From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: Calum Miller; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 16 September 2026 22:30:19
Attachments: image001.png

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing 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 have lived in [redacted] since 2002 and [redacted], part of the [redacted] which includes the Ray Valley Benefice in which Site A, MOD Bicester is located. I am also [redacted] itself; Bicester, being the closest town to the site, will be significantly impacted should the proposed development go ahead. It is in these capacities that I ask you to refuse planning permission.

I also wish to object to the way the application is being handled, in particular the very short timescale for consultation. The planning application and supporting documents (over 1,000 pages) were only published for comment on 2 September and the window for responses is only 11 days (7-17 September), compared to the minimum 21-day period required for 'normal' planning applications. This is unfair and unreasonable and I ask that the consultation period be extended to give more people the opportunity to engage with the detail of the application and respond as they see fit.

With regard to the substance of the application, many local people have spoken with me and there is overwhelming agreement that the proposal reflects a poor plan which will be incredibly disruptive to local communities should it go ahead While the proposal has generated a lot of emotion, the questions and objections put forward by local people are substantial, rational and cover a wide range of planning grounds.

First of all, the scale of the plan is deeply concerning. The Ray Valley Benefice, which covers the site is rural in character with 12 villages and a total population of only ~6,000 people. Adding an additional 1,200 people will have a very substantial impact on local facilities, especially as the proposal envisages relatively limited provision on site for the new residents. Reference has been made to offering daily transport into local population centres such as Bicester. While Bicester has a significant and growing population (~40,000), facilities in the town are limited and will be stretched. Although the application documents say there will be some primary healthcare provision on the site, the impact of the new population on local hospitals and emergency services remains unclear. This lack of clarity is reflected in many areas in this hasty proposal, which does not form part of the development for which Cherwell's existing Infrastructure Delivery Plan was prepared. There is a significant and worrying lack of information about how the additional infrastructure requirements would be accommodated, for example in relation to:

- handling sewage/wastewater, in the short and medium term

- electrical power supply
- drainage and flooding risk
- transport
    - the Transport Assessment gets the name of the main road wrong repeatedly, which does not suggest a great deal of study has gone on
    - the B4011, the main road serving the site, is a country road with paths only in small stretches, making it unsafe for pedestrians to walk to local villages, or into Bicester
    - there is only a very limited bus service.

If the proposal goes ahead, our churches will want to offer a welcome to the newcomers and provide what support we can. However, our resources are limited, and it will be very difficult to help another 1,200+ residents with distinctive needs. There is no indication in the application of additional resources being made available in Bicester or in the villages to help the new residents.

The haste with which the proposal is being progressed also means fundamental work has not been completed, e.g. in relation to ecological impact, fire safety, and ground conditions (including dealing with chemical contamination). With so many unanswered questions, I request that application be refused. However, should the Secretary of State be minded to approve the application, I ask that such approval should be delayed until the crucial outstanding investigations and assessments are completed.

Yours faithfully,



