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: 17 September 2026 17:22:18

[You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

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 do not believe that the site is suitable location, and the application is being rushed through without the proper checks being carried out and is not complete. The ecological report has not been correctly investigated, and other technical work is outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety and ground conditions.

The issue of ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Potential contamination issues were identified in previous land-quality work, but no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

The site is prone to flooding, and the strategy for combatting this with adequate drainage has not been fully addressed.

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. I myself have been witness to a nasty accident in this stretch of road.

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 size of the site is far too big for its location, dwarfing the nearest established village. It is an isolated rural area, 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.

A previous application proved this location to wholly inadequate to be used as asylum accommodation, and nothing has changed in terms of infrastructure and amenities. This 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,

