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 18:23:24

[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 ask that planning permission be refused.

I have huge concerns about the impact on my local Community. The strains on already stretched resources would be catastrophic.
Local people's needs should not be compromised or be treated with a lower priority than the occupants of the site. This would be a gross negligence of basic duty of care and human rights to the legitimate residents of the Bicester area. I feel extremely strongly about this.
I emphasise that the needs of the Asylum Seekers should not be treated as a higher priority or put extra stress on already inadequate resources.

The location of the site wholly unsuitable. The lack of local facilities is ridiculous and its proximity to a tiny village would pose potential danger and risks.

I have the following questions:-

- Has a full risk assessment been carried out and signed off by a person or Government Body who will ultimately be responsible for any undesirable outcomes arising from the site and/or its occupants? This is a most basic Health and Safety and Safeguarding requirement. Is this document in the public domain? If it isn't, it should be.
- How will the inevitable increased pressure on Policing be met? Our local force is already stretched.
- How will medical needs be met. Our local Health Authority and emergency services are stretched beyond belief. Routine GP appointments are hard to come by. Hospital Specialist appointments are equally hard to come by and always carry unacceptable waiting times and delays.
- How will dental needs be met? It is impossible to find an NHS dentist anywhere around.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

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 serious 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.

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 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,



