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: 11 September 2026 21:26:53

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I ask that planning permission be refused.

Piddington and the surrounding areas, need support. This part of the UK is huge for tourists and unspoilt.
The stuff of movies and a much needed time off planet can be found here for all. It's beautiful and should remain this way.

Large groups of men are normally monitored (see the Science), such as at football matches. If this goes ahead, will there be stewards and Police escorting these men in large groups around the villages, at all times when they're dropped off by the coaches in Bicester, as there's not even a shop in Piddington.
Has safeguarding risk been written up to include this, at all times, like at football? No it has not, because that would cost too much money + Police escort would then be labelled racist.
Cultural differences relevant to women's rights and behaviour do exist in some countries of origin, and authorities should account for relevant differences when conducting safeguarding risk assessments.

It isn't about saying that every individual man is dangerous.
It's about recognising the psychology of being confronted by a large group of unfamiliar men from another culture. Groups of men & even women, can behave differently from individuals, and people can become emboldened by being surrounded by others they know. That can make an otherwise ordinary encounter feel much more threatening to someone walking alone, particularly women, older people or anyone who feels physically vulnerable.

It should be against the law to congregate in large groups of men without Police presence. Other scenarios are monitored, such as demonstrations & football for this very reason of 'just incase it kicks off'.

2:

> **"Has a formal health-security/infectious-disease risk assessment been undertaken for a proposed communal population of up to 1,250 people, and has the UKHSA Health Protection Team been consulted? If not, should that assessment take place before occupation?"**

Sent to Professor David Heymann

I’m an honorary member of CHGH (special invitations).

3:

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

I am particularly concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

The transport evidence also raises serious questions. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions.

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

I am concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a substantial and complicated application. The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly considered in so short a time. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so I ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

Taken together, these issues mean I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until 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.

Plus the report from UKHSA after Epidemiological review.

Yours sincerely

Miss Judith Evans Looi (Jude)
[redacted]

My daughter: [redacted]