[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 07:04
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 formally object to planning application **PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843**, concerning the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

My objection is based on serious concerns that the application has not yet demonstrated that this site is suitable for a development of such exceptional scale. Significant gaps and uncertainties remain in the evidence base, including in relation to contamination, flooding and drainage, highways and pedestrian safety, ecology, fire safety, ground conditions and essential infrastructure.

Incomplete investigation of ground conditions and contamination

I am particularly concerned that the potential for ground contamination has not been adequately resolved. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been undertaken to properly investigate and address those risks.

Given the proposed scale of the development and the number of people who would be accommodated on the site, it is important that these matters are fully investigated before any permission is granted. It would be inappropriate to rely on unresolved uncertainties concerning potentially contaminated ground.

Flooding and drainage

There are also significant concerns regarding flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are identified as being at high risk of surface-water flooding, while aspects of the proposed drainage strategy remain unresolved.

These are fundamental considerations for a development of this scale. The application should demonstrate, through sufficiently detailed and robust evidence, that the development can be safely drained without increasing flood risk on the site or elsewhere.

Highways and pedestrian safety

The transport evidence raises further concerns. The Transport Assessment repeatedly appears to refer to the wrong road, raising questions about the reliability and accuracy of the assessment.

More broadly, the B4011, which serves the site, has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. A development accommodating up to 1,256 people would inevitably place additional demands on the local highway network and pedestrian routes.

The application therefore needs to demonstrate convincingly that the site can be safely accessed by pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and other road users, rather than assuming that existing infrastructure is adequate for a development of this magnitude.

Essential infrastructure remains unresolved

I am also concerned that the application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure, including electricity and wastewater.

These are not minor details that can reasonably be left unresolved for a development of this scale. The ability to provide reliable electricity, wastewater treatment and other essential services is fundamental to whether the site is capable of accommodating up to 1,256 people.

Planning permission should not be granted where there remains material uncertainty about whether the necessary infrastructure can actually be delivered and operated safely and sustainably.

Scale and suitability of the location

The sheer scale of the proposal is also a major concern. Accommodating up to 1,256 people on this site would represent an exceptionally large development in an isolated location with limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport provision and few services within reasonable walking distance.

The question is therefore not simply whether the site can physically accommodate buildings and people, but whether it is an appropriate and sustainable location for a development of this particular scale.

In my view, the application has not demonstrated that it is.

Insufficient time for proper public scrutiny

I am also seriously concerned about the extremely short period allowed for representations.

The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages and cover numerous technical disciplines. It is not reasonable to expect residents, local councils and technical specialists to read, understand and properly scrutinise such a substantial evidence base within such a limited period.

Ordinary planning applications are subject to a minimum 21-day representation period, and the standard Crown Development route provides for 21 days at each stage. In view of the exceptional complexity and scale of this proposal, there is a strong case for allowing the public a reasonable opportunity to consider the evidence and raise informed objections.

I therefore ask that the representation period be extended to **at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, ending on Monday 28 September 2026**, given that the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

Previous consideration of the site

It is also relevant that this site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

While the circumstances of the current application must of course be considered on their own merits, the previous consideration of the site reinforces the importance of carefully examining whether this location is appropriate for asylum accommodation and whether the concerns identified previously have genuinely been addressed.

Conclusion

Taken individually, the matters outlined above raise significant questions. Taken together, they demonstrate that there is substantial uncertainty as to whether Site A is a suitable, safe and sustainable location for a development accommodating up to 1,256 people.

In particular, I do not believe the applicant has yet provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the development can be delivered without unacceptable risks relating to:

- flooding and drainage;
- wastewater infrastructure;
- ground conditions and contamination;
- ecology;
- highways and pedestrian safety;
- electricity supply;
- lighting and noise;
- fire safety; and
- the eventual decommissioning of the site.

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 all outstanding technical and environmental matters have been fully investigated and the relevant evidence has been made publicly available for proper scrutiny.

In particular, this should include outstanding work and evidence concerning **drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning**.

Given the scale and complexity of the proposal, it is essential that these fundamental matters are satisfactorily resolved before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]