[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 17:20
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

[redacted] [redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

Re: Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

I am writing [redacted] to formally register my strong objection to the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester.

[redacted], I am clear that this site is fundamentally unsuitable for a development of this nature. A smaller proposal for asylum accommodation on this site was previously deemed inappropriate, refused by an independent Planning Inspector, and subsequently cancelled. The basic constraints of the location have not changed in 20 years, and this significantly larger proposal should be rejected again.

My objection rests on several major technical and procedural deficiencies:

- **Incomplete Technical Evidence:** Crucial ecological and technical surveys remain outstanding. Ground contamination risks identified in previous land-quality reports have not been properly investigated, and no borehole testing has been conducted to resolve known risks.
- **Flooding & Drainage Infrastructure:** Parts of the site face a high risk of surface-water flooding, and key aspects of the drainage strategy remain completely unresolved. Furthermore, the application fails to confirm permanent solutions for basic essential services, including wastewater management and electricity supply.
- **Highways & Pedestrian Safety:** The Transport Assessment contains fundamental errors, including repeatedly citing the wrong road. The B4011 serving the site lacks adequate pedestrian infrastructure and has a documented history of serious collisions.
- **Isolation & Scale:** Placing a 1,256-person facility in an isolated rural location with negligible surrounding infrastructure, poor public transport links, and very few services within walking distance is unfeasible and unsustainable.
- **Procedural Unfairness:** The consultation window is unreasonably short for a complex application spanning over 1,000 pages of technical documentation. Standard planning applications allow a minimum of 21 days. I request that the representation period be extended to at least Monday 28 September 2026 (allowing 21 days from 7 September 2026, accounting for the 21st day falling on a Sunday).

It is unacceptable to approve a development of this scale while fundamental questions surrounding fire safety, ground conditions, flooding, and utilities remain unanswered.

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused. If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no final decision be taken until all outstanding technical

assessments—concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, safety, power, lighting, noise, and decommissioning—are fully completed and published for public scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

Max Dreier

[redacted]

[redacted]