**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 17:26:47

[redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Secretary of State,

Re: Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

I am contacting you to raise my strong objection to the proposed asylum accommodation development at Site A, MOD Bicester. Having considered the scale of the proposal and the information currently available in support of it, I do not believe that this location has been demonstrated to be suitable for accommodation of up to 1,256 people. I therefore ask that planning permission be refused.

I have significant concerns regarding the completeness and adequacy of the evidence submitted in support of the application. Important ecological and technical matters remain outstanding, while substantial questions remain regarding contamination, ground conditions, drainage and flooding, fire safety, highways, infrastructure and the overall suitability of the site for a development of this scale.

Ground conditions and contamination

I am particularly concerned that the potential for ground contamination has not been adequately investigated. Previous land-quality assessments identified potential contamination issues, yet I understand that no borehole investigation has been undertaken to properly establish the nature and extent of any contamination or associated risks.

Given the scale and proposed use of the development, I do not consider it appropriate for these matters to remain unresolved.

Flooding and drainage

There are also significant concerns regarding flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are identified as being at high risk of surface-water flooding, while aspects of the proposed drainage strategy remain unresolved.

A development accommodating up to 1,256 people would place

considerable demands on drainage infrastructure, and I believe these matters should be fully investigated and resolved before any planning permission is granted.

Highways, transport and pedestrian safety

The transport evidence also raises serious concerns. The Transport Assessment repeatedly appears to refer to the wrong road, which calls into question the reliability and accuracy of the assessment.

Furthermore, the B4011, which serves the site, has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. The scale of the proposed development makes it particularly important that the impact on highway safety, pedestrians and other road users is fully and accurately assessed.

Essential infrastructure

I am also concerned that the application has not demonstrated a confirmed, permanent solution for essential infrastructure, including electricity and wastewater.

I do not believe a development intended to accommodate up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental infrastructure requirements remain unresolved.

Suitability and scale of the site

The proposed development is exceptionally large in relation to its isolated rural location. The site has limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport provision and relatively few services within walking distance.

I therefore have serious concerns about whether this is an appropriate and sustainable location for accommodation on this scale, and whether the needs of the people who would be accommodated there could realistically be met by the location.

Insufficient time for proper consideration

I am also extremely concerned about the very short period provided for public representations.

The application comprises well over 1,000 pages of material across numerous technical disciplines. It is not reasonable to expect members of the public, local residents, councils and technical specialists to read,

understand and properly scrutinise such a substantial body of evidence within such a limited timeframe.

Ordinary planning applications are subject to a minimum 21-day consultation period, and the standard Crown Development process provides for 21 days at each stage. I therefore respectfully request that the representation period be extended to provide at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking the deadline to Monday 28 September 2026, as the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

Given the exceptional scale and complexity of this proposal, allowing sufficient time for meaningful public scrutiny is particularly important.

Previous consideration of the site

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

This previous history should, in my view, be taken into account when considering whether Site A is an appropriate location for asylum accommodation, particularly given the significantly larger scale of the current proposal.

Conclusion

Taken together, these issues lead me to believe that the applicant has not demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale, or that the potential impacts have been adequately assessed and satisfactorily addressed.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission for application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I respectfully request that no decision is made until the outstanding matters relating to drainage, flooding, wastewater, ground contamination, ecology, highways and pedestrian safety, electricity supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning have been fully investigated, resolved and made available for proper public and technical scrutiny.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]