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, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Date: 16 September 2026 22:37:03

[redacted]

I am writing as a resident of [redacted], to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-person accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE. I ask that planning permission be refused.

My primary concern is transport and pedestrian safety on the roads serving the site. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application repeatedly refers to the B1104, not the B4011, which is the road that actually borders the site — a basic error that raises real doubts about the reliability of the evidence for the road network in question. The B4011 has a recorded history of injury collisions, yet much of the surrounding route lacks a continuous footway or street lighting. A development of this scale will generate significant additional pedestrian and vehicle movement along roads that are not currently safe or equipped for it, and I do not believe permission should be granted until an accurate transport assessment addressing the correct road has been produced and properly scrutinised.

I am also concerned about a cross-boundary consultation gap. [redacted] sits just across the [redacted] from Piddington and is directly connected to it by road, yet the formal consultation effort I am aware of — Cherwell District Council's mailer to addresses in the vicinity, and local Oxfordshire political engagement — has been concentrated almost entirely on the Oxfordshire side. As a Buckinghamshire resident directly on the affected road network, I do not believe residents like me have had equal notice or opportunity to engage with an application of this scale, and I ask that this be taken into account when assessing whether proper consultation has taken place.

Value for public money is a further significant concern. The National Audit Office's March 2024 investigation found that the Home Office's large-sites asylum accommodation programme, originally projected to save around £94 million compared with hotel accommodation, was in fact expected to cost approximately £46 million more. Given this record, I do not believe the case for urgency and public benefit has been adequately made for this specific site, and I ask that the financial case be published and independently tested before any decision is taken.

I also note a discrepancy in the application reference used in official correspondence: the July acceptance letter and part of the September applicant letter use reference PCU/RARE/J1725/3378659, while the current published reference is PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843. I ask MHCLG to clarify which documents form part of the live application under consideration, as this inconsistency raises concerns about the administrative rigour of the process.

I understand that permission granted through the urgent Crown Development route is excluded from the standard statutory biodiversity net gain condition under Schedule 7A, paragraph 17(a)(ii) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. A development of this scale on a rural site should not proceed without the ecological safeguards an ordinary

application of this size would be required to meet.

Finally, I would ask the Secretary of State to take into account the outstanding ecological surveys, unresolved drainage and utilities questions, and gaps in fire-safety planning identified by Piddington Parish Council in its own review of the application documents, as well as the unresolved flood risk, ground contamination, and infrastructure concerns raised in evidence prepared locally. The exceptionally short 11-day representation period has not given residents and technical specialists sufficient time to scrutinise an application of this scale and complexity.

Taken together, these issues mean the applicant has not demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this size, nor that the process to date has been administratively sound or adequately consulted upon. 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 an accurate transport assessment, clarification of the application reference discrepancy, and outstanding work on drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, lighting, and fire safety has been completed and made available for proper public scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]