From: Hylma Smit
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 11:59:29

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to record my objection 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 am asking that planning permission be refused.

I believe there are concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application, as important ecological and technical work remains outstanding. There are also significant questions remaining around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

It is very concerning that ground contamination has not been fully investigated, especially in view of previous land-quality work identifying potential contamination issues, and the fact that there has been no borehole investigation carried out to resolve those risks.

Similarly, there are also significant flooding and drainage concerns as parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

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 shown a permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. Surely a development housing up to 1,256 people should not be approved while such basic matters have not been resolved.

Further concerns are the exceptional size of the development for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

Additionally, 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. As ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21-day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage,, I therefore 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.

I believe this site was also previously considered for asylum accommodation. This was a smaller proposal which 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.

Furthermore, it is understandable that the residents of Piddington are greatly concerned about the population in their quiet village suddenly almost tripling - and that by single men. Whilst I realise one should not generalise, it is true that many illegal immigrants come from countries where the culture is entirely different from ours in the UK (as can be seen from the Government's booklet advising immigrants about life here). Women are not respected and are treated as inferior with no rights, and violence against women is accepted. It is more than likely that residents of Piddington will no longer feel safe in their own village.

For all the above reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless wanting 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,

Hylma Smit
[redacted]