From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: Calum Miller; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 17 September 2026 23:15:45

You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public and a resident of Bicester, to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843. That is the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I am asking that planning permission be refused.

I have concerns about whether the evidence submitted with the application is complete. Important ecological and technical studies remain outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

My main concern is ecological, and I have been horrified over the past week to find out exactly what has happened in reference to ecological surveys of the site and surrounding area.

I am looking at the determinations from professionals, who focused on the ecology assessment in the MOD Bicester Site A planning application. The "preliminary ecological assessment" notes there are no records for bats, great crested newts, dormice, badgers, reptiles, amphibians and no rare plants within 2km of the site. However, it seems that they did not check the correct records and as such a full and proper ecological assessment must be carried out before any further possibility of the site use can be determined.

The actual records - held by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre - show there are correct records within 2km of the site for the following:

- 12 bat species, several right next to the site.
- widespread evidence of Great Crested Newts, including on the site itself
- Badgers just 300m away
- Otter, Polecat and Hazel Dormouse
- 88 records of rare and protected wildflowers, including one so scarce it has its own county recovery plan
- 27 bird species that are on the UK Red List - not 8 as the application says.

These omissions are vitally important to the ecological concern around use of this site for habitation. The Crown Development process may be fast-tracked, but planning law still says that process must get the ecological assessment correct. Given the evidence from these records, before they approve the application, they should be completing full and proper field assessments. British wildlife must not be compromised for the vagaries of the political landscape; wildlife has suffered enough due to the vast expansion of housing etc taking over their homes, and those plants and animals driven to the brink of extinction (such as hedgehogs - now vulnerable to extinction in the UK) must be allowed to thrive in their own safe havens.

In addition to my concerns about the ecosystem and biodiversity of the area, I do feel there are many further reasons that this site is not an acceptable place for this type of housing.

I am 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. I live in Upper Heyford, just down the road from Piddington, and there are huge current concerns about 'forever chemicals' on the decommissioned army base I live on. They are the highest recorded levels in the UK.

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.

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 water services cannot cope at the moment with current requirements, such as at the close by Graven Hill, where it's very problematic.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with no surrounding infrastructure, very limited public transport and few services within walking distance. We have fought long and hard for public transport to improve for ourselves in the local area of Upper Heyford, and had very little luck with getting any service.

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.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

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,

[redacted]

[redacted]