[redacted]

From: Chris Hegarty-Swain [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 10:26
To: Crown Casework
Cc: wpwsobjection@gmail.com; calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester

[redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing [redacted] to formally object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, concerning the proposed provision of asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 people at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

Having considered the information currently available in support of the proposal, I do not believe that the application has demonstrated that this is a suitable or sustainable location for a development of this scale. I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

A significant concern is the apparent lack of complete information within the application. Several important assessments and investigations remain outstanding, meaning that potentially significant matters cannot yet be properly assessed. These include issues concerning ecology, fire safety, ground conditions, drainage and the wider suitability of the site.

Land contamination and ground conditions

I am particularly concerned that the risks associated with historic land contamination have not been sufficiently investigated. Previous information has identified potential contamination on the site, but, to my understanding, borehole investigations have not been undertaken to establish the nature, extent and severity of any contamination. It would be inappropriate to determine an application of this magnitude without a comprehensive understanding of these risks.

Flooding and drainage

There also appear to be unresolved issues regarding surface water, flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are susceptible to surface water flooding, while aspects of the proposed drainage strategy remain to be confirmed. These matters should be fully investigated and resolved before any planning decision is reached.

Highways, transport and pedestrian safety

The submitted Transport Assessment also raises concerns. References to an incorrect road call into question the reliability and accuracy of the transport information provided.

Furthermore, the B4011, which provides access to the proposed site, has limited pedestrian infrastructure and has experienced a number of serious road traffic incidents. The impact of introducing a development accommodating up to 1,256 residents, together with associated staff and service vehicles, therefore requires particularly careful consideration. The application should clearly demonstrate that the existing highway network can safely accommodate the additional movements generated by the development.

Essential infrastructure

I am also concerned that there does not appear to be sufficient certainty regarding the provision of essential infrastructure, particularly electricity and wastewater treatment. Before such a large-scale facility is approved, there should be clear evidence that adequate and reliable arrangements are available for the entire operational lifetime of the development.

Scale and location

The proposed scale of the development is, in my view, disproportionate to the character and capabilities of the surrounding area. The site is located in a relatively isolated rural setting with limited public transport, restricted pedestrian connectivity and few local facilities within practical walking distance.

Locating accommodation for up to 1,256 people in such an environment could place considerable pressure on local infrastructure and services and would create significant transport and accessibility challenges.

Public consultation

I am further concerned about the limited period available for members of the public, local authorities and other interested parties to properly examine and respond to what is a highly complex and significant planning proposal.

Given the scale of the development and the number of technical matters requiring assessment, sufficient time should be provided for the submitted documentation to be properly scrutinised and for any outstanding information to be considered before a decision is made.

Previous planning history

It is also relevant that this location has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A previous and smaller proposal was refused following consideration by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being withdrawn. This previous planning history should be taken into account when assessing whether the current, substantially larger proposal is appropriate for the site.

Conclusion

Taken collectively, the concerns outlined above lead me to believe that the applicant has not yet demonstrated that Site A is an appropriate location for a development of this size and nature.

I therefore respectfully ask the Secretary of State to refuse planning permission for application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

Should the Secretary of State be minded to approve the proposal, I would strongly request that no determination is made until all outstanding information and assessments have been completed and made available for proper public and technical scrutiny. This should include, but not be limited to, flooding and drainage, wastewater capacity, land contamination and ground conditions, ecology, highways and pedestrian safety, electricity supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and arrangements for the eventual decommissioning and restoration of the site.

Yours faithfully,

Christopher John Hegarty-Swain

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]