From: Katie Jenkinson
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Objection – MOD Bicester Site A – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 11 September 2026 14:49:00

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing formally to object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A, application reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

I live locally and I am very concerned about the scale of this proposal, particularly as it would accommodate up to 1,256 people for up to 10 years. I also noticed that this report refers to accommodation for 3,510 people, even though this application is for 1,256. That seems like a significant discrepancy and makes me question whether all the technical documents have been prepared specifically and accurately for this proposal.

I want to make it clear that my objection is not based on anyone's nationality or immigration status. My concern is whether this particular site is suitable for a development of this size, and whether enough has been done to protect both the people who would live there and the existing local community.

I understand this would be an open site rather than a detention centre, so residents would be free to leave the site and go into the surrounding area.

My main concerns are:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->the safety and safeguarding of local residents, particularly women, young people and older or vulnerable people. (There does not appear to be a full, detailed Community Safety and Safeguarding Assessment looking at what this could mean outside the site itself);

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->the protection of those who will live there, migrants who are likely already to have been traumatised by dangerous journeys and difficult situations in their home countries;

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->the lack of a completed Operational Management Plan which will only be produced once the service provider has been appointed;

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->the costs of making this site suitable, at a time when there is so much financial constraint in our country;

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->uncertainty over the impact on policing and emergency services;

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->poor pedestrian access and unsafe walking conditions (no footway and no street lighting at the northern access, the B4011 has a 50mph speed limit, and around the southern access the footways are only about one metre wide with no proper crossing facilities);

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->the fact that the Travel Plan does not appear properly to assess movements of the 1,256 residents themselves;

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->unresolved sewage and drainage arrangements (important surveys have not yet been completed and the drainage report itself appears to say that the viability of the current proposals has not yet been determined, also there is not yet definite confirmation that the local wastewater system has enough capacity).

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->surface-water flood risk (I understand that parts of the site are at risk of surface-water flooding, requiring further investigation and modelling);

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->questions relating to the site's former military use (The submitted unexploded ordnance assessment says further investigation may be needed

because of the site’s historic association with munitions);

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->and the impact on healthcare and other local services.

The proposal appears to rely heavily on the site being largely self-contained, but it is not clear to me exactly what health services would be available on site, how they would be staffed, what hours they would operate, and which services would still rely on local GPs, hospitals, ambulances and other local facilities. This should be clearly established before permission is given, as there are already issues with access for Bicester residents to GPs locally.

Finally, although this is described as a temporary development, 10 years is a long time. For local people, this would not feel temporary. A facility housing up to 1,256 people for a decade will have a major effect on local roads, services, policing, the environment and surrounding communities.

For all of these reasons, I do not believe it has yet been shown that MOD Bicester Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

At the very least, I believe there should be no occupation of the site until all of these matters have been properly investigated and resolved, with enforceable safeguards in place.

In particular, I would ask for a full Community Safety and Safeguarding Plan that specifically considers the impact on women, young women, older residents, vulnerable people and anyone walking alone in the surrounding area, particularly after dark.

I therefore respectfully ask that this application is refused.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

Anne Jenkinson

[redacted]