[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 23:10
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

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

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 strongly request that planning permission be refused.

I am writing as a concerned parent, a member of the local community, and someone who believes strongly that people seeking safety and refuge deserve to be treated with dignity and humanity.

I have serious concerns about the suitability of Site A for accommodating over 1200 people. My husband has personally worked on this site and, from his experience, I have significant concerns about its suitability for housing people at all, let alone more than 1,200 individuals.

These are about whether the site, infrastructure and surrounding community can safely and humanely support a development of this scale.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, with significant unresolved issues including:

- **Ground contamination:** Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination, yet no borehole investigation has been undertaken to properly resolve these risks.
- **Flooding and drainage:** Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.
- **Transport and pedestrian safety:** 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.
- **Essential infrastructure:** There is no confirmed permanent solution demonstrated for critical infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater.
- **Fire safety, ecology, lighting, noise and decommissioning:** Significant questions remain around these matters which should be resolved before a development of this scale is approved.

The proposal is exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with limited public transport, little surrounding infrastructure and few services within walking distance. This raises concerns not only for the existing community, but for the people who would be accommodated there.

As a parent and on humanitarian grounds, I find it particularly concerning that more than 1,200 people could be placed in a location that may not have the infrastructure and services necessary to meet their basic needs.

When the needs of a population of this size are not adequately met, frustration and isolation are inevitable. That frustration will affect the surrounding villages and towns. This risks creating tension and animosity between proposed new residents and existing communities.

The responsibility for preventing this lies with the decision-makers. People seeking refuge deserve safe, suitable and humane accommodation, while the existing communities deserve proper protection of their safety, infrastructure and quality of life. Both groups should be properly considered before a decision is made.

I am also concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine an application of this complexity. The documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines. It is not reasonable to expect the public to properly review and respond to this volume of information within such a short period.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. This makes it particularly important that the current, substantially larger proposal is subjected to thorough scrutiny.

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

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

The people who may be accommodated at Site A deserve safe and humane conditions, and the communities surrounding the site deserve the same consideration. Neither should be placed at unnecessary risk because fundamental questions about the suitability of this site remain unanswered.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]