**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 16:48:12

[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.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

I am particularly concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

The transport evidence also raises serious questions. 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. It is a busy road with many cars and lorries moving along at 50mph. Palmer Avenue, opposite the site is also 50mph with no pavement and the traffic includes MOD lorries going to site C in Arncott.

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

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.

The proposal pays no attention to the safety of women and children in the two closest villages, Arncott and Piddington. The government has rightly highlighted its concern about attacks on women in general but has taken no steps to consider whether it is appropriate to place 1,250 single young males in these surroundings. The government acknowledges

potential problems with the distribution of its leaflet to asylum seekers about how to act in a country which has a completely different culture from the one they have left but still seems incapable of seeing the potential issues.

Health stakeholders have also not been fully consulted, beyond being told that local GP and dentist surgeries will not be impacted as full medical facilities are available on site. This is a contravention of what is stated in the planning document. There is not sufficient local health service capacity to deal with complicated medical issues that may be present in the proposed asylum accommodation.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled due to falling numbers of asylum seekers, which is the case currently and is one of the governments commitments to decrease the numbers of small boat crossings.

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 is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until 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,

