From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 17 September 2026 14:33:23

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

Dear Secretary of State,

Re: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Proposed asylum accommodation at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

I am writing as a resident of [redacted] to object to the proposed development at Site A, MOD Bicester, which would provide asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 people.

I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused.

My concerns are mainly about the size of the proposal, the location of the site and the impact that a development of this scale could have on Bicester and the surrounding communities.

Local services and infrastructure

As someone who lives in [redacted] I am concerned about the additional pressure that accommodation for up to 1,256 people could place on local services and infrastructure.

This is a very large number of people to accommodate at one site, in addition to the staff and facilities that would be required to operate it. I do not think it is enough to assume that the existing infrastructure will simply be able to cope. There needs to be clear evidence that the necessary services and utilities are capable of supporting a development of this size.

I am particularly concerned about essential utilities such as electricity and wastewater, and whether the proposed arrangements are sufficient for the number of people being accommodated.

These issues should be properly resolved and explained before planning permission is granted.

The scale and location of the proposal

I am also concerned about the suitability of the site for accommodation on this scale.

The fact that it is a former military site does not necessarily mean that it is suitable for accommodating more than 1,250 people. It is in a relatively isolated rural location, with limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

This matters because people living at the site will still need access to shops, healthcare, public transport and other essential services. The impact of those journeys and the additional demand on the surrounding area needs to be properly considered.

In my view, the question should not simply be whether there is enough physical space within the former MOD site. It should also be whether the location and the infrastructure around it are appropriate for a

development of this size.

Previous consideration of the site

I am also concerned about the previous planning history of the site.

The location was previously considered for asylum accommodation, with a proposal for approximately 750 people considered in 2003. Following a public inquiry, an independent Planning Inspector recommended that planning permission should not be granted. The Government subsequently granted permission, but the proposed accommodation centre was never implemented and the scheme was ultimately cancelled.

The current proposal is significantly larger. It would accommodate up to 1,256 people, compared with approximately 750 in the previous proposal. That is an increase of 506 people, or approximately 67.5%

I think this difference is important. This is not simply the same proposal being brought forward again. The number of people involved is substantially higher, with corresponding requirements for accommodation, utilities, transport, services and site management.

I would therefore like to see clear evidence explaining what has changed since the previous proposal and why the site is now considered suitable for a development of this greater scale.

Outstanding evidence and public consultation

I am also concerned that some of the evidence needed to properly assess the proposal is not yet complete.

The Home Office's own application documents acknowledge limitations in the evidence base. The ecological consultant states that the survey undertaken cannot be considered a comprehensive assessment, while further species surveys remain outstanding. There are also outstanding matters relating to biodiversity and fire safety.

For a proposal of this size, I do not think it is unreasonable to expect the necessary surveys and technical assessments to be completed before a decision is made. Local residents should be able to see the full evidence on which the decision will be based.

The application documents are extensive and cover a large number of technical issues. Given the scale and potential impact of the proposal, I do not believe the current consultation period gives residents enough time to properly understand the application and make informed representations.

I therefore ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, ending on Monday 28 September 2026. This would give residents, local councils and technical specialists a more reasonable opportunity to consider the proposals and respond.

Conclusion

I appreciate that the future use of the former MOD site is an important issue, but I do not believe a development of this scale should be approved without clear evidence that the site and surrounding infrastructure can properly support it.

As a Bicester resident, my concerns are about the potential impact on local services and infrastructure, the rural location, the substantially increased scale compared with the previous proposal, and the fact that some important evidence is still outstanding.

I therefore respectfully ask the Secretary of State to refuse planning permission.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until the 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 public scrutiny.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objection.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]