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 06:08:46

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to formally 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 respectfully ask that planning permission for this proposal be refused.

I appreciate that decisions of this nature are complex and that the need for suitable accommodation must be considered carefully. However, I am deeply concerned that this particular application has not demonstrated that this site is safe, suitable or adequately prepared for a development of such an exceptional scale.

There are serious concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, while significant questions remain unanswered in relation to fire safety, ground conditions and the overall suitability of the site.

I am particularly concerned about **ground contamination**. Previous land-quality work has identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been undertaken to properly investigate and resolve those risks. I do not believe it is appropriate to proceed with a development intended to accommodate up to 1,256 people when such fundamental questions about the condition of the land remain unanswered.

There are also significant concerns regarding **flooding and drainage**. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, and aspects of the proposed drainage strategy remain unresolved. These are not minor matters; they are fundamental considerations when determining whether a site is capable of safely accommodating such a large population.

The **transport evidence** also raises serious concerns. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, which gives me considerable concern about the reliability and accuracy of the assessment itself. The B4011, which serves the site, has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. I am therefore particularly worried about the safety of pedestrians and other road users if such a substantial number of people are brought to this location.

There are further unresolved questions concerning essential infrastructure, including **electricity and wastewater**. The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for these fundamental services. It is difficult to understand how permission could responsibly be granted for accommodation for up to 1,256 people while such basic infrastructure requirements remain unresolved.

I am also deeply concerned by the **scale and location** of the proposal. A development of this size would be exceptionally large for what is, in practical terms, an isolated rural location, with limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within reasonable walking distance.

This is not simply a question of numbers on a planning application. It concerns the creation

of a facility capable of accommodating more than a thousand people in a location that does not appear to have been demonstrated to possess the infrastructure, transport links and services necessary to support a development of this scale safely and sustainably.

I am equally concerned about the **extremely short representation period** that has been provided.

The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages and cover numerous technical disciplines. I find it very difficult to see how residents, local councils and technical specialists can reasonably be expected to read, understand and properly scrutinise such a substantial body of information within such a short period.

Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21-day representation period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage. Given the scale and complexity of this proposal, I respectfully ask that the representation period be extended to **at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, ending on Monday 28 September 2026**, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

Residents deserve a genuine opportunity to understand what is being proposed and to raise properly informed concerns. A decision of this magnitude should not be made before the evidence has had adequate time to be examined.

It is also important to 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. I believe that history deserves proper consideration when assessing whether this location is genuinely suitable for the current proposal, which is substantially larger.

Taken together, these concerns leave me unable to accept that the applicant has demonstrated that **Site A is a suitable location for a development of this exceptional scale**.

I therefore respectfully, but sincerely, ask the Secretary of State to **refuse planning permission**.

If, notwithstanding these concerns, the Secretary of State is minded to approve the application, I respectfully request that no decision is made until all outstanding work and questions concerning **drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning** have been fully addressed, completed and made publicly available for proper scrutiny.

I hope that the concerns of local residents and the importance of making a safe, properly evidenced and sustainable planning decision will be given the careful consideration they deserve.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objection.

Yours faithfully,



Sent from my iPhone