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 10:36:33

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

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.

Incomplete evidence base

Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain unresolved on fire safety, ground conditions and the overall suitability of the site.

Ground contamination

Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

Flooding and drainage

Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

Transport

The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road. The B4011, which actually serves the site, has next to none pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. The B4011 is simply too dangerous to have hundreds of people walking on it. This site could lead to **multiple fatalities**.

Infrastructure

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed, permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. A development for up to 1,256 people should not be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

Scale and location

The proposal is exceptionally large for an isolated rural site with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and no services nearby. Those housed in the site are likely to need lots of government support, of which none is near the proposal.

Representation period

The extremely short representation period does not give residents, councils or technical specialists adequate time to examine an application of this scale. The documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, and it is not reasonable to expect proper consideration of them in so short a window. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21-day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage. 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.

Planning history

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

Conclusion

Taken together, these issues mean the applicant has not 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 be made until outstanding work on 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.

Many thanks,

