**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 16 September 2026 08:27
**To:** Crown Casework
**Cc:** calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
**Subject:** Fw: Application: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

**Importance:** High

**Categories:** [redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

**OBJECTION to Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, SITE A, MOD Bicester.**

I would like to strongly object to this project and wish to make the following points.

Having read a good number of your official documents what initially strikes me is the sheer enormity of the potential cost of this proposed project. Official figures seem not to be available but having carried out some research estimates of £ 700 million and above are touted and banded around. When will the official cost be made available to the general public ?

The documents released are lengthy and how most ordinary working-class people are supposed to read and digest in such a short period of time is beyond me. No doubt the Government have spent many weeks / months / year's putting these documents together and it seems the general public are supposed to have to research, digest and comment in a very small time span. That together with quite a lot of information being withheld anyway, with blank pages and sentences means a true understanding is even more difficult. At worst the time frame should be amended accordingly.

My main concerns as follows:

1. **Site Selection Process**

Could you please confirm which alternative sites have been considered ?

This site proposal project means the following issues are involved

- New modular accomodation
- Health & welfare facilities
- Roads
- Security infrastructure
- Staff facilities
- Wastewater provision
- The above and many more

Therefore this project involves so much more than using existing buildings. It is a very complex project.

Hence my question. **Which other sites have been considered ? How does the cost of this project compare with other proposed sites ? When will this information be available ?**

**B) Infrastructure:**

Please advise how additional infrastructure is going to be facilitated ?

Site A to my knowledge does not form part of Cherwell's current infrastructure. When have these discussions taken place and who is paying for this change of strategy.

From my research it seems a traffic increase of 12.1% (morning time) seems likely should this project proceed ? A significant percentage on these roads during morning traffic.

**C) Hospital Services:**

Given the current issues with the NHS system can you advise how an additional 1256 male personnel will be catered for ? Does that mean even longer waiting periods for the current general public ?

Please advise how the potential 1256 male residents will be dealt with in terms of health services.

There appears to be no details whether medical care will be provided on site ? Via NHS ? Or via private providers at even greater cost.

If the plan is to utilise NHS services what impact will that have on the local community already struggling with appointments and operations.

**D) Similar plan 2003**

It has been highlighted a similar plan was rejected in 2003 after a public inquiry concluded the site was too isolated and would overwhelm local services.

I suspect not much has changed.

What has changed to make it viable now ?

**E) Flooding & Drainage:**

It would appear there are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Is it true parts of the site are a high risk for surface water flooding. It would seem that aspects of the drainage system remain unresolved at this point !!

**F) Ground Contamination:**

There is also a concern over ground contamination and whether this has yet been fully investigated. Can you confirm ?

It would appear previous land quality work had identified potential contamination issues. However no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve these risks.

**TO CONCLUDE:**

- The area designated for this project is incredibly large for this small area and isolated to some extent with limited infrastructure, public transport and services in the immediate vicinity.

- The site selection is wrong in my opinion.

- A highly complex project with serious cost involved and much upheaval to the community

- Significant risk in terms of Health & Medical services.

- Far too many unanswered questions.

- Lack of transparency from Government and far too short a time period for local residents to form views.

- Why not place 5 asylum seekers in every town of 10,000 + population ? Although I disagree with the whole policy at least this gives a chance of integration. There are plenty of towns with this population and it enables Government to utilise the 'everyone must share' practice often spoken about.

In short the Planning Permission should be refused. It is the WRONG PLAN and WRONG Site. There are so many reasons this project should be cancelled.

Yours Faithfully,

