[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 14:04
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

[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, as there are many areas of concern already raised by our local mp and I have my own concerns as mentioned below.

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.

My other concern [redacted] is the risk of asbestos. This is something we would always need extensive testing and risk assessments to make sure the properties were safe for residents to move in to, and I'm sure a building of the age that you are looking to house the asylum seekers in those numbers, is not adequate in the current state that the site is in.

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.

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

[redacted] wastewater supplies take time to put into place for such a large number of residents, [redacted] always having to look into the future for the new builds to make sure the wastewater plant could cope with the capacity of incoming wastewater. This was not something that was decided and changed in weeks it took months of planning.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. Again, Upper Heyford is a prime example of this, without infrastructure and services how can you expect 1000+ more people to live there.

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.
Based on the last email from the uk government and parliament, and this comment in particular ‘ it is imperative that we fix this system. Only by restoring order and control to our borders can we be the open, tolerant and generous country that we know ourselves to be’ I feel that this is an issue that has needed to be fixed long ago before it reached the situation we are in now, I really hope that before we decide to house more asylum seekers that we deal with the numbers that are currently in our country in a more controlled and organised manor.
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,
Catherine Eaves
[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for iOS