From: Evie Terzino
To: Crown Casework
Cc: [redacted] planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: Re: Objection to Urgent Crown Development Application - MOD Bicester (Site A); Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 13 September 2026 22:40:05

[redacted]

Evie Terzino
[redacted]

13th September 2026

Crown Casework Unit Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Re: Objection to Urgent Crown Development Application MOD Bicester (Site A)
Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Site: Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Applicant: Home Office

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed asylum accommodation at the MOD site.

[redacted] I am genuinely frightened by the scale and nature of this proposal. The accommodation of up to 1,250 single adult men in one location represents a very significant change to the character and intensity of use of the site and surrounding area.

My concerns about personal safety are genuine. I should be able to walk locally, use public spaces and travel home in the evening without feeling unsafe. I believe the potential impact on the safety and quality of life of existing residents, particularly young women, needs to be properly assessed as part of the planning process.

I am also concerned about the capacity of local policing and emergency services to deal with the additional demands created by a development of this exceptional scale. The application should provide clear evidence that adequate security, access control, emergency response and policing arrangements will be available.

I am equally concerned about the ecological impact. There are protected species in the area, including bats and great crested newts. I believe a comprehensive ecological assessment should establish the presence of protected species and habitats and demonstrate that they will not be adversely affected by the proposed development.

The planning assessment should therefore properly consider:

* public safety, security and fear of crime;
* the exceptional scale and intensity of the proposed use;
* the impact on local policing and emergency services;
* traffic and pedestrian movements associated with the development;
* the impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding rural communities;
* protected species, including bats and great crested newts;
* potential impacts on habitats and biodiversity; and
* whether appropriate mitigation can realistically address these impacts.

I appreciate that asylum seekers themselves should not be judged by nationality or immigration status. My

objection is to the planning implications of accommodating such a large number of single adult men at this particular location and the resulting impact on public safety, local services, the environment and the existing community.

I strongly object to the proposal and ask that these matters are properly assessed and given appropriate weight when determining the planning application.

Yours faithfully,

Evie Terzino
[redacted]