**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:** 12 September 2026 10:24:45

---

[redacted]

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 have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site. In addition the concerns of local people have not been taken seriously enough

Ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous work identified potential issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns which may well put further pressure on local services if emergency response is required. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

The transport evidence raises serious questions. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, which does not inspire confidence in this proposal at any level. Thee 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. It would appear to me to be nothing short of negligent that 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 almost no 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. Should not this one be similarly cancelled before more public money is wasted.

The first duty of government is to protect its citizens. This proposal clearly ignores that duty. Local people are simply frightened. Old folk are frightened for their security, particularly their night time safety. Parents are, frankly, worried stiff for the safety of their children who will be put in danger.

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]