From:	Patricia Webster
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 21:43:07

[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 share the concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and there are significant questions around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

The preliminary ecological appraisal seems to be based on a single visit and explicitly states that it is not considered a comprehensive assessment of the site's ecological interest. The full ecological appraisal has not been established.

I am particularly concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues.y It appears that no borehole investigation has been carried out to investigate and to resolve those risks.

In addition 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 and are of genuine concern. This application seeks approval before hydraulic modelling and drainage investigation has actually been completed.

The transport evidence also raises numerous 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 transport assessment admits the location isn't good and is not ideal.

It is clear that the application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater.

There is a surprising amount of unfinished technical work in the application. Consequently, I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved. Too many important areas are seemingly being based on assumptions, preliminary work or future investigation.

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

The plan totally relies on assumptions that depend heavily on residents behaving in accordance with the intended 'travel plan'. The applicant has a duty to establish details such as, how many off-site trips residents will make; where they go; walking rates; shuttle usage and staff car trips. The application shows zero pedestrian connection or solution i.e. 1256 non-detained men housed next to a rural road where the applicant says walking 'isn't recommended'.

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**. Nothing has changed!

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,

Patricia Webster

