[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 21:53
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]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, which proposes a 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.

I have serious concerns about whether the application has provided sufficient and reliable evidence to demonstrate that this site is suitable for a development of this scale. There appear to be important gaps in the ecological and technical information submitted, with significant questions still outstanding around contamination, flooding and drainage, highways and pedestrian safety, fire safety, ground conditions and essential infrastructure.

I am particularly concerned about the lack of a full investigation into potential ground contamination. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to properly establish the extent of those risks. I do not believe these matters should be left unresolved when considering accommodation for up to 1,256 people.

There are also significant concerns regarding flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, while aspects of the proposed drainage strategy remain unresolved. These are fundamental considerations that should be properly addressed before planning permission is granted.

The transport evidence is also concerning. 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. The scale of the proposed development would inevitably place additional pressure on the local road network and surrounding infrastructure, and I do not believe the application has adequately demonstrated that pedestrian and highway safety can be maintained.

I am also concerned that there is not yet a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure, including electricity and wastewater. A development accommodating up to 1,256 people should not, in my view, be approved while such fundamental requirements remain unresolved.

The sheer scale of the proposal is another major concern. This is an exceptionally large development for what is an isolated location, with limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. The impact of placing such a large number of people in this particular location needs to be properly assessed, rather than simply considering whether the site can physically accommodate the proposed buildings.

I am also concerned that the extremely short period given for public representations does not provide local residents with a fair opportunity to consider these issues. The application is substantial and technically complicated, with documents running to well over 1,000 pages across multiple disciplines. It is not reasonable to expect local residents, councils and technical specialists to properly read, understand and respond to such an application within such a limited timeframe.

Ordinary planning applications have a minimum 21-day representation period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage. I therefore ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking it to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

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 makes it particularly important that the suitability of this site, and the reasons why this substantially larger proposal should be considered acceptable, are properly demonstrated.

Taken together, these concerns lead me to believe that 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 is made until the outstanding work and concerns relating to drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning have been fully addressed and the relevant evidence has been made available for proper public and technical scrutiny.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objection.

Yours faithfully,

