From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Objection Bicester MOD Site A
Date: 07 September 2026 21:54:38

[redacted]

Dear Sir or Madam,

I object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, for the use of MOD Bicester (Site A) as asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 people.

I live in [redacted]

I object on planning grounds, not on asylum policy. My objection is that the site is unsuitable for this scale of use, and that the application does not contain the evidence needed to conclude otherwise. It seems likely the whole application is being rushed through on political grounds with minimal representation and deferred/ignored surveys, rather than taking the right steps to ensure the site is safe and fit for purpose.

From the applicant's own Planning Proposal Statement, there are several issues with no clear resolution:

1. No safe access on foot, for 1,256 people with no cars.
The applicant confirms there is no pedestrian infrastructure on the B4011, making both site accesses "inaccessible by foot". There is no cycle infrastructure on a 60mph single carriageway, and the road has had several accidents in recent years. Walking to the nearest bus stop would also not be possible due to the B4011 having no pavement.

The proposal suggests that the site is "self-contained", and yet very clearly doesn't offer everything necessary to be self-contained. It states its residents will be signposted to recreation and education "in the local community", they will need to obtain clothing from voluntary sector support "in the vicinity", and will be free to attend worship off-site.

Both positions cannot be correct. If the site genuinely meets residents' needs on site, the applicant should explain how recreation, education, clothing, and worship are to be provided within it, because their own document states they are not. If, as appears to be the case, residents will need to leave the site on foot, then the applicant has already accepted that there is no safe way to do so.
I believe to ignore this contradiction and proceed would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety along the B4011.

2. Healthcare provision hasn't been demonstrated.
On-site provision is only "space for the provision of healthcare", and not a funded service. The applicant then names Unity Health Brill, 4.5 km away in Buckinghamshire, and asserts it has spare capacity, without a source.

Neither the practice, nor Buckinghamshire Council, nor Brill Parish Council appears to have been consulted, and no Health Impact Assessment has been submitted. [redacted] I would ask that the assertion be put to the practice, the local healthcare body, and to the councils, and their responses published.

3. Management and security cannot be assessed.
Only an outline management plan exists; the full plan will be written after a contractor is

appointed and kept on site, never published or enforceable through planning controls. The Security Management Plan, admissions and access arrangements, trip generation figures, junction capacity data and parking numbers are all withheld.
I accept that some operational security detail needs to be kept confidential. But we are being asked to accept conclusions while the evidence for them is undisclosed.

I ask that the application be refused, or determination deferred, until the withheld transport and security material is disclosed in a form allowing comment, the statutory consultees respond on the record, Buckinghamshire Council and the affected parish councils are consulted, and a further representation period of at least 30 days is provided.

Please acknowledge receipt and confirm that this representation will be placed before the decision-maker.

Yours faithfully,
[redacted]