From:	Carina Collins
To:	Crown Casework
Cc:	calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk
Subject:	Objection: Planning Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date:	11 September 2026 15:57:03

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to lodge my objection to the planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-male asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

My objection stems from three areas of concern:
1. The process
2. The site
3. The local impact

The applicant appears to be bulldozing this proposal through by using the 'urgent Crown development application' method, bypassing Cherwell District Council and the normal planning process. It is only under pressure from local MPs that a consultation with the public has been established at all, and even then a 10-day window for feedback on over 1000 pages of evidence is entirely irregular. Normal consultation processes are 21 days. Given the scale of this proposal, and the significant infrastructure investment required, a thorough process and genuine consultation is essential to ensure proposals are fit for purpose, well-considered and deliver the best return on use of taxpayer money. That it's taken from June to September to formally lodge the application calls the 'urgent' nature of this proposal into question.

In terms of the site itself, it was designed as a storage and distribution site and never intended to host any kind of residential accommodation. The site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation and was refused by an independent Planning Inspector following a public inquiry in 2003 due to the site's isolation and local impact. These facts remain true today. The B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. There are no shops or services nearby. The cost to demolish the existing buildings and establish new accommodation and required infrastructure is considerable - both financially and ecologically - and I cannot believe this represents good value for taxpayers.

The application evidence submitted so far is incomplete, but already indicates potential contamination issues, flood risks and significant impact on protected species including bats. The investment required to mitigate these issues surely makes the proposals unfeasible. I note that significant ecological and technical work still needs to be undertaken and therefore the full facts regarding the site are not yet known. No decision should be taken until this work has been completed and assessed.

The operational proposals for the site are not clear. Details of security arrangements are not specified. It is unclear whether residents will be bused in and out on special buses (no reference to bus parking is made in the application), or expected to use existing limited public transport. It is unclear what measures will be in place to ensure the whereabouts of residents are known at all times in order to ensure the safety of both asylum residents and neighbouring communities. A response from the police force is not included in the application.

Given the nearest village of Piddington has a population of 358, the proposal to move up to 1,256 foreign men to the site is exceptionally large. The local population will be significantly outnumbered by foreigners and the male/female ratio will be 10:1. This is a monumental change in the demographics of an area, but even more so in a rural village location.
Bicester infrastructure is already under significant pressure. Local GP practices lack suitable facilities to serve patients and the patient:GP ratio is already 2500:1. The proposal makes no comment on how medical services will be provided; local services, including any secondment of local health practitioners, must not be impacted. To make such a huge investment in infrastructure for foreign nationals when local services are struggling is a huge betrayal of local British people.

As a resident of [redacted] and a woman living alone, I am extremely concerned about the proposal. Incidents of rape and sexual assault by asylum seekers are well-known and the government's recent publication of a pamphlet to discourage such behaviour only confirms the genuine risk. Locating over 1,200 foreign men to my area will change the way I live my life as I will no longer feel safe.

The applicant has not demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this nature or scale. I request that planning permission be refused.
If you are nevertheless in favour of approving the application, no final decision should be made before the outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny. Policing and operational plans must also be made clear.

Yours sincerely,
Carina Collins
[redacted]