From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Formal Objection – Urgent Crown Development Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A
Date: 07 September 2026 19:58:29

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE

I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the proposed development of MOD Bicester Site A for the accommodation of up to 1,256 asylum seekers.

I appreciate that the wider question of asylum accommodation is a matter of national policy. My objection is not to the principle that people awaiting determination of asylum claims require safe and appropriate accommodation. My objection concerns the **scale, location, suitability and long-term impact of this particular development on this particular site**, and whether the evidence submitted provides sufficient assurance that those impacts can be adequately managed.

I ask the Secretary of State to give particular consideration to the following material planning matters.

1. Scale and character of the proposed development

This is not a small accommodation facility. The application proposes capacity for up to 1,256 non-detained single adult males aged 18–65, operating 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

The scale of this proposal needs to be considered in the context of its rural location and the relatively small communities surrounding the site. Concentrating more than 1,200 people in one facility represents a substantial change in the intensity and character of the site's use and potentially affects neighbouring communities in a way that cannot reasonably be regarded as insignificant merely because much of the accommodation would be contained within the site.

I am particularly concerned that the development is repeatedly described as "temporary", while the proposed period of operation is at least ten years and the Transport Assessment states that facilities are being designed so that they could operate beyond ten years if required. A development capable of operating for more than a decade should, in my view, be assessed according to the reality of its potential long-term impact rather than treated as a short-term intervention.

2. The applicant's own Transport Assessment acknowledges that the location is not ideal

One of my strongest concerns is that the site's physical location appears fundamentally unsuitable for a residential population of this scale.

The Transport Assessment acknowledges that the location is "not ideal" from the perspective of accessibility by sustainable modes of transport. It identifies that there is no pedestrian infrastructure serving the site and recommends that service users use Home Office-provided minibuses rather than walk to surrounding settlements. It also records that,

because of the rural location, there are no other facilities within a 2km walking distance of the site.

This is particularly important because the proposed facility is explicitly non-detained. Residents will be able to leave the site and interact with surrounding communities.

I therefore question whether it is reasonable to locate more than 1,200 residents in a place where ordinary safe pedestrian access to nearby communities and services is acknowledged to be inadequate.

Reliance upon shuttle buses and minibuses is mitigation for a fundamentally inaccessible location; it does not make the location itself sustainable.

3. Impact on local infrastructure and services remains insufficiently resolved

The application repeatedly relies upon the proposed facility being largely “self-contained” in order to minimise pressure on surrounding communities.

However, self-containment is an aspiration, not a guarantee that local impacts will not occur.

The Equality Impact Assessment acknowledges potential impacts on healthcare, emergency services, policing and community relations. It also confirms that the exact healthcare provision for the site remains subject to discussion with local health authorities.

For a development accommodating up to 1,256 people, I am concerned that planning permission could be granted before the exact arrangements and capacities necessary to protect existing local services have been established.

This is particularly relevant in an area where existing residents already depend upon finite NHS, policing, transport and other public-service capacity.

4. Community safety, safeguarding and fear of crime

As [redacted], I want my concerns about community safety to be taken seriously without making assumptions about individual asylum seekers.

I recognise that a person’s status as an asylum seeker does not make them a risk to the community, and I do not suggest otherwise.

However, planning for a facility housing up to 1,256 non-detained adults requires an objective assessment of safeguarding, policing, anti-social behaviour, community safety and the fear of crime. The applicant’s own documentation recognises crime, fear of crime and community cohesion as matters requiring consideration and acknowledges that a facility accommodating a large number of single adult males may have an actual or perceived impact on community relations.

These concerns should not simply be characterised as negative public perception to be addressed through communication or factsheets. They require robust evidence about policing capacity, safeguarding arrangements, incident management and the impact upon neighbouring settlements.

The fact that 24/7 security is proposed within the site does not, by itself, address the impact outside its boundaries.

5. Key operational safeguards are not yet finalised

I am particularly concerned that the Planning Proposal Statement confirms that a full Operational Management Plan will only be prepared following the appointment of the Service Provider.

For a proposal of this size and duration, this appears to leave significant operational detail to a later stage.

Before permission is granted, decision-makers should be satisfied not merely that future management arrangements *could* mitigate impacts, but that there is a sufficiently detailed, funded and deliverable plan demonstrating *how* those impacts will actually be managed.

This should include clear arrangements covering policing and emergency services, healthcare provision, safeguarding, transport, movement to and from the site, anti-social behaviour and incident management, community liaison and mechanisms for responding where impacts exceed those anticipated.

6. Community cohesion and the suitability of institutional-scale accommodation

I also question the broader planning and social consequences of placing such a large, relatively homogeneous population into one isolated institutional facility.

[redacted] and understand personally what it means to build a life in another country. My objection is therefore not based on hostility towards migrants or people seeking asylum.

On the contrary, I question whether concentrating up to 1,256 people in a remote, highly controlled former military site, physically separated from normal community infrastructure, represents an appropriate or sustainable model either for the people accommodated there or for the communities surrounding it.

Large-scale segregation does not automatically create community cohesion. It may make integration and positive interaction considerably more difficult and create an artificial divide between the facility and existing communities.

7. The cumulative effect should be considered, not individual impacts in isolation

My concern is ultimately about cumulative impact.

A rural and poorly pedestrian-connected location; up to 1,256 residents; 24/7 operation; a minimum ten-year lifespan; increased staff, service and transport movements; potential demands upon police, NHS and emergency services; a non-detained population able to leave the site; and unresolved elements of the final operational arrangements must be considered together.

An individual mitigation measure may appear capable of addressing an individual issue. That does not necessarily demonstrate that a development of this scale is appropriate for this location.

I am also concerned by the limited opportunity afforded to the local community to scrutinise such an extensive proposal. The application was validated on 2 September and the public representation period runs only from 7 to 17 September. Given the volume and complexity of the supporting technical documentation and the potentially decade-long consequences for surrounding communities, meaningful public participation requires

sufficient opportunity for residents and local bodies to understand and respond to the evidence.

Conclusion

I therefore respectfully request that the Secretary of State **refuse planning permission for application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843**.

The national need to provide asylum accommodation does not, in itself, demonstrate that every available government-owned site is suitable for accommodation at this scale.

In my view, the application has not demonstrated convincingly that accommodating up to 1,256 people at this rural location can be achieved without unacceptable or insufficiently understood impacts upon accessibility, local infrastructure, public services, community safety and community cohesion.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that permission should not be granted without robust and enforceable planning conditions and/or obligations addressing, at minimum, maximum occupancy, transport provision, healthcare capacity, policing and safeguarding arrangements, community liaison, monitoring of impacts on local services, incident reporting, and a clear review mechanism allowing occupancy or operation to be restricted where mitigation proves inadequate.

This is the community in which my family and I live and are raising our children. I recognise the Government's responsibility to address the national asylum accommodation challenge, but solving a national problem should not mean transferring disproportionate and insufficiently mitigated consequences to one local community.

Please treat this email as my formal representation and objection to the application.

Kind regards,

[redacted]