From: Simon Taft
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: 11 September 2026 21:48:10

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire.

My principal concern is the overall cost of this proposal and the absence of clear evidence demonstrating that the full financial implications have been properly assessed. Given the scale of the development, which would accommodate up to 1,256 residents, I believe there should be much greater transparency regarding both the capital costs and the ongoing expenditure that would be required to make the site suitable and operational.

Having reviewed the application documents, I am concerned that a number of fundamental matters remain unresolved, making it difficult to understand the true cost of delivering the scheme. Significant uncertainties remain around drainage, flood mitigation, contamination, electricity supply, wastewater infrastructure, highways and pedestrian safety. Until these issues have been fully investigated, any assessment of the overall cost appears incomplete.

Of particular concern is the potential for substantial additional expenditure arising from site preparation and remediation. Previous studies have identified the possibility of land contamination, yet further intrusive investigations have not been undertaken. Without a full understanding of site conditions, neither the public nor decision-makers can properly assess the scale of any remediation works that may be required or the cost of delivering them.

Similarly, important questions remain regarding flood risk and drainage. Parts of the site have been identified as being vulnerable to surface water flooding, while aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved. Should significant engineering works be required, these could add considerably to the overall cost of the development.

The application also fails to provide certainty regarding key infrastructure requirements, including electricity supply and wastewater provision. These are essential services for a development of this scale and it is unclear what additional investment may be required to establish adequate capacity. Approving the proposal before these costs are fully understood would, in my view, be premature.

Beyond the direct development costs, I am concerned about the suitability of the location itself. The site is relatively isolated, with limited public transport, restricted pedestrian infrastructure and few local services within easy reach. Any future requirement for transport improvements, highway upgrades or additional supporting infrastructure could result in further expenditure that has not been clearly identified within the application.

The quality of some of the supporting evidence also raises concerns. For example, the Transport Assessment contains references to incorrect roads, which undermines confidence in the accuracy of the analysis and the reliability of the conclusions being presented.

More generally, I do not believe that a proposal of this magnitude should be considered for approval while so many important technical matters remain outstanding. It is difficult to

determine whether the development is practical, sustainable or financially justified when the full extent of the required mitigation, infrastructure and site works remains unknown.

I am also concerned that the consultation period has been insufficient for proper scrutiny. The application comprises a vast quantity of technical material across numerous disciplines, and local residents, councils and technical specialists should be afforded adequate time to review and assess the information before a decision is made.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Should the Secretary of State nevertheless be minded to approve the application, I would ask that no decision is taken until all outstanding investigations have been completed and published, including those relating to contamination, drainage, flooding, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, wastewater capacity, fire safety and decommissioning. In addition, a comprehensive and transparent assessment of the full implementation and operational costs associated with the proposal should be made publicly available before any determination is reached.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Taft
[redacted]