From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 15 September 2026 16:33:55

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

WRONG PLAN, WRONG SITE

Community-led campaign opposing the proposed asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester · wpws.org.uk

To: crowncasework@communities.gov.uk

Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Site: Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

Date: 10 September 2026

Re: Formal objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, submitted on behalf of Wrong Plan, Wrong Site

Dear Secretary of State,

Wrong Plan, Wrong Site (WPWS) is a community-led campaign group formed in response to this proposal, representing residents of Bicester and the surrounding villages. This is a consolidated, organisational objection, submitted separately from and in addition to the individual representations being made by our supporters, drawing together the evidence base against this application in one place.

This application concerns a proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester. Our objection is set out in four parts below: procedural fairness, environmental and heritage risk, infrastructure and public services, and planning policy, scale and precedent.

Our position, in summary

1. Planning permission should be refused, for the reasons set out below.

2. If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, the representation period should first be extended to at least 21 days, from 7 September 2026 to Monday 28 September 2026, to allow proper scrutiny of a very large volume of technical material.

3. If the application is approved, no decision should be implemented until the outstanding technical work identified in Section B and C below has been completed and published for scrutiny.

A. Procedural fairness and consultation

- **Representation period.** The published representation period, 7 to 17 September 2026, is just 11 days. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so 11 days falls well short of the baseline used everywhere else in the planning system. The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, which is not a reasonable amount of material to read and properly consider in that time. We 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.

- **Incomplete evidence.** The evidence submitted with the application is not complete. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

- **Conflicting scale figures.** Different application documents contain inconsistent figures relating to the size, phasing and capacity of the proposed development, with one document referring to 3,510 service users rather than the 1,256 stated elsewhere. This inconsistency has not been explained or resolved anywhere in the application.

- **Screening evidence inconsistencies.** We note apparent inconsistencies between documents concerning nearby development and the assessment of cumulative impacts, which raise questions about the reliability of the environmental screening process.

- **No published site selection process.** The application does not set out a detailed comparison showing what alternative sites were considered, the criteria used, or why Site A was selected over other options, and we believe this should be published.

B. Environmental and heritage risk

- **Ground contamination.** 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.

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

- **Ecology and biodiversity.** We are concerned about the age and completeness of the

ecological evidence submitted, and about whether the biodiversity net gain requirements that should apply to a development of this kind have been properly addressed.

- **Lighting and its effect on wildlife.** A detailed lighting scheme, and an assessment of its potential effects on wildlife including bats using nearby hedgerows and woodland, has not yet been completed.

- **Archaeology and heritage.** No field archaeological evaluation has yet been undertaken, despite the recognised potential for Roman and medieval remains in the wider area around Alchester.

- **Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI.** We have concerns about whether a hydrological pathway could connect development at Site A with the nearby Arncott Bridge Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest, and whether this issue has been fully resolved.

C. Infrastructure, safety and public services

- **Essential infrastructure unconfirmed.** The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. We do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

- **Wastewater uncertainty.** We remain concerned about whether a permanent sewage solution can be delivered within the proposed lifespan of the scheme, and what arrangements would operate until then.

- **No decommissioning plan.** Although permission is sought on a temporary basis, we have not been able to find any detailed information in the application explaining how the development would eventually be removed and the site restored.

- **Local infrastructure planning.** Site A does not form part of the development for which Cherwell's existing Infrastructure Delivery Plan was prepared, and we have concerns about how the additional infrastructure requirements this development would generate would be accommodated.

- **Emergency and hospital services.** The documents acknowledge that hospital care would not be provided on site, and we are concerned about the additional demand this could place on existing local health and emergency services.

- **Unexploded ordnance.** The application's unexploded ordnance assessment remains preliminary, and a more detailed risk assessment cannot yet be completed.

- **Transport and pedestrian safety.** The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions.

D. Planning policy, scale and precedent

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

- **Conflict with local planning policy.** The site sits outside established settlements and has little surrounding public transport, retail or community infrastructure, and we have concerns about its compatibility with the adopted local development plan.

- **Site 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 and request

Taken together, these issues mean Wrong Plan, Wrong Site does not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale. On behalf of our supporters, we respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Should the Secretary of State be minded to approve the application notwithstanding the above, we ask, in the alternative, that the representation period first be extended as set out in Section A, and that no decision be implemented until the outstanding work identified in Sections B and C has been completed and made available for proper public scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]