From: [redacted]
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 08:46:46

[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.

My main concerns are about whether this is a suitable location for a development of this scale, particularly when it comes to transport, pedestrian safety, infrastructure and the pressure it could place on services that are already there to serve the local population.

I am particularly concerned about road and pedestrian safety. The site is in a relatively isolated location and the surrounding roads do not have the sort of continuous pavements, lighting and pedestrian infrastructure that I would expect to see for a development accommodating more than 1,200 people. People living at the site will inevitably need to travel to access shops, services, appointments and other facilities. I do not think the application adequately demonstrates that this can be done safely, particularly for pedestrians.

I am also concerned about the wider infrastructure needed to support a development of this size. Electricity, wastewater, drainage and other essential services need to be properly established and demonstrated to have sufficient capacity before a decision is made. I do not think it is reasonable to approve a development of this scale while there are still unanswered questions about whether the necessary permanent infrastructure can actually support it.

Another issue that concerns me is the pressure that could be placed on local emergency and hospital services. The proposal is for a very large number of people in one location, yet there is no hospital or equivalent healthcare facility on the site. Any additional demand will therefore have to be dealt with by existing local services. I would like to see much clearer evidence showing that the NHS, ambulance service and other emergency services have been properly consulted and have the capacity to deal with the additional demand without affecting the service available to existing residents.

I am also concerned about what happens at the end of the proposed use. If this is genuinely a temporary development, there should be a clear and detailed decommissioning and restoration plan. The application should explain who will be responsible for removing the accommodation and associated infrastructure, restoring the site and paying for this work. This should not be left as an issue to be dealt with years down the line.

Taken together, these concerns make me question whether Site A is an appropriate location for a development of this size. I believe the Government needs to demonstrate, with proper evidence, that the roads are safe, that the

necessary infrastructure can support the development, that local emergency and hospital services can cope, and that there is a credible plan for the eventual decommissioning and restoration of the site.

I therefore respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

If the application is nevertheless minded to proceed, I ask that no decision is made until the outstanding issues around highways, pedestrian safety, infrastructure capacity, healthcare and emergency services, and decommissioning have been properly assessed and the evidence made available for public scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

Sundeep Wilson
[redacted]