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 21:45:14

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I live in [redacted], and I am writing because I am genuinely concerned about the proposed development at MOD Bicester and what it would mean for the community in which I live and raise my child.

I have taken the time to look beyond the headlines and read through the planning information because this is not an abstract issue for me. This is our local area, our roads and infrastructure, and the environment immediately around our home. Having looked at the proposal and the supporting evidence, I do not believe the application demonstrates that this is a suitable site for a development of this scale.

I also want to be completely clear that my objection is not an objection to asylum seekers or to people seeking refuge. My concern is about whether this particular location, and the infrastructure supporting it, can safely and sustainably accommodate up to 1,256 people for ten years.

I am therefore asking that planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 be refused.

The proposal is exceptionally large. It is not simply the reuse of an existing MOD building: it involves substantial new modular accommodation together with roads, parking, security infrastructure, health and welfare facilities, staff accommodation, recreational areas and a wastewater treatment plant. It would accommodate up to 1,256 people for up to ten years. In my view, an application of this scale requires particularly robust and complete evidence that the site and surrounding communities can support it.

My first concern is the apparent incompleteness of the evidence base.

The ecological assessment identifies further survey work as necessary, meaning that the full impact on protected species, habitats and lighting has not yet been established. For a development of this size and duration, I do not believe it is appropriate to make a decision before the necessary ecological evidence is complete.

I am also concerned about ground conditions and potential contamination. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet the evidence does not appear to include the borehole investigation needed to properly resolve those concerns. Before approving accommodation for more than 1,250 people, I believe the condition and suitability of the land should be properly established.

Flooding and drainage are another significant concern. Parts of the site are at risk of surface-water flooding, while questions remain around the proposed drainage arrangements and attenuation. Given the scale of the development, it needs to be demonstrated that the proposals will not increase flood risk or create drainage problems for the surrounding area.

There are also serious questions around transport and pedestrian safety. The Transport Assessment contains repeated references to the B1104 despite the site being served by the B4011. The B4011 has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a history of injury collisions. As a local parent, I am particularly concerned about the interaction between a development of this scale, existing traffic and pedestrians travelling between Upper Arncott, Piddington and surrounding facilities.

The infrastructure requirements also concern me. The application needs to demonstrate reliable arrangements for essential services including electricity and wastewater. The proposal itself includes a wastewater treatment plant, and I do not believe the information currently available provides sufficient reassurance that these fundamental requirements have been fully resolved.

I am also concerned about the impact on the surrounding communities. Upper Arncott and Piddington are not urban areas with extensive public transport, shops and services immediately surrounding the site. The location is relatively isolated, and the proposal would introduce a very large population and associated infrastructure into that setting. The application therefore needs to demonstrate that this is genuinely a suitable and sustainable location, rather than simply a site where accommodation can physically be constructed.

The effects of lighting, noise, traffic, emergency access, security and general site management also need to be properly considered. These are particularly important given the proximity of existing residential communities and the proposed ten year duration of the development.

There is also a relevant planning history. A previous proposal for approximately 750 asylum seekers at this location was refused by an independent Planning Inspector. I recognise that the previous decision does not automatically determine the current application, but the current proposal is substantially larger. I believe it is reasonable to expect the applicant to demonstrate clearly what has materially changed since that decision and why the concerns relevant to the earlier proposal no longer apply.

I am also extremely concerned about the very short period that has been allowed for public representations. The application was published on 2 September and the formal representation period runs only until midnight on 17 September. A request for additional time has now been refused, despite the very substantial volume of technical information involved and apparent inaccuracies in the information used to create this planning application.

The application contains extensive documentation covering transport, flooding and drainage, ecology, contamination and ground conditions, utilities, fire safety, noise and other technical matters. These are not matters that can realistically be scrutinised properly by ordinary residents within such a short period.

I appreciate that this application is being dealt with under an urgent Crown Development process. However, the urgency of the procedure does not make the underlying planning issues any less important. I ask that all substantive concerns raised by local residents are properly considered and that unresolved or incomplete evidence is not treated as adequate simply because the timetable is unusually compressed.

Taken together, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

As a local parent, I want to know that decisions of this magnitude affecting the place where my family lives are based on complete and accurate evidence, properly assessed infrastructure and a genuine understanding of the impact on the surrounding communities. Having reviewed the information available, I do not believe that standard has been met.

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 be made until the outstanding matters relating to drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways and pedestrian safety, electricity supply, lighting, noise, fire safety, emergency access, site management and decommissioning have been fully investigated, addressed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]