From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 16 September 2026 09:45:45

[redacted]

Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

I am writing as a member of the public 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 request that planning permission be refused as the site is not fit for purpose for a number of reasons.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding or not accurate, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

Having watched an interesting video by a local councillor Claire Brenner about the ecology of the site I was astounded that your Ecology report did not contain any information about a number of protected species on the site. In particular there was no mention in your report about the Great Crested Newts close to and on the site, even though there are clear records from the Environment Office in the Thames Valley showing that they are present on the land. Nor was there mention in your report of the twelve species of protected bats, some of which are rare woodland bats such as the Bechstein's bat which is nearly extinct. In fact, your report failed to mention that there were any bats on the location, which is rather shocking as there is information and databases out there that this information can easily be obtained from. Then there is the matter of Nightingales which had been extinct in Oxfordshire for about 20 to 30 years, which came back from extinction in Oxfordshire only recently back in 2020. This was due to work the MOD did to recreate the habitat they need. The site area has the only breeding pair of Nightingales in the whole of Oxfordshire. It is rather surprising to note that the applicant was the one to do the habitat work to bring them back but failed to mention the Nightingales in their ecological assessment! Their report also said that there were no reptiles or amphibians in the area. There are in fact indeed reptiles and amphibians in the area such as the Grass Snake, Smooth Newts, Palmate Newts, Common Lizards, Common Toads, Common Frogs. Then there are the Invertebrates as well, which include the Purple Emperor, Small Blue Butterfly. Additionally, there are a number of rare plants as well in the area, despite the report saying there were no records of them, such as the Devil's-bit Scabious which is included in a current county wide conservation strategy as it's the only plant that the Marsh Fritillary Butterfly feeds on.

The site and the area around it, I believe is of great Ecological importance and will be destroyed if this development goes ahead. I am astounded by the Ecological report submitted by the applicant as it does not contain this fact or indeed many correct facts. I believe the report is flawed and not fit for purpose and for that and other reasons I have mentioned, the development application should be rejected and another more suitable site be sought.

I am particularly concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

The transport evidence also raises important questions. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions.

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

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 am concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a 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. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so I ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. Your proposal for 1256 person asylum accommodation for this site is therefore very surprising when it has previously been refused.

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

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 is made until outstanding work and more accurate reports 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]

[redacted]