[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 12:17
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

Categories: RE

[redacted]

Dear Sirs

I write 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 am writing to ask that planning permission for the proposed use of MOD Bicester Site A for asylum accommodation be refused.

I have a number of concerns about both the suitability of the site and whether the application provides sufficient information for the proposal to be properly assessed. Given the scale of the development, I am particularly concerned that important issues remain unresolved.

My first concern is the extremely short period allowed for representations. The application is substantial and technically complex, with a large volume of supporting documentation covering numerous disciplines. I do not believe that ten days provides residents, local councils, community representatives or technical specialists with a reasonable opportunity to examine the material properly and make informed representations.

Ordinary planning applications generally provide a minimum 21-day consultation period, and the Government's guidance for Crown Development applications states that the representation period should normally be at least 21 days. I therefore ask that the current deadline be extended to 28 September 2026, providing a full 21-day period from 7 September.

I am also concerned about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. There appear to be a number of important ecological and technical matters that remain outstanding, while significant questions remain regarding contamination, flooding, drainage, fire safety, highways and infrastructure.

In particular, I am concerned that the potential for ground contamination has not been sufficiently investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet I understand that further intrusive investigation, including borehole investigation, has not been undertaken to resolve those concerns. Given the

proposed scale and duration of occupation, I do not believe these matters should remain unresolved when the application is determined.

There are also significant concerns regarding flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are subject to surface-water flood risk, and aspects of the proposed drainage arrangements remain unresolved. A development of this scale should, in my view, have a clearly demonstrated and deliverable drainage strategy before permission is granted.

The transport evidence also raises concerns. The Transport Assessment appears in places to refer to the wrong road, which calls into question the reliability of the assessment. More generally, the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. The consequences of adding a development of this scale to the surrounding road network, particularly for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users, need to be fully understood.

I am also concerned about the availability and reliability of essential infrastructure, including electricity and wastewater. I do not believe that a development intended to accommodate up to 1,256 people should be approved while fundamental questions remain about whether the necessary infrastructure can be provided and operated safely and reliably.

The scale of the proposal is itself a significant consideration. This is a very large development in a relatively isolated location, with limited public transport, limited pedestrian connectivity and few services within walking distance. The Government's own information indicates that the proposed accommodation could house up to 1,256 people and is intended to operate for a minimum of ten years.

I am particularly concerned about the impact that such a substantial development could have on the safety, security and general amenity of people already living in the surrounding communities.

I appreciate that planning considerations should not be based simply on the identity or circumstances of the people who would occupy the accommodation. My concern is instead about the practical consequences of introducing a development of this size into this particular location, and whether the application has adequately demonstrated that those consequences can be managed.

For example, the application should properly address the effects on surrounding residents arising from increased vehicle and pedestrian movements, road safety, lighting, noise, emergency access and response, security arrangements, policing and the potential additional demand on local services.

I note that Cherwell District Council has itself raised concerns and questions relating to community safety, policing, access, transport, infrastructure and the impact on local communities. These are therefore not simply matters of general public opinion; they

are practical issues associated with the proposed development which warrant proper assessment.

I do not believe that these matters should simply be left to be dealt with after the development is occupied. There should be clear evidence before a decision is made demonstrating how the safety and amenity of existing residents will be protected, how emergency services and policing requirements will be addressed, how traffic and pedestrian movements will be managed, and how complaints or incidents affecting neighbouring communities will be dealt with.

The NPPF places importance on creating safe and accessible places and maintaining appropriate standards of amenity. In my view, those considerations need to include the relationship between this unusually large development and the established communities surrounding the site.

I am also aware that the MOD Bicester site has previously been considered and rejected for asylum accommodation. Given that history, I believe particular care should be taken to establish whether this location is genuinely suitable for the scale and duration of the development now proposed.

Taken together, these issues leave me unconvinced that Site A has been demonstrated to be 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 be made until the outstanding matters concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety, security and decommissioning have been fully investigated and addressed.

I would also ask that the relevant technical evidence is made publicly available and that the consultation period is extended to 28 September 2026, so that residents and other interested parties have a reasonable opportunity to consider the extensive documentation and respond meaningfully.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone