[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 11:21
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 and resident of the nearby town of Bicester, where in the near vicinity, you propose to house non-documented males against the consent of the village of Piddington. I strongly object to the planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, a proposed 1,256-male illegal entry to the United Kingdom, to the centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I request that planning permission be refused, due to non-consent, the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. With ecological and technical work remaining outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site, frequent flooding. The objection to this site seems to be mainly around to suitability of this site, including ground contamination which 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 issues. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved. It is astounding that more concern is being aired by local MPs on the basis of the site, and not the residents of Piddington, their human rights or democratic consent. I have no hesitation in raising the issue of a lack of any 'radical deterrent' where this government is merely managing the numbers, reducing should not be goal, but, actually protecting our borders and preventing entry to our country, this does not seem to be the priority. This government, regardless of any previous government is failing in it's first responsibility, protecting our borders and actually looking to spreading the problem of undocumented men across the country so we end up with thousands of differently culturally matched males infiltrating communities against the people's will.

- Transport is non-existent in the village of Piddington, no shops, no pub. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road. 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. A development accommodating up to 1,256 MEN should not be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.
- The proposal of an exceptionally large influx of males for an isolated rural location with little to do, very limited public transport and few services within walking distance.
- These men should not be permitted to roam freely anywhere, nor should be transported to near by towns as the government does NOT know their background or whether they may have a criminal record.
- The women of this country have already suffered, [redacted], all due the lack of the governments will and radical approach to deter from the source of crossing the channel

The extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, which is my concern, to address and properly examine such a substantial and complicated application. The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly digested 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. Please note: 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 that Site A is not a suitable location for a development of this scale. No village so small should be expected to absorb 1,256 men, whether from crossing the channel or from any other means. It is totally inappropriate!

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,

[redacted]