From:	Pauline Sutton
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
Date:	13 September 2026 16:07:59

[redacted]

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.

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.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

I am 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.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.
I
n addition, I am concerned also about how the residence are going to occupy their time and will boredom set in, as there is little to do in the vicinity and also a lack of things to do near by, so will this result in discontent showing in a number of ways. Bicester and the surrounding areas
are growing very fast with little infrastructure for the present community, so what entertainment will be available to the occupants of the site. This could cause a lot of discontent in the area, which isn't healthy and could cause phycological problems for the residents of the asylum
accommodation.

The cost of turning the site into residential dwellings considering the above problems of the site could be large

and we have at present a number of people without homes and a number of homeless people for no fault of their own, who require accomodation.

.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 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,

Pauline Sutton (Mrs)

