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 14:35:40

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

Dear Secretary of State

I am writing to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 concerning the proposed asylum accommodation centre at MOD Bicester Site A.

Although I do not live immediately beside the site, [redacted] community live in [redacted] I therefore have a genuine connection with people who live and work in the surrounding villages.

Having considered the published information, I am concerned that a development of this exceptional scale is being advanced for an isolated rural site without the necessary technical questions first having been resolved.

The proposal would accommodate as many as 1,256 people and operate for ten years. Describing it as temporary should not obscure the fact that this would create a substantial residential population, larger than that of some of the neighbouring villages, for a full decade. The consequences for transport, infrastructure, the environment and nearby communities therefore require particularly rigorous assessment.

I am not satisfied that the application provides that reassurance.

Ground contamination has not been adequately resolved. Earlier land-quality work identified potential contamination and found investigated areas generally unsuitable for residential redevelopment without remediation, yet no borehole investigation has been undertaken to establish the actual ground conditions upon which this accommodation would be constructed.

The location of the principal accommodation on a low and flood-prone part of the site is also troubling. Surface-water flooding, drainage and attenuation remain material concerns, alongside unresolved questions about the proposed wastewater arrangements. The possibility of a hydrological pathway affecting Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI should be properly investigated before—not after—planning permission is

granted.

There are similar gaps in the ecological evidence. The applicant’s own ecological material acknowledges that the survey cannot be regarded as comprehensive, while further protected-species work remains outstanding. The effects of lighting, construction and prolonged occupation cannot reliably be assessed without that information.

I am also concerned that no field archaeological evaluation has apparently been completed despite the recognised potential for Roman and medieval remains in the wider area. Once intrusive construction and infrastructure works begin, any damage to previously unidentified remains may be irreversible.

The Transport Assessment does not inspire confidence. It repeatedly refers to the B1104 rather than the B4011 adjoining the site. This matters because the B4011 has limited pedestrian infrastructure, poor lighting along parts of the route and a history of injury collisions. Residents would not be detained and would reasonably need to reach shops, appointments and public transport. A credible assessment must therefore examine the road people would actually use and provide a safe, practical means of travelling beyond the site without dependence on an unconfirmed transport arrangement.

Nor has the application demonstrated confirmed and dependable permanent solutions for electricity and wastewater. Fire-safety information also appears incomplete. These are not peripheral details capable of being left until later: they are fundamental to determining whether accommodation for 1,256 people can be provided safely and sustainably at this location.

The very short representation period compounds these problems. Residents, local authorities and technical consultees have been given only 11 days to examine well over 1,000 pages spanning numerous specialist disciplines. That is not a realistic opportunity for meaningful scrutiny, particularly when ordinary planning applications and the standard Crown Development procedure provide 21 days. I therefore ask that the period be extended to Monday 28 September 2026.

Finally, this land has previously been examined for asylum accommodation. A materially smaller proposal, for approximately 750 people, was refused following consideration by an independent Planning Inspector and was subsequently abandoned. The present proposal is

substantially larger. The earlier conclusions should therefore be addressed directly and transparently rather than treated as historical background of little relevance.

Taken together, the scale and duration of the proposal, the site's isolation and the number of unresolved technical matters mean that the applicant has not demonstrated that MOD Bicester Site A is suitable for this development.

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to grant permission, no decision should be taken until the outstanding work on contamination, flooding, drainage, wastewater, ecology, the SSSI, archaeology, highways and pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and eventual decommissioning has been completed, published and allowed a proper period of public and technical scrutiny.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]