From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: FW: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 Wrong Plan Wrong Site Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Date: 16 September 2026 21:56:49

[redacted]

Sent from my Galaxy

Dear Secretary of State,

Subject: Objection to an urgent Crown Development Order for MOD Bicester Site A

I have serious concerns about how much evidence is still missing from this application. Key ecological and technical assessments remain incomplete, and there are unresolved questions on fire safety, ground conditions, and whether the site is even suitable for a scheme of this kind.The Road is such a fast road, it is only a matter of time before a serous road traffic accident will happen.

One issue that concerns me in particular is that ground contamination has not been properly assessed. Earlier land-quality studies flagged possible contamination, but no borehole investigation appears to have been undertaken to check whether those risks are real.

Flooding and drainage are also far from settled. Significant portions of the site face a high risk of surface-water flooding, and the drainage strategy put forward still has unresolved elements.

The transport case doesn't inspire confidence either. The Transport Assessment repeatedly names the wrong road, and the B4011, which actually serves the site, has poor pedestrian provision and a documented history of serious accidents.

Nor has the application shown a confirmed, permanent answer for essential infrastructure like power and wastewater. A scheme intended to house up to 1,256 people should not be waved through while questions this fundamental remain open.I don't understand why the sight was even chosen as it has no buildings that have housesed large or even small numbers of pick you have to ask how much is going to be spent on accommodation for the 1256 MEN?

Beyond the technical gaps, the proposal is simply out of scale for its setting: a remote, rural location with minimal surrounding infrastructure, poor public transport links, and almost nothing within walking distance.

I'm also concerned that the representation period, as it stands, is far too short for residents, councillors and technical experts to give an application of this complexity the scrutiny it needs. With documentation running to well over 1,000 pages spanning multiple technical fields, it simply isn't realistic to expect proper consideration in such a limited window. Standard planning applications allow a minimum of 21 days, and the ordinary (non-urgent) Crown Development route applies 21 days at each stage — so I'd ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, running to Monday 28 September 2026, since day 21 itself falls on a Sunday.

It's also worth noting that this site has been through this before: a smaller asylum accommodation scheme here was refused by an independent planning inspector, before ultimately being cancelled.

It’s also worth noting that you keep referring to the site as army barracks and it was not used as army barracks.

Taken together, I don't think the applicant has made the case that Site A is an appropriate location for development on this scale.

I would therefore ask that planning permission be refused.

Should the Secretary of State nonetheless be inclined to approve the scheme, I would ask that no decision be taken until the outstanding work on drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been finished and made available for proper public scrutiny.



