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 22:52:28

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.

First, I object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A on ecological and biodiversity grounds.

My objection is based in particular on the limitations and outstanding work identified in the applicant's own Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.

The ecological assessment expressly states that the survey cannot be considered a comprehensive assessment of the ecological interest of the site. It was based substantially on a single survey visit, and the report acknowledges limitations arising from survey timing, restricted access and the fact that establishing the presence or likely absence of protected species normally requires multiple visits at appropriate times of year.

The report identifies the site as having potential to support a range of protected and notable species and recommends further targeted surveys for hazel dormouse, barn owl, breeding birds, great crested newt, reptiles and terrestrial invertebrates. It also recommends pre-construction checks for badger and water vole.

I therefore consider that the ecological evidence is incomplete and that the application should not be determined until these surveys have been undertaken, assessed and made available for public scrutiny. The results could materially affect the development layout, construction methods, mitigation requirements and any licensing requirements.

There are also specific concerns regarding bats. Several trees have been identified as containing features suitable for roosting bats, and the ecological appraisal states that further nocturnal emergence and/or aerial surveys may be required where works or disturbance occur. Buildings may also require further bat surveys. The proposed development should therefore not proceed on the assumption that these impacts can simply be dealt with at a later stage.

I am also concerned about artificial lighting. The site contains habitats potentially used by bats for foraging and commuting, together with hedgerows, scrub and woodland-related habitats. The proposed development would introduce accommodation, roads, parking, security infrastructure and other facilities, with the associated requirement for external lighting. The ecological effect of that lighting on bats and other nocturnal wildlife should be properly assessed before determination, including the potential for illumination to disrupt ecological corridors.

A further significant concern is the relationship with Arncott Bridge Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest. The applicant's ecological assessment states that the site is approximately 1.8 km from the SSSI and lies within its associated impact zone. It

expressly identifies possible impact pathways including hydrological connectivity and pollution risk and states that consultation with Natural England may be required.

This issue is particularly important because the proposal includes a wastewater treatment plant and substantial drainage infrastructure. I ask that the potential hydrological and pollution pathways between the development and Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI are fully investigated and that Natural England's views are established before any decision is made.

The timing of the habitat survey also warrants caution. The ecological report states that the optimal period for the relevant habitat survey is April to September, whereas the survey was undertaken from late March to early April. The report acknowledges that this may reduce confidence in detecting less conspicuous or seasonally apparent flora and some species field signs.

The ecological assessment also records restrictions on access to parts of the site, including woodland areas. This further supports the need for additional surveys before the application is determined.

In particular, I request that the following are completed and published before determination:

1. All targeted protected-species surveys recommended by the applicant's ecologist.
2. Further bat surveys where required by the identified roost potential.
3. Appropriate seasonal ecological surveys where the existing survey timing limits confidence.
4. A complete assessment of potential impacts on Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI, including hydrological and pollution pathways.
5. A detailed ecological lighting assessment and lighting strategy.
6. A transparent biodiversity baseline and biodiversity net gain calculation.
7. Details of habitat retention, creation, enhancement and long-term management.
8. Details of how ecological mitigation will be secured, monitored and enforced throughout construction and the proposed ten-year period.

In my view, it would be premature to conclude that the development is acceptable in biodiversity terms while the applicant's own ecological assessment identifies these outstanding surveys, limitations and potential impact pathways.

I therefore request that planning permission be refused unless and until the outstanding ecological evidence has been completed and demonstrates that the development can proceed without unacceptable harm to protected species, habitats and designated sites.

I am also 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.

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 faithfully,

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone