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 21:36:36

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I request that the application is rejected and planning permission refused.

I am incredibly concerned about the lack of detail within the application, notably regarding the infrastructure, technical and ecological details.

The site cannot be proven suitable if ground contamination has not been fully investigated, especially given the use of the site previously has been for MOD storage purposes. Previous land-quality work identified contamination issues, however there has been no borehole investigation to further explore the risks involved or remedy them.

The application does not provide any solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns, with the site being totally inadequate for the purpose proposed. Various areas of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and the drainage strategy is incomplete.

The ecology assessments reference the incorrect records database for the area. This assessment cannot be relied upon and must be reviewed in greater detail to ensure environmental and ecological factors are properly considered.

The transport evidence raises some of the most serious concerns. The Assessment consistently refers to the incorrect road, while the B4011 serving the site has blind corners, limited visibility and insufficient street lighting, with a recorded history of serious, and even fatal, collisions. The closest roads to the site are 50mph and 60mph, and there is a total lack of pedestrian pathway towards Bicester, so I do not see how the site can allow foot pedestrians to depart the site, meaning transport should be provided in full to ensure safety and mitigate risk to life. This would be at a significant cost to the government, and ultimately funded by the taxpayer unwillingly, which suggests a need for any residents to be retained on site and not permitted to leave if the application was to be considered for approval.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

Finally, the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a substantial and complex application. The application documents exceed 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, so it is not reasonable to expect these to be read and fully technically appraised or considered in a reduced period of time, particularly given that planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage. The representation period should be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls over a weekend.

To reiterate, I request that planning permission be refused.

However, if the application is to be considered for approval, the work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning should be completed and made available to the concerned public.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]