From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 16 September 2026 16:02:43

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident to object to the planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I am concerned about this application on a number of serious grounds:

1. **Value for money for the tax payer**
2. **The impact on the asylum seekers who would be housed there**
3. **The impact on the local environment and community**
4. **The planning application process**

Taking each of these in turn

1. **Value for money for the tax payer.** According to the NAO some £28 million was spent on the previous plan to build an asylum centre on this site, one principle factor for its failure being the rising costs of the project, resulting in the Bicester project being cancelled by the Home Office. I am concerned that once the true costs of building and running an asylum centre on a site without adequate electricity supply, drainage etc. etc. is evaluated history will repeat itself and yet more tax payer's money will be wasted. The project should not proceed at any price, it needs to make financial sense and to date there is clearly no evidence that this is the case.

   This site was previously used for military storage and logistics. To convert it to residential use is likely to be extremely expensive with issues such as asbestos on site, drainage on a site that already experiences flooding new electricity supply, new buildings, new roads, buried ordnance assessments required etc. all need to be properly costed and evaluated. This clearly hasn't happened despite the months since use of this site was first proposed. There are also wider financial implications for example for the local health service which is already under pressure, this application needs to be considered alongside the other 12 major developments under consideration or already planned in the Bicester area to ensure that appropriate services are available not just to this site but also to the current and future residents of Oxfordshire, an area of high housing growth. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c624l62ppd5o

2. **The impact on the asylum seekers who would be housed there:** Asylum seekers need to be treated fairly. This site is several miles from Bicester in a rural area of low population density and is without access to any local facilities such as shops, a library etc. There is no safe access to bus services or other amenities. It is not even safe to walk on the local roads for exercise. It is unclear if any sport or entertainment facilities will be available from the time the first residents are housed. There is clear evidence of serious accidents on the nearby road. In the event of a fire how long would it take for the fire service to reach the location and would there be a suitable water supply to control a fire? It seems Thames Water have not even been consulted, but we are in an area of severe water stress... The proposed water treatment will be sited well under the standard minimum distance from resident's rooms. The impact on residents' well being of all of this can only be imagined.

3. **The impact on the local environment and community.** There has been no effective evaluation of the impact on the nearby SSSI, possible hydrological links or of assessment of listed species which should be considered under any planning application (for very good reasons, UK nature is under severe stress). This Summer could have been used to undertake proper studies. This has not happened despite this being an "Urgent Crown Development". The number of residents proposed are disproportionate to the local population who will be vastly outnumbered and the location of the site not conforming to the agreed local plan. What price increased devolution and stronger public control the Prime Minister promised in his first speech to the House of Commons on September 1st?

4. **The planning application process.** The time allowed for local residents to become aware of this consultation, read relevant documentation and make representation is wholly unacceptable and out of line with due democratic processes for what is clearly intended to be a permanent facility. Proper consultations with all local service providers should have been undertaken. It should not have been necessary for our local MP to have to press for documents to be published for more than two months. If this application was deemed so urgent in June the documents should have already been available in order for an Urgent Crown Development order to be approved. This clearly was not the case, the lack of effective proof reading so that the wrong road number is repeatedly quoted to say nothing of the other many anomalies in the document is frankly shocking. The people in my locality deserve better.

I trust this application will be rejected for sound planning reasons.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Different application documents contain inconsistent figures relating to the size, phasing and capacity of the proposed development. One document even refers to 3,510 service users rather than the 1,256 stated elsewhere.