[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 11:02
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 ask that planning permission be refused as I have serious concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application and the sustainability of the plans.

I understand that important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the overall 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. We suffer flooding across a wide area every Winter in this locality.

The transport evidence also raises serious questions. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has no pedestrian infrastructure whatsoever and has a recorded history of serious collisions.

Also 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, notwithstanding the dangers of walking on the local roads which have no footway.

Much has been said of the impact on the nearby village of Piddington, with a population of 300. But in reality those housed at Site A would have little reason to head in the direction of Piddington. The far greater possibility is wanting to reach Bicester, which has only two practicable routes to access it from the site.

I live in the nearby [redacted], which is on one of the obvious walking routes from Site A to Bicester, and possibly the nearest shops to the site.

According to the 2021 census the village has a population of 1855, adding the potential of the 1256 people proposed to be housed at Site A, risks overwhelming the village and its facilities. Although clearly larger than Piddington, It still represents a potential population increase of 68%. And if the exiting evidence that points to the desire to eventually increase the number housed at Site A to over 3000, which would be totally unsustainable.

I am also 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 regarding the multitude of issues is resolved, including:

- flooding
- wastewater
- contamination
- ecology
- highways
- pedestrian safety
- power supply
- lighting
- noise
- fire safety and decommissioning

have been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]