[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 19:53
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]

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to you, as the [redacted] who settled in [redacted] and also as a [redacted]

I am also writing as a member of the public living in [redacted] o 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.

As a [redacted] who successfully sought asylum and settled and built their lives in [redacted] I am well informed and have lived experience of our responsibility to support those in need. I am acutely aware of how positively asylum seekers can contribute to the society they join. My grandparents worked hard, bought their own properties, paid taxes, raised families and contributed to society. My family continues to uphold their legacy.

As a [redacted] with experience of delivering [redacted] It is clear that the application is not well supported in terms of ecological and feasibility studies. The cost of pursuing development of the site, without these early detailed considerations, will become an even bigger 'bad news story' than the local attention the development is currently attracting. (Think, HS2 public perception issues, even more polarised, and just around the corner from HS2 sites!)

It's easy to see, that the site cannot and will not be delivered successfully within any sort of accelerated timescales. Applications for power and water, have long lead times, may be cost prohibitive and may ultimately undermine the suitability and safety of this site. I say this, as a [redacted] Choose any NSIP and consider the impact of utilities services- establishment and diversion of- on programme and delays. There are no appropriate temporary solutions for power and water on a site of this size.

It's easy to see, that without appropriate archaeological and ecological surveys, intrusive surveys ([redacted], that there will be delays, disruption, limitations as to how the site can be delivered and ultimately, again, will attract significant local negativity and resistance.

It's easy to see, that creating additional surface water flood risk, will put site users at risk, will create additional cost in the maintenance and operation of the site and also impact further the local area. The business that [redacted] There is acute pressure around flood risk management and again, this is increasingly a pressure point for the public.

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

The way in which this proposal has been prepared is short sighted and without carrying out the necessary due diligence. A decision to continue will
Put more public monies at risk, will not accelerate the delivery of a solution (there will in fact, be delays which could mean delivery of the site is not complete until early 2028).

This is the wrong site.

I would appreciate your reconsideration/ thorough re-application considering the above points to present a realistic picture of what the feasibility of this site actually is. Not what you hope it can be. There must be a more evidence based application.

Learn lessons from other such projects and sites. Don't be blindsided by the need for a quick fix. This is not it.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]