From:	Helen Rossiter
To:	Crown Casework
Cc:	Calum Miller MP; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject:	Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date:	11 September 2026 17:53:37

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

As an ex-civil servant who has previously undertaken investment analysis for a number of projects (including basing decisions), I strongly object to the planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

Based on my review of the released information (and some internet research) I recommend:

1 Refusing planning permission for the Bicester site, and asking to review a full appraisal.This should include a review that is robust, value for money and benefits focussed which has been subjected to relevant scenario analysis.
This should include addressing the option to house long-term residents: how would we look after the mental/emotional health of asylum seekers who have likely no access to volunteering or engaging in the wider community given the remoteness of the site.

2 If the secretary of state is minded to approve the planning permission, I implore them to at least make sure the outstanding work is completed and properly scrutinised first. This would include drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning investigations.

Please note that from my experience if you skip the analysis stage you get late and overspent projects that don't deliver what you want.

Background
I am deeply concerned that pushing forward with a 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE will undermine local and central government strategies.

Ecological
Piddington is near semi-ancient woodland (and flora and fauna may have moved into the site)
https://www.ocv.org.uk/sites.php?id=99
There is also the potential for contamination from soil disturbance, and I also found a reference to great crested newts being found in a local pond (protected species).

Local Cherwell plans
Climate change (which seems at odds with using generators on site given the lack of infrastructure), Sustainable Local development (where the local amenities or 'volunteering' opportunities aren't there for the current let alone new residents), or healthy and sustainable communities (where there doesn't seem any reasonable plan regarding integration).
https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/275/local-plan-review-2040/1116/chapter-2-plan-vision-and-objectives

Oxfordshire Net Zero
How does this fit in with the net zero e.g. how are staff getting to work with the lack of

public transport to a small village, how ecological are the buildings, and is diesel going to be used for electrical generators given the power supply issues?
https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/environment-and-planning/climate-action/enabling-net-zero-county

Travel risks
There is a history of flooding in the area, possibly made worse with additional concreting on site.
https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/3673319.villagers-hit-flash-flood/
Having commuted regularly passed the site, on several occasions in the winter I saw cars in the hedges where they had skidded off. There is a lack of pavements even when the weather is good.

Lessons (not) learned
A previous attempt at turning the site into asylum accommodation was refused. What changes have happened since then - or are things being ignored to get approval (but would derail the project in the medium term impacting price, outcome or delivery dates)?

National Heath, Fire and Police service strategies
I haven't been able to review these areas but the decision would also have an impact on these services too.

The planning proposal doesn't seem to make sense on the timescales as it seems to be pushing you into a risky decision - rather than allowing you to make an informed decision after receipt of essential investigation results.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Rossiter ACMA
[redacted]