[redacted]

From: John Butler [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, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

[redacted] [redacted]

[redacted]

Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to object very strongly 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 think that planning permission should be refused for the following reasons:

· The application does not set out a detailed comparison showing what alternative sites were considered, the criteria used, or why Site A was selected over other options.

· I have grave concerns about the lack of thoroughness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and important questions remain unanswered around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site - this site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation, and was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled, and this was for a smaller site that the one now being proposed, so why would it suddenly become suitable now?!

· I am also 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 Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has no pavements and a history of accidents. It is a busy and fast road, which I would never want to have to walk along.

· No hospital will be provided on site, I doubt that the existing health services could cope with the extra load. There is also not enough police or other emergency services capacity to deal with the site.

· Essential infrastructure such as electricity, water supply and wastewater have not been properly considered or resolved. Surely a development accommodating up to 1,256 people (let alone the 3,510 stated in one document!) should not be approved while such basic requirements remain unanswered? It is uncertain whether permanent sewage or even electricity can be delivered to the site - at what cost to the taxpaying public and the environment will it entail to get just these basics to the site?

· The proposal is ridiculously large for an isolated and very rural location, with little to do, nowhere to go, very limited public transport and no services within walking distance.

· No proper ecological survey has been carried out on the site. It is known that there are bats there, which are protected. Why is this not being taken into consideration?

· I am also concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide enough 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.

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 still pig-headed enough 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,

Mr John Butler

[redacted].