From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: Calum Miller MP; wpwsobjection@gmail.com; Glenn Middleton
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 17 September 2026 23:06:10

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 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 details my objections below, in brief they are : 1) safety of locals 2) safety of asylum seekers 3) proprtonality of numbers 4) ecology and environmental concerns being overlooked

As above I have srroous concerns about the thoroughness and reliability of the evidence submitted with the application. Vital ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site. Traffic and pedestrian safety need to be addressed.

I am concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet I understand 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. This is a high speed carriageway, heavily used without pedestrian footpaths.

I am deeply concerned that the safety of local residents in Piddington and the wider area has not been considered. Male and female, young and old will be at risk inevitably with such a dense population of young males being housed so close to small less populated areas and less policed areas.

Irrespective of race or background those men housed at the proposed site will have natural urges the only outlet for which will be local people, consenting or otherwise.

There is not the police or other infrastructure required to accommodate such high levels of additional people, the same would be true of prisoners or large detention centre/home, irrespective of race or gender or age.

The impact on wildlife and the area has also been improperly addressed.

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.

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 sincerely

[redacted]