1250 undocumented men are allowed to roam wherever they want it could have an affect of staff being unable to get to work and for the prison to function properly! The prison already has to deal with drones and people throwing contraband over the wall. Just think how much more contraband will be thrown over the walls when 1250 men are free to roam! This will become a no go area.

The small town of Bicester will become a ghost town if 1250 males are bussed into it on a daily basis, old age pensioners, women and children will not feel safe to walk the streets. This will result in numerous shops, restaurants and pubs closing down.

On the other hand what will happen if the 1250 males are bussed into Bicester Village? So many of our children have got part time jobs whilst still at school there, will they be safe? Security will not be able to contain 1250 males looting shops and I am sure the number of visitors will drop considerably!

I believe the site is unsuitable to take 1250 men next to the small village of Piddington and surrounding villages. Women children and men are frightened of being outnumbered and I believe the Government are just not interested as it is not on their doorstep!!

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. 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,

Linda Franklin



Sent from my iPad