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, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Date: 11 September 2026 18:54:36

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public and a resident of the Bicester area for 30+ years 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 following grounds:

The proposed site on MOD Bicester site A has not been fully assessed and evidence provided concerning possible ground contamination. This site has previously has been the subject of suspected land contamination issue and no further work has been undertaken to look into this key question. A 2010 assessment found this site unsuitable for redevelopment so why should it even be considered in 2026 as suitable for housing asylum seekers.

The wider area contains important habitats and ecological assets. Proper site-specific environmental and protected-species surveys are needed before development proceeds.

Turning to Flooding and drainage risks of this proposed site. Could the scheme increase flood risk elsewhere. We need adequate provision for extreme rainfall and climate change. These issues need to be fully assessed and documented before permission is granted.

A proposal of this size will impact up transport infrastructure. Neither a footpath or cycle path exist on the B4011 and the proposed site is nearly 5 miles from the centre of Bicester. A site of this size is not suitable as it sits alongside the B4011 which is a road currently permitting 60mph speed limit. The Governments own planning documents acknowledge a fundamental problem with the location: access to the site by walking and cycling is poor. Little current infrastructure or transport links exist in this area as deemed by the Government already ‘not ideal’ due to the rural location.

Residents would need access to GPs, hospitals, mental-health support, dentistry, interpreters and ambulance services. The Government must show that suitable provision is available and that this does not impact upon the services in place for current population.

The proposal would place major new demands on water, wastewater, electricity, drainage and communications. Site-specific capacity evidence has not yet been published.

A proposal to accommodate around 1,250 single adult men at a rural site requires a clear, evidence-led assessment of community safety. The Government should show how women, children and vulnerable people have been considered, what policing and reporting arrangements would be in place, and how public transport, walking routes, lighting and other local safety issues have been assessed.

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.

Local communities were not involved while the proposal was being developed. Residents deserve access to the evidence and a genuine opportunity to influence the decision.

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,

Mrs Gill Court
[redacted]