From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework; calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Date: 16 September 2026 22:47:59

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public, and resident of the nearby town of Bicester, to object to the 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.

Its clear to me that the planning application is incomplete and that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development is suitable for this site. There are significant concerns around the impact of the development on the local infrastructure, as well as unanswered safety and environmental questions.

Ground contamination is of particular note, as it has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues.
To compound the hazard parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved. In combination with the contamination risk, any flooding resulting from the development would likely carry significant health risks to those living on the site, in the surrounding areas or indeed travelling on the nearby roads, as well as harm to flora and fauna. The application has not demonstrated that the site is safe for residential use, and I do not believe it should be approved until this matter is fully resolved.

The Transport Assessment indicates no plan to alter the road to support the proposed bus service. Its unrealistic to expect that all the residents of the proposed development will use the bus exclusively, I have grave concerns that there will result an increase in foot-traffic on the road which will inevitably lead to an increase in fatalities and traffic accidents. the Transport assessment makes mention of this being a 'Temporary' site as justification, but in the same sentence indicates that the other parts of the planning here are being designed to support more permanent use in case the need arises, whats more 10 years is not a temporary period -- this is a significant duration.

Its highly concerning that the application does not provide a clear plan for the provision of essential services such as electricity and wastewater. The lack of a confirmed permanent solution for these critical infrastructure elements raises serious questions about the feasibility and sustainability, and cost to public purse. How can an application such as this be approved on the basis of such weak evidence? Clearly this should be rejected at this stage pending a full and robust plan for the provision of essential services.

The proposal is also colossal in scale when taken in comparison to the size of the nearby village, this is an rural location with little infrastructure, public transport and few services within an easy walking distance.

It is offensive that the application is being rushed through, and that the public is being given such a short period to respond. This is a significant development with nuanced and complicated impact on the surrounding area across many facets, a short representation period does not allow sufficient time for proper consideration of the application by the public or indeed by technical specialists.

Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so to shorten this further is to say to us all that our input is not valued and carries little weight. I ask that the Secretary of State extend the period for public consultation to a minimum of 21 days, and that the application be re-advertised to ensure that all interested parties are aware of the proposal and have sufficient time to respond.

The Fire assessment is also of concern, as it does not provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that the site can be safely evacuated in the event of a fire, details are sparse -- often redacted. The proposed development is large and complex, and the lack of planning here is especially insulting to the local townspeople who have so recently lost the lives of two firefighters.

Where, in the event of fire or flood or natural disaster, will the residents of the proposed development be evacuated to -- once such a site is fully complete and occupied there will be no room in the surrounding area, they cannot simply be left in the middle of a busy road inhibiting emergency services and causing further risk to themselves and others. Neighbouring sites are gated with high fences and barbed wire leaving fleeing staff and residents with no escape.

A smaller similar proposal was refused, and subsequently cancelled in the past by an independent Planning Inspector. To expect a development of this scale to now go ahead can only be with the view that the issues outlined before can somehow be brushed under the carpet, and ignored in spite of the risks that they pose to the people involved.

Site A is clearly not shown to be a suitable location for a development of this scale.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is dedicated to continuing in spite of the myriad objections, 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, un-censored and with a reasonable period for public response.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]