[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 20:59
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

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

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

I am writing as a local resident and member of the public to formally object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, which proposes an asylum accommodation centre for up to 1,256 people at Site A, MOD Bicester.

I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

My concerns are not based on opposition to providing accommodation for people seeking asylum. They are based on whether this particular site is appropriate for a development of such exceptional scale, and whether the necessary infrastructure, services and safeguards are genuinely in place to support it.

Incomplete evidence and unresolved technical matters

I have significant concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, while serious questions remain regarding fire safety, ground conditions, drainage, wastewater, highways and the overall suitability of the site.

In particular, I am concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to properly establish and resolve those risks.

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

The transport evidence raises further concerns. 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. It is difficult to see how the application can demonstrate that the safe and sustainable movement of up to 1,256 additional residents has been adequately addressed.

The application has also not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure, including electricity and wastewater. A development accommodating potentially 1,256 people should not, in my view, be approved while fundamental infrastructure requirements remain unresolved.

The scale of the proposal and impact on Bicester and surrounding communities

The sheer scale of this proposal is deeply concerning. An accommodation centre for up to 1,256 people represents a substantial population in its own right, and it is proposed in a location with limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and relatively few services within walking distance.

Bicester is already a town experiencing significant pressure on its infrastructure and public services. The town also accommodates a very significant visitor population through Bicester Village, which places additional pressure on roads, transport, policing and other local services. At the same time, residents are acutely aware of the limitations in public funding available to support the existing community and the services on which it relies.
I am particularly concerned about the additional pressure this proposal could place on Thames Valley Police and other emergency services. The local policing resources are not unlimited, and I question whether the existing police force and emergency-service infrastructure have the capacity to support a development of this size, particularly given the isolated location and the potential demands placed upon local services.

These concerns should not be dismissed as simply an objection to the number of people proposed. The fundamental planning question is whether the necessary infrastructure and public services have the capacity to support an additional population of this magnitude in this particular location.

The impact would be substantial on the nearby village of Piddington is a small rural community with limited infrastructure and services. I am concerned that residents could experience a disproportionate impact from a development of this scale, with increased traffic, pressure on local roads and services, and potential demands on a community that is simply not equipped to absorb such a significant increase in population.

As a parent and local resident

I am also writing [redacted]. This is not an abstract planning issue for me. The safety, security and wellbeing of my family and the wider community are important considerations in deciding whether this is an appropriate location for a development of this scale.

I have particular concerns about pedestrian safety, emergency response times, road safety and the ability of local services to respond effectively if incidents occur.
I appreciate that people seeking asylum may themselves be vulnerable and deserve to be treated with dignity and compassion. However, that does not remove the need for government to ensure that accommodation is located in places where residents can be properly supported and where the host community has the infrastructure and services necessary to manage the additional population safely and sustainably. In my view, this application has not demonstrated that this balance has been achieved.

Insufficient time for proper consideration

I am also concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a substantial and complicated application.

The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines. It is not reasonable to expect residents and other interested parties to read, understand and properly respond to such a significant body of evidence within such a limited period.

Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21-day representation period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at each stage. I therefore respectfully request that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking it 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

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

The fact that a previous proposal was considered and refused reinforces the need for particularly careful scrutiny of whether this site is genuinely suitable for the proposed use and scale.

Conclusion

Taken together, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for an asylum accommodation centre of up to 1,256 people.

The combination of unresolved technical matters, flooding and drainage concerns, questions regarding contamination and infrastructure, inadequate pedestrian and transport provision, pressure on already stretched local services, concerns regarding policing and emergency-service capacity, and the disproportionate impact on nearby rural communities means that I do not consider this proposal to represent sustainable or appropriate development for this location.

I therefore respectfully request that the Secretary of State refuse planning permission for application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I respectfully request that no decision is made until the outstanding matters concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning have been fully addressed, independently assessed where appropriate, and made publicly available for proper scrutiny.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Kind regards

[redacted]