[redacted]

From: M Whittaker [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 12:53
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]

[redacted]

13 September 2026

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.

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.

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.

MOD Site A is isolated along a narrow rural road with no safe pedestrian footpaths or lighting. The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. The nearest basic village amenities are miles away, and direct, high-frequency public transport links to Bicester do not exist. Expecting hundreds of residents to navigate these roads on foot presents a major safety risk.

MOD Bicester Site A is also located directly adjacent to a community children's playground. Furthermore, Piddington relies on nearby Ambrosden, including Five Acres Primary School and local preschools, for its early-years infrastructure. Introducing a transient population of up to 1,256 individuals directly next to local play facilities and within the immediate catchment of oversubscribed rural schools introduces severe safeguarding and community-integration risks that have not been adequately assessed or mitigated.

Placing a facility of this scale directly adjacent to small rural villages, where the entire population of nearby Piddington is under 400 people, creates an extreme demographic imbalance. There is no infrastructure or credible integration strategy to support meaningful daily activities or maintain community cohesion.

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.

Surrounding medical practices and NHS networks in Bicester and the surrounding villages are already operating at or over capacity. A sudden influx of up to 1,250 residents requiring complex, wraparound health and wellbeing support will overwhelm local facilities that are already struggling to meet current resident demand.

I am also 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.

In additon, this exact site was subjected to a full public planning inquiry in 2003–2005 for the same purpose. The planning inspector rejected the proposal, citing its geographic isolation, lack of sustainability, and detrimental impact on local infrastructure. Those core issues have not changed; in fact, local roads and healthcare networks are under even greater strain today.

For these reasons, I urge you to oppose these plans and call for a full, transparent local consultation process rather than bypassing standard planning oversight. MOD Site A is simply the wrong location for a facility of this nature.

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,

Michelle Whittaker

[redacted]