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: 15 September 2026 19:26:22

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, which proposes a 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I strongly believe planning permission should be refused.

My main concern is that, despite the enormous scale of this proposal, there are still too many unanswered questions about whether the site is actually suitable. Important ecological and technical work is still outstanding, while concerns remain around contamination, flooding, drainage, fire safety, highways and essential infrastructure.

I am particularly concerned about the ground conditions and potential contamination. Previous investigations have identified possible land-quality issues, yet no borehole investigation appears to have been carried out to properly establish what is actually there. I don't think those risks should simply be left unresolved when the proposal is for accommodation for up to 1,256 people.

Flooding and drainage are another major concern. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding, and there still appear to be unresolved issues with the proposed drainage arrangements. These are basic requirements for a development of this size and should be properly established before permission is granted.

The transport information also concerns me. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, which does not give me confidence in the accuracy of the assessment. The B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and has a history of serious collisions. Bringing potentially 1,256 people to an isolated site with limited public transport and very little within walking distance clearly raises questions about pedestrian safety and access.

There are also still questions over whether permanent solutions have been confirmed for essential services such as electricity and wastewater. I don't believe a development of this scale should be approved while such fundamental infrastructure arrangements remain uncertain.

More generally, I think the sheer size of the proposal needs to be properly considered. This is an exceptionally large development for a relatively isolated rural location. It is not simply a matter of putting accommodation on an existing site; it would effectively create a very large community in a location that has limited transport links, services and infrastructure.

I am also concerned about the extremely short period that has been allowed for people to respond to the application. The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages and cover a wide range of technical subjects. It is simply not realistic to expect local residents, councils and technical specialists to properly read, understand and comment on all of this material in such a short period.

Ordinary planning applications have a minimum 21-day consultation period, and the standard Crown Development process also provides 21 days at each stage. I therefore ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking it to Monday 28 September 2026, as the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

I also note that this site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before the subsequent proposal was cancelled. Given that history, I think there is even more reason to properly consider whether this location is genuinely suitable for a development which is now considerably larger.

I appreciate that there is a need to provide suitable asylum accommodation, but that does not mean that every site is appropriate, regardless of its location or the problems that still need to be resolved. In this case, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is suitable for a development of this scale.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Secretary of State to refuse planning permission.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until the outstanding issues relating to drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning have been fully investigated and the results made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully

