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: 10 September 2026 11:12:42

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Secretary of State,

Re: Proposed accommodation for up to 1,256 asylum seekers at MOD Bicester

I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the proposal to accommodate up to 1,256 asylum seekers at MOD Bicester.

I want to make clear from the outset that my concerns are not about the people who may ultimately be accommodated at the site. My objection is to whether MOD Bicester is an appropriate location for a development of this scale, and whether the surrounding area and existing infrastructure are capable of supporting it safely and sustainably.

Although I have only lived in the area for a few months, I have very much enjoyed living here. One of the reasons I chose this area is its community, relatively quiet character and surrounding countryside. I am concerned that accommodating more than 1,200 people at one location could have a significant and lasting effect on the character of the area.

Most importantly, I believe there remain too many unanswered questions about the suitability of the site.

There are concerns regarding the condition of the land and the possibility of contamination, as well as concerns relating to flooding and drainage. I find it difficult to understand how a site can be considered suitable for accommodating more than 1,200 people when fundamental questions about the condition of the land and its ability to deal with surface water and drainage have not yet been fully resolved.

I am also particularly concerned about the impact on local roads and pedestrian safety.

The B4011 is already a busy road and pedestrian facilities in the vicinity are limited. Introducing potentially more than 1,200 additional residents to a site in this location could have a substantial impact on traffic and pedestrian movements. I am especially concerned about people needing to walk alongside or cross roads and routes that were not designed to accommodate a development of this scale.

There are also important questions surrounding basic infrastructure, including electricity, wastewater and drainage. These may be technical matters, but they are fundamental to determining whether the site is genuinely suitable for the proposed use. Before such a large number of people are accommodated in one location, it should be demonstrated clearly that the necessary infrastructure has sufficient capacity and can operate safely and reliably.

The site's location is another significant concern.

There are relatively few shops and other everyday services within easy walking distance, while public transport options in the area are limited. This raises questions about how residents would access essential services and about the consequent impact on local roads and transport infrastructure.

I am also concerned about the additional pressure that a development of this size could place on local community facilities and emergency services, including healthcare, policing, fire and rescue services and the road network. I have not seen sufficient evidence to reassure me that the cumulative effect of this additional demand has been properly assessed and that adequate capacity exists.

I also believe that local residents should be given a fair and meaningful opportunity to understand and comment on what is being proposed.

The volume of information associated with an application of this nature is substantial. Most members of the public do not have the time, specialist knowledge or resources required to assess hundreds of pages of technical documentation within a limited consultation period. Given the potential scale and long-term consequences of this proposal, I do not believe it is unreasonable for residents to be given sufficient time to understand the evidence and raise informed objections.

I recognise that there is a need to provide suitable accommodation for asylum seekers. However, that does not mean that every site is suitable for accommodating such a large number of people. In my view, MOD Bicester has not been demonstrated to be an appropriate location for a development of this scale.

I am particularly concerned about the potential effects on the local environment, road and pedestrian safety, infrastructure and the character of the surrounding area. I am also concerned about the consequences for people who already live locally.

For example, I am a young woman in my mid-twenties who enjoys walking in the surrounding countryside, and I have a young nephew who enjoys playing in the local parks. These are ordinary aspects of everyday life that we currently take for granted. I believe residents should be able to expect that the safety, accessibility and character of their local environment will be properly considered when proposals of this scale are being assessed.

In summary, I believe there are significant outstanding questions concerning:

- flooding and drainage;
- potential land contamination;
- wastewater and utilities capacity;
- electricity infrastructure;
- traffic and highway capacity;
- pedestrian safety and accessibility;
- lighting, noise and other effects on local amenity;
- ecology and the surrounding environment; and
- the capacity of local emergency and public services.

Taken together, these concerns lead me to believe that the scale of the proposed accommodation has not been adequately matched to the characteristics and capacity of the location.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that planning permission is **refused**.

At the very least, I ask that the decision is not rushed and that all outstanding investigations, assessments and infrastructure considerations are fully addressed, with the relevant information made available to local residents, before any final decision is taken.

I hope that the concerns of people who actually live in the area will be properly listened to

and given the serious consideration they deserve.

Yours faithfully,

Fenella Lockhart

