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, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Date: 15 September 2026 15:39:01

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

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 request strongly that planning permission be refused.

My concerns are numerous – here are just some.

1. I am concerned that the extremely short consultation period doesn't provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to examine such a substantial and complicated application properly. 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. The time limit for ordinary planning applications is a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so I ask that the consultation 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.

2. The transport evidence raises serious questions. It is incredible that the wrong road is repeatedly referred to, while the B4011 which actually serves the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. I understand that other changes mean that street lights are going to be turned off for part of the night to reduce carbon emissions.

3. 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. Some figures I have seen suggest that the cost of electricity generation by generators could range between £10 000 and £20 000 **per day** and use large amounts of diesel fuel each day. This comes with significant environmental/pollution impact on the local community, which does not appear to have been assessed and this at the same time that street lights are going to be turned off to reduce carbon emissions, which seems crazy. We are trying to reduce emissions on the one hand and creating extra ones on the other.

4. The evidence submitted with the application seems incomplete. Important ecological and

technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site. For example 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.

5. There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site have a historical risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

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

7. This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

8. The application doesn't give any information showing what alternative sites were considered, the criteria used or why Site A was selected over other options.

9. The documents acknowledge that hospital care would not be provided on site. Questions have therefore been raised about the additional demand that could fall on existing local health and emergency services. It is already difficult for many to get medical appointments at surgeries.

10. Site A does not form part of the development for which Cherwell's existing Infrastructure Delivery Plan was prepared, raising questions about how the additional infrastructure requirements would be accommodated and its compatibility with that plan. The site sits outside established settlements and has little surrounding public transport, retail or community infrastructure.

11. Different documents contain inconsistent figures relating to the size, phasing and capacity of the proposed development. One document even refers to over 3 500 residents rather than the 1,250 stated elsewhere.

12. Although permission is being sought on a temporary basis, the objection evidence of a lack of detailed information explaining how the development would eventually be removed and the site restored suggests that it may not be temporary at all. And 10 years is quite a long period of being temporary.

13. 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.

14. It does not seem to be that any decision should be made until outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety, decommissioning etc. has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

I therefore strongly request that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]