[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 14:21
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

[redacted]

[redacted]

Adrian Tatum

[redacted]

13th September 2026

Dear Secretary of State,
I object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed temporary asylum accommodation at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE. I ask that you refuse planning permission.

[redacted] My concern is not abstract: the road between [redacted] and Site A is an unlit rural route with no pavements and traffic travelling at speeds of up to 60 mph. It does not safely support people walking or cycling between the communities and the site.

The Travel Plan itself confirms the central problem. It acknowledges that the site is not ideal for access by sustainable travel modes. It identifies no facilities other than sports pitches within a 2 km walk of the site, limited pedestrian and cycle accessibility, and a B4011 subject to a 50 mph limit. It instead relies on the site being as self-contained as possible and on shuttle buses or minibuses for necessary off-site trips. In my view, this does not demonstrate that this isolated rural location is suitable for a development of this scale.

Traffic and transport

The proposal would accommodate up to 1,256 people, alongside staff, visitors, deliveries, refuse vehicles, coaches and minibuses. The cumulative effect would place an unacceptable additional burden on rural roads and local infrastructure. The Travel Plan proposes 147 car spaces for staff and visitors, while providing only seven cycle spaces, and its measures concentrate on encouraging employees to change their travel habits after occupation. It does not provide a convincing, operationally detailed answer to the likely volume, routing, timing, capacity or environmental effects of regular shuttle-bus movements needed to connect a population of this size with external services.

The Travel Plan also uses 2011 Census journey-to-work data as a preliminary baseline and says it will set site-specific targets only after first occupation. Monitoring is proposed within six months of

occupation and subsequently over several years. In my view, it is not acceptable to approve the development first and establish whether its transport assumptions work afterwards. The evidence and mitigation should be complete, tested and available for public scrutiny before any decision is made.

Rural character, environment and local services

[redacted] the surrounding villages depend on a limited rural road network and have few facilities. Increased vehicle movements, including shuttle buses, would add noise, emissions and disturbance to a largely rural landscape. I am also concerned about the effects on the local environment and ecology. These effects should be fully assessed, together with the cumulative pressure on local health, policing and other community services, before a proposal of this size is considered acceptable.

Community safety and capacity

The application proposes accommodation for up to 1,256 non-detained single adult men. The Travel Plan says that residents would be free to come and go from the site. I do not suggest that people seeking asylum are inherently a risk. Still, the scale and location of this proposal make it essential that the application openly demonstrates how community safety, safeguarding, supervision, policing, healthcare and access to local services would be properly resourced. I have not seen sufficient evidence to give nearby residents confidence that these impacts have been assessed and funded.

Consultation and planning history

I am concerned by the very short consultation period for a complex proposal supported by extensive technical material. Residents, councils and specialists need a fair opportunity to examine the evidence. I also understand that a smaller asylum accommodation proposal for this site was rejected following a public inquiry in 2003. The current proposal is substantially larger. The application should clearly explain what material circumstances have changed and why the site is now suitable, particularly given the location's continued isolation and limited infrastructure.

Outstanding technical evidence

I am also concerned that essential technical matters remain unresolved. Previous land-quality work is understood to have identified potential contamination issues, yet I understand that no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks. I also have concerns about surface-water flooding and drainage, including whether the drainage strategy has been properly resolved. These are fundamental site-suitability matters and should not be left to be addressed after consent.

The application has not, in my view, demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for electricity and wastewater. Nor should a development of this scale proceed without complete and publicly scrutinised evidence on fire safety, lighting, noise, ecology and eventual decommissioning. I am also concerned by reported inconsistencies in the transport evidence, including references to the wrong road, and by the need for clear evidence on collision history, highway safety and pedestrian safety on the B4011 and adjoining rural roads.

The consultation period should be extended.

The short representation period does not allow residents, local authorities or technical specialists sufficient time to examine a substantial proposal supported by a large volume of material across several disciplines. I request that the consultation period be extended to at least 21 days and that, if any material evidence is added or amended, the public be given a further proper opportunity to comment.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused. If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the proposal, no decision should be made until complete, independently scrutinised evidence is published on transport and shuttle operations, highway and pedestrian safety, environmental and ecological effects, police and service capacity, drainage, flooding, contamination, utilities, fire safety, lighting, noise and decommissioning.

Yours faithfully,

Adrian Tatum

Evidence referred to

Site A Bicester Travel Plan, Home Office, June 2026: sections 2.5, 3.2 to 3.7, 4.1 to 4.6, 6.0 to 8.0; in particular pages 12 to 25 and 33 to 36. The document describes the proposal as accommodating up to 1,256 non-detained single adult male service users, acknowledges the location is not ideal for sustainable travel, and sets out the travel measures and monitoring arrangements.