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: 16 September 2026 21:08:23

[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 a local resident of [redacted] I have numerous concerns regarding how this proposal will affect myself, my family and local residents.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved. The surrounding area's flood every winter. Marsh Gibbon road into Piddington regularly floods increasing traffic along the B4011 as well as the Ploughley road between Arncott and Ambroseden. A small extension to a traveller site on the Widnell lane adjacent to dote A was denied planning permission partly due to concerns that extra hard standing for caravans would increase flooding along that road so how can accommodation for 1256 men not cause flooding?

The transport evidence also raises serious questions. The B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. The paths that are available in the area are poorly maintained and often impassable due to overground shrubs and flooded paths.

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. There are reports that electricity is to be supplied via diesel generators which will cause significant noise and air pollution and against the government's aim of net zero.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. Arncott is the nearest village to Site A with only a small shop, pub. The only reliable bus runs to Bullingdon prison and we struggle with any mobile phone signal and the pavements are small and poorly lit and non salted in the winter making them difficult to use and not suitable for increased foot traffic that Site A will inevitably cause.

I also have concerns that the site will have negative effects on the local wildlife. We regularly walk from Arncott, past HMP Bulingdon and back down Palmer avenue into Arncott. We see deer, badgers, Bats and many different species of birds on our walks and a facility of this size will undoubtedly negatively effect them and this needs serious consideration. Through investigation on site A needs to take place to assess the wildlife and unique ecosystems that will undoubtedly be there.

I am concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils, local emergency services 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.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. The site was historically a storage facility not former barracks that has housed people before. There must be more suitable sites elsewhere in the country.

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.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]