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 21:38:14

[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 ask that planning permission be refused.

I am writing to express my concerns of the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. It is evident that vital ecological and technical work has not been undertaken. Additionally, there still remains significant questions about fire safety, ground conditions and the overall suitability of the site.

It is apparent that contamination issues at this site have not been fully investigated. While previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, no borehole investigation has yet been carried out. In addition, flooding and drainage are a significant concern at this site. Indeed, parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

I am also concerned about the transport evidence submitted for this site as it repeatedly refers to the incorrect road! In fact, the B4011 that actually serves the site has very limited pedestrian infrastructure as well as a recorded history of serious collisions. This suggests that this site is not a safe place for pedestrians to be regularly walking, as further accidents will occur.

I also want to question the application's solution for essential infrastructure, such as electricity and wastewater, as a permanent solution has not yet been suggested. Indeed, it is not acceptable for a development that will accommodate 1,256 people to be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

I am concerned at the size of this proposal, with it being situated in a very rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, very limited public transport, and minimal services within walking distance.

It is apparent that the extremely short representation period has not provided enough time for local residents, councils, and technical specialists to fully examine this substantial and complicated application. The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly considered in so short a time. I therefore suggest that the representation period be extended, to allow a full and proper analysis to take place.

Additionally, this site was previously considered for asylum accommodation. However, a smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

Subsequently, the above reasons all confirm that Site A is not suitable for a development of this type. I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Should the Secretary of State decide to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]