[redacted]

**From:** Anna Kinsella [redacted]
**Sent:** 13 September 2026 11:35
**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 to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 (the proposed asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE).

I ask that planning permission be refused. My concerns are outlined below.

1. Transport:

- the Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road

- the B4011 road serving the site has little to no pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. I drive this road regularly myself, and fear for the safety of any pedestrians. I would fear encountering groups of walkers as I drive the narrow and winding roads around the site, with limited visibility and nowhere to safely step aside. I would not myself risk walking along that road. Even if transport is provided into and out of the site, it would be unreasonable to expect people to only go for a walk outside of the accommodation by travelling elsewhere to do so. Increased pedestrian traffic is inevitable for any site of this kind and size. It is essential that pedestrians and drivers are safe.

2. Ecological and technical work:

- significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site

- ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no substantial investigation has been carried out to resolve the risks

- there are 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

3. Infrastructure

- the application does not demonstrate a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater

I do not believe a development accommodating people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved. This site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation, and a smaller proposal refused by an independent Planning Inspector, before being cancelled. I am immensely concerned that the new application's proposed capacity is exceptionally large for such an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

In addition, the short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a substantial and complicated application. With well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly considered in such a short time frame.

As a result of the issues outlined above, 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,

Dr Anna Emery

