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 14:44:13

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to formally object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 concerning the proposed accommodation centre for up to 1,256 people at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

As well as being a [redacted] and [redacted] operating within the [redacted] I have invested in building a business here, providing skilled employment and contributing to the local economy. My concerns therefore extend beyond the immediate impact of the proposal to what it could mean for existing businesses, employment and continued investment in the area.

My most immediate concern is infrastructure.

The area is already experiencing significant pressure as a consequence of the pace of residential and commercial development. At a recent council-led event I attended, it was communicated that existing infrastructure is currently unable to keep pace with this growth and that the necessary upgrades will not be completed in full until well into the 2030s.

This is already having practical consequences for local businesses. Advanced manufacturing, engineering and technology-focused companies are being encouraged to establish themselves, invest and grow in the area, while some businesses are being asked to operate using generators or otherwise compromise their sustainability objectives because the infrastructure required to support their operations is not presently available.

Against that background, I am particularly concerned that there does not appear to be a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure for the proposed development itself, including electricity and wastewater.

Before accommodating up to 1,256 additional people on this site, I believe there needs to be a clear understanding of the additional demand this would place on electricity, water, wastewater, highways and other local services, together with certainty over how that demand would be met without further disadvantaging existing residents and businesses.

For businesses such as mine, reliable infrastructure is fundamental to decisions about investment, recruitment, growth and sustainability. Adding another substantial source of demand before existing constraints have been resolved raises serious questions about the cumulative impact of development in the area.

Infrastructure is not my only concern.

Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, alongside significant questions concerning fire safety, ground conditions and the overall suitability of the site.

Ground contamination is a particular concern. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet, as I understand it, no borehole investigation has been undertaken to properly establish and resolve those risks. For a development intended to accommodate such a significant number of people, I believe these matters warrant thorough investigation.

There are also substantial questions concerning flooding and drainage. Parts of the site are identified as being at high risk of surface-water flooding, while elements of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

I am similarly concerned by the transport evidence. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. Given the proposed number of occupants and the relatively isolated location of the site, I believe the effects on local roads, pedestrian safety and surrounding communities require particularly careful consideration.

More broadly, the scale of the proposal concerns me. Accommodating this number of people in an isolated rural location with limited surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and relatively few services within walking distance raises legitimate questions about whether this is an appropriate location for a development of this nature and scale.

I am also concerned about the extremely short representation period. The application comprises well over 1,000 pages of material covering numerous technical disciplines. Residents, businesses, councils and technical specialists need a reasonable opportunity to understand that information and its implications.

Given that ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21-day representation period and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at each stage, I believe the representation period should be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, taking it to Monday 28 September 2026 because the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

I am also conscious that this site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. I believe that history makes it particularly important that the present proposal receives proper scrutiny.

For me, these issues also have a very real commercial consequence.

My business depends upon reliable infrastructure, access to skilled people and confidence that this remains an appropriate location in which to invest and grow. We have made a commitment to the area, provide skilled employment and want to continue developing the business here.

However, I also have a responsibility to consider the long-term interests of the

business and our employees. If this development proceeds without these concerns being satisfactorily addressed, particularly against the backdrop of infrastructure constraints that are already affecting local industry, I would feel I had little option but to reconsider the long-term location of my business, including the possibility of relocating elsewhere.

That would not be my preferred outcome, but continued investment in advanced manufacturing cannot be considered independently of the infrastructure and wider environment required to support it.

Taken together, these issues leave me unconvinced that the application 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 is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no 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.

