[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 20:34
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to formally object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 concerning the proposed asylum accommodation centre for up to 1,256 people at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I respectfully ask that planning permission for this proposal is refused.

My primary concern is that an application of this size and significance appears to have been submitted while a number of important technical matters remain unresolved. In my view, there is not yet sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site is safe, appropriate or capable of supporting accommodation for such a large number of people.

One particular concern is the condition of the land. Previous investigations have identified potential contamination risks, but these do not appear to have been fully investigated through borehole testing. Given the proposed residential use of the site, I believe these risks should be properly understood before any permission is granted.

Flooding and drainage also require further scrutiny. Areas of the site are identified as being at high risk of surface-water flooding, while elements of the proposed drainage arrangements remain unresolved. These are fundamental issues for a development intended to accommodate more than 1,200 people.

I also have concerns regarding access and highway safety. The Transport Assessment contains repeated references to the wrong road, which raises questions about the reliability of the assessment. The B4011 serving the site has limited provision for pedestrians and a history of serious road collisions. The potential impact of significantly increasing pedestrian and vehicle movements in this location therefore needs careful consideration.

There also appears to be no confirmed permanent solution for some of the basic infrastructure required to support the development, including electricity supply and wastewater. It seems inappropriate to approve accommodation on this scale before it has been clearly demonstrated how these essential services will be provided.

More broadly, I question whether this is a suitable location for a facility housing up to 1,256 people. The site is relatively isolated, with limited public transport, pedestrian infrastructure and access to everyday services within walking distance. The scale of the proposal appears disproportionate to the infrastructure available in the surrounding area.

I am additionally concerned about the limited period allowed for public representations. The application comprises well over 1,000 pages of material covering numerous complex technical areas. Residents, local authorities and relevant specialists should be given sufficient opportunity to properly review and respond to that information.

A period shorter than the usual 21 days does not, in my view, provide adequate time for meaningful scrutiny of an application of this complexity. I therefore request that the representation period is extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, meaning until Monday 28 September 2026, as the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

It is also relevant that this location has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector and was subsequently cancelled. Given that history, I believe particularly robust evidence should be required to demonstrate why a substantially larger proposal is now appropriate.

Considering all of these matters together, I do not believe the application currently demonstrates that Site A is an appropriate or sufficiently assessed location for a development of this nature and scale.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Should the Secretary of State nevertheless be minded to grant permission, I ask that no final decision is taken until all outstanding assessments and proposals relating to flooding, drainage, wastewater, land contamination, ecology, highways and pedestrian safety, electricity supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and eventual decommissioning have been completed, published and allowed sufficient time for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]