From: [redacted]
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
Date: 16 September 2026 15:05:27

[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 concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. There are important ecological and technical work that remains outstanding:

- Despite a 2010 land quality assessment identifying potential contamination risks at the site, no borehole investigation has taken place in the more recent assessment. Moreover the areas investigated were found generally unsuitable for redevelopment to a domestic end use without remediation.
- There is significant surface floodwater risk, with the main accommodation being proposed on one of the lowest and most flood-prone parts of the site.
- The B4011 serving the site does not have a continuous walkway or lighting alongside it, and there is a history of serious collisions. The Transport Assessment also repeatedly refers to the wrong road (the B1104 rather than the B4011).
- There is not a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater: the Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment says the condition and capacity of the existing electricity network cannot be relied on.

In 2003, a smaller proposal for around 750 people on the same site was refused by an Independent Planning Inspector and then cancelled. This failed process represented a significant cost to the taxpayer. It is hard to see how the new plan represents value for money for the taxpayer, given the history of the site and the fact that in March 2024, the National Audit Office found that the Home Office's large-sites asylum accommodation programme was expected to cost more overall than the hotels it was intended to replace, rather than delivering the savings originally projected.

I am 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.

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 intends to approve the application despite the objections, it is important that no definitive decision is made until the outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

