**From:** [redacted]
**To:** Crown Casework
**Cc:** Joe Marshall
**Subject:** Planning appeal PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
**Date:** 10 September 2026 08:44:30

---

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

Dear sir/madam

I am currently a resident of [redacted] in Oxfordshire and I am writing about the proposed development of an asylum seeker Centre on MOD Bicester Site A located on the B4011, ref PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

I have lived in [redacted] who have grown up there from the ages of four up to leaving for university or work. Before that, we lived in [redacted] and also before that in [redacted] when the original application for this site was rejected on several grounds. We are very familiar with this area, we walk and cycle around the local roads. We travel into Bicester on a regular basis and [redacted]. None of the immediate infrastructure around the site has changed in the last 25 years apart from an expansion of the prison and the addition of a traveller site on Widnall Lane. I believe that has also been a development of a concrete processing company opposite the prison. Traffic on the local roads has increased because of these developments and is often used as an alternative route to the M40 when it's congested and also by lorries seeking to avoid the low bridge on the A41. The speed limit on the road has been reduced to 50mph since 2003, however it has no pedestrian footways and is entirely unsuitable for pedestrians. Palmer Avenue provides an alternative route towards Bicester via Arncott and Ambrosden, but this has a National speed limit and no pedestrian footway.

Bicester has grown significantly over the last decade, but this has placed strain on the utility services in the area, as noted in the report prepared by the Home Office. The site has never been used for human habitation and is currently not fit for that purpose as it lacks the sufficient power, water and waste facilities. The site requires significant development over several months to be converted for the purposes proposed and without mains utilities will increase the traffic on the B4011 in terms of tankers delivering and removing from the site.

The planning proposal has been declared an urgent national matter, yet has already been ongoing for several months and would take several more to become operational where it is planned to be in use for ten years. This seems somewhat outside the definition of urgent and also far from temporary.

There are a number of inconsistencies within the application which should be clarified or corrected before the application can be properly assessed. Similarly there are incomplete sections and outstanding investigations which must be complete to adequately assess the proposal. For example, there are no plans for elevations or boundaries, basic elements of planning applications. There has been no assessment of potential light pollution. The site is a habitat for different species of protected bats which will undoubtedly be affected by increased lighting requirements. Our house in Piddington is already affected by light pollution from the prison and this site is closer to our home than the prison.

The proposed population of 1250 all male service users is far in excess of any individual local village population and is over 3 times the population of Piddington, the closest village. There is no plan included for how service users (which are cited as over 3,000 in other parts of the report) will be safeguarded, nor any mention of how this population will integrate with the local population, which they are free to do. There is no definite plan for healthcare, wellbeing, health and safety or even unexplored ordnance on site. The site will also need to accommodate staff, on different shifts and staying on site, with further increases the utility requirements and traffic flow. Although cost is not a planning matter, it is relevant to this being an urgent matter, as the site is being proposed on this basis as a lower cost alternative to hotels or HMOs, however there is no mention of cost anywhere in this proposal. If it is an urgent national matter it should include the cost evaluation, including the full site development costs. If it does not include these then it should be treated as a planning application for consideration by Cherwell authorities. National planning guidance requires that both national importance and urgency be demonstrated at the level of the individual site, not simply asserted by reference to a general national problem. The application does not state why this specific site is urgent or of national importance.

Furthermore, the Application Form records the proposed use class as C2A – Secure Residential Institutions, which is the same use class used for prisons and detention centres. Under international humanitarian law asylum seekers cannot be detained indefinitely and the information provided in relation to this site has always been that service users will be free to come and go. The application needs to be absolutely clear on the proposed use and treatment of service users.

I am challenging this notice based upon the fact the report is clearly incomplete and various evaluations relating to the report are clearly incomplete, therefore this notice should be rejected and a resubmission requested that is complete, including all of the requisite reports and surveys and then subjected to normal planning process and review i.e. not treated as a national urgent matter.

Yours faithfully

Robert Clark

[redacted]