From:	Langford Kitchens
To:	Crown Casework
Cc:	calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject:	20260911 Formal Objection of Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 (MOD Bicester, Site A)
Date:	11 September 2026 13:39:04

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a [redacted] to formally object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester.

The objection is based on the development poses significant risks to local businesses, supply chains, workforce stability and essential infrastructure.

1. Infrastructure instability will directly affect local businesses

The application confirms that the site will rely on diesel generators for power. This is not a sustainable or reliable energy solution for a development of this scale. Local businesses depend on predictable infrastructure, yet the application lacks confirmed permanent solutions for electricity, wastewater, drainage and transport safety. Any strain on these systems will have immediate knock-on effects on commercial operations.

2. Increased pressure on local services will harm business productivity

The Government states that MOD sites are “self-sufficient,” yet the evidence does not support this. Local healthcare, policing, utilities and emergency services are already stretched. Businesses rely on these services for staff wellbeing, continuity planning and operational resilience. A development of this size, without complete assessments, will inevitably divert resources away from local employers.

3. Transport and road safety risks threaten staff, customers and logistics

The B4011 has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a history of serious collisions. The Transport Assessment contains factual errors and does not demonstrate safe access for a population of 1,256 people. For businesses that rely on staff commuting, deliveries, collections and customer access, this represents a serious operational risk. The local road network is already operating under significant strain, with persistent congestion and capacity pressures.

4. Commercial uncertainty created by incomplete evidence

Key assessments remain outstanding across contamination, ecology, noise, lighting and fire safety. Businesses cannot plan or invest confidently in their own local companies, when a major development is being progressed without a complete evidence base.

5. Procedural unfairness undermines confidence in the process

The consultation period is significantly shorter than the standard 21-day minimum normally applied to Crown Development cases. For an application exceeding

1,000 pages, this is not a fair or reasonable process for residents, businesses or local authorities. A rushed process increases the risk of poor decision-making and long-term commercial disruption.

6. Relevant precedent - previous refusal at this site

A smaller asylum proposal at the same location was previously refused by an independent Planning Inspector. The same unresolved issues remain, yet the scale has increased dramatically.

Request

Given the scale of the risks to local businesses, infrastructure and service capacity, I ask that the application is not approved subject to all outstanding assessments are completed, published, and a full and lawful consultation period.

Thank you for your support

Yours sincerely
Mr Tim Osborne
[redacted]