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 15:48:56

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to you in my capacity as [redacted] and on behalf of the Bicester Methodist Church, to object to the planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256 person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire OX25 1AE.

I ask that the planning permission be refused.

The [redacted] Church is committed to being a justice-seeking church, standing up for people seeking asylum and those discriminated against. We are a church that stands up for the rights of the poor, the dispossessed, migrants and those seeking a safe place to live. We stand against the abuse of power and leadership in our country and across the world. We stand on behalf of those seeking asylum in Britain who deserve the best accommodation we can offer. Which is not this proposed site.

There is nothing safe in the proposal to build accommodation on Site A. It is the wrong place because of its former use, its lack of utilities, its location and transport links. The site is a former fuel depot with diesel in underground tanks; ground contamination has not been investigated using bore hole drilling. The site has no connection to a water supply or to the sewerage system, it regularly floods with surface water a concern. Drains in the local area are already at capacity. The site has no electrical or gas supply. There has been little or no investigation into the basic safety of the site as a place for people to live.

There is evidence in the planning application paperwork that public transport, ecology, infrastructure and other fundamental matters have been given scant attention. That the site is served by a busy B Road with no pavements is just one example of a total disregard to the welfare of the people that the Home Office propose to house in this accommodation.

When the proposal was first made by the Home Office there was no opportunity for the public to have a voice in this planning proposal. Even with this planning application which has come after intervention by our MP, there is not sufficient time within the proposal period, for local residents and all interest parties, to be able to respond with any depth of knowledge and understanding. Not because this does not

exist, but because the application documents run to over 1,000 pages of complicated technical details, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be properly read and considered within the given 10 day time frame. If this were an ordinary planning application there would be a 21 day planning period. The standard Crown Development route also has a 21 day planning period. It is not just and fair that this proposal has been reduced to 10 days.

[redacted] were involved in the previous planning application proposal, to build a smaller accommodation development on this site. That proposal was refused by the independent planning inspectors and the proposal cancelled. In the intervening years the site has further deteriorated and there is no evidence that it now is suitable.

We ask that the planning permission be refused.

And we ask that if the Secretary of State decides that this proposal should go ahead; that no decision be made until all work concerning drainage, flooding, sewerage, waste water, land contamination, ecology, transport, public safety, highways, pedestrian safety, electricity supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and the comprehensive decommissioning of a former WW2 fuel depot, has been completed and independently verified.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]