[redacted]

From: Amelia Thompson [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 12:13
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

Categories: [redacted]

[redacted]

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.

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.

As a woman and a mother, I am particularly concerned about safety. This is currently a relatively low-crime area, and I am concerned about placing such a large population in an isolated location with limited amenities, poor pedestrian infrastructure and limited public transport. I am also concerned about the safety of my children and about how people living at the site would safely access shops, healthcare and other essential services. My concern is about the suitability and infrastructure of the location, rather than about the individuals who may be accommodated there.

I am also concerned about the pressure this development would place on essential infrastructure. [redacted] I am particularly conscious of the existing pressures on water and wastewater services. The ongoing pollution issues experienced by Thames Water, particularly during periods of rainfall, reinforce my concern that the capacity and resilience of these services must be properly demonstrated before a development of this scale is approved. The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater.

I am also concerned about the potential additional pressure on local policing and emergency services. My husband works for the police, so I have a personal understanding of the pressures already faced by the service. A development accommodating up to 1,256 people should demonstrate that the additional demands placed on policing and other emergency services can be properly supported.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. I do not believe the application has demonstrated that this location is suitable for a development of this scale.

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,

Amelia Lamert

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone