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: 15 September 2026 14:30:19

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a [redacted] to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed non-detained asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I ask that planning permission be refused.

My objection is based particularly on the likely pressure on healthcare and emergency services, the incomplete ecological evidence, the site's surface-water flooding and drainage constraints, and the previous rejection of this location for asylum accommodation.

Healthcare and emergency-service capacity

The application proposes accommodation for up to 1,256 people and includes space for health and welfare facilities. The Government states that the site is intended to be largely self-contained and that healthcare provision will be determined through discussions with health partners. However, the submitted information does not appear to provide a sufficiently detailed and binding healthcare-delivery plan.

In particular, it does not clearly establish:

- which medical, nursing, dental and mental-health services would be available on site;
- how many healthcare professionals would be required;
- where those professionals would be recruited from;
- whether staffing the site would draw personnel away from existing NHS services or other local healthcare providers;
- which services would still have to be provided by local GP practices, dentists, pharmacies and hospitals; or
- what additional demand would be placed on ambulance, emergency-department and other emergency services.

The provision of rooms or "space" for healthcare is not the same as demonstrating that suitably qualified staff and funded services will be available. If healthcare workers are recruited from an already constrained local or regional workforce, this could reduce capacity elsewhere. Hospital care would necessarily remain dependent on existing services.

Before permission is considered, the applicant should therefore provide a detailed, funded and deliverable healthcare and emergency-services impact assessment, prepared in consultation with the relevant NHS bodies, ambulance service and local healthcare providers. This should quantify expected demand and demonstrate that the proposal would not materially reduce access to healthcare for existing residents.

Ecology and biodiversity

I am also deeply concerned that the ecological evidence is incomplete. The applicant's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal expressly states that, because it was based on a single visit, it cannot be regarded as a comprehensive assessment of the ecological interest of the site.

The appraisal identifies habitat with potential importance for protected wildlife, including trees and buildings with bat-roost potential. It recommends further nocturnal emergence and other

surveys where potentially suitable features may be affected. The site has also been appraised for great crested newts and other protected or notable species.

Local residents in and around Piddington have referred to ecological records and previous Thames Valley environmental studies identifying important species in the area. Any such records should be properly obtained, published and reconciled with the applicant's evidence. It would be unsafe to conclude that the ecological effects are acceptable while species surveys, lighting assessments and other necessary work remain outstanding.

A development involving demolition, modular construction, extensive infrastructure, lighting and occupation by as many as 1,256 people for ten years could have substantial effects on habitats, wildlife corridors, bats, amphibians and other species. Those effects must be fully understood before permission is granted, rather than deferred until after the principle of development has been approved.

Flooding and drainage

The proposed accommodation is situated in a low-lying area where surface-water flooding is a serious concern. As somebody familiar with this locality, I regularly see extensive areas of the surrounding fields affected by flooding during winter, when local ditches and watercourses become overwhelmed.

The applicant's own Flood Risk Assessment states that much of the site is shown as being at high-to-low risk of surface-water flooding and assesses the overall present-day and future surface-water risk as moderate. It also recommends that:

- new development should be located outside surface-water flood extents;
- a hydraulic model of the overland flow path may be required;
- a CCTV condition survey of the private surface-water drainage network should be undertaken; and
- a full ground-investigation study should confirm groundwater levels.

These are significant outstanding matters. The assessment also acknowledges that development could alter hardstanding areas and the site's surface-water flow regime. Drainage, attenuation, groundwater conditions, the condition and capacity of existing drains and the effect on surrounding land and watercourses must therefore be conclusively assessed before any decision is made.

I do not consider it appropriate to approve accommodation for up to 1,256 people on this site while essential investigations and elements of the drainage solution remain unresolved.

Previous rejection of the site

This land has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal, reportedly for approximately 750 people, was refused by an independent Planning Inspector in 2003 and subsequently cancelled.

The present proposal is considerably larger, with capacity for up to 1,256 people and a proposed operational period of at least ten years. The applicant should demonstrate clearly how the reasons and circumstances that led to the earlier refusal have changed and why a substantially larger development should now be considered acceptable. The application does not, in my view, provide sufficient justification for reversing the earlier conclusion about the suitability of this location.

Incomplete evidence and premature determination

More generally, significant questions remain concerning contamination, wastewater, permanent electricity provision, transport, pedestrian safety, lighting, noise, fire safety and eventual decommissioning and restoration of the site.

The exceptionally short representation period has also made it extremely difficult for residents, councils and technical specialists to examine more than 1,000 pages of evidence covering numerous specialist disciplines. I request that the representation period be extended to provide at least the equivalent of a normal 21-day consultation period.

Taken together, these matters demonstrate that the applicant has not established that Site A is a suitable or sustainable location for a development of this nature and scale.

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to grant permission, no decision should be made until the outstanding ecological, biodiversity, healthcare, emergency-services, flooding, drainage, wastewater, contamination, highways, pedestrian-safety, power-supply, lighting, noise, fire-safety and decommissioning evidence has been completed, published and made available for meaningful public and technical scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,



