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 10:43:59

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at [redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to 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.

I ask that planning permission be refused as it was in 2003, when this site was previously looked at and deemed unsuitable. The proposal is exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application.

The transport evidence is of such poor quality I am astonished it has been included. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road which leads me to believe it was a cut and paste error which is unacceptable. The B4011 serving the site is a dangerous 50mph road with minimal pavement. I live locally and have been first on scene at two accidents in just the past year, one of which led to significant injuries. This is not bad luck, but a demonstration of how many accidents occur on it. Statistics supporting this are freely available but do not appear to have been referenced. I noticed when driving past, a traffic survey was only being carried out within the last week, which means it's impossible for the results to have been considered. There is limited pedestrian infrastructure- the only pavement nearby leads to a male prison, which I assume is not somewhere you would like male asylum seekers to congregate.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Large parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, in fact if you overlay the surface water map you can barely see any areas which may not be at risk. It is not safe to house anyone, let alone vulnerable people in poor quality housing. There is significant fluvial flood risk to the north and surrounding area which may also cause a danger. Aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved. The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding. I do not believe full consideration has been given to the local important wildlife sites and sites of special scientific interest. Lighting is a particular concern in such a rural area and is disruptive to many protected species. Ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

I am 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, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly considered in so short a time. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so I ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

Taken together, these issues mean I do not believe the applicant has 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

outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Regards,

[redacted]