FORMAL OBJECTION – MOD BICESTER SITE A

Application Reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Joyce Priddle,
[redacted]

Date 13 September 2026.

Dear Crown Development Casework Unit

I am writing [redacted] to formally object to the planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 (proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.)

I wish to state that my objection to the use of this site is not an objection to people seeking asylum. It is an objection to the size of the development, its suitability and to the effect on the surrounding area and people to be housed there. Having studied the documents provided, my objection questions whether the application has thoroughly explored all necessary assessments and established that this site is appropriate.

The site entrance is on the B4011. This is [redacted] fast and always very busy. There are no footpaths, no street lights and often accidents. Widnell Lane, [redacted], along with all other roads around the site and in the local area are narrow, rural roads with no footpaths or lighting.

The documents Transport Assessment confirms this and refers to an ''absence of any pedestrian infrastructure serving the site'' The documents suggest that mini buses will be provided to transport up to 1256 people. The document states that people will be free to come and go and does not state this will only be by minibus consequently suggesting these people will need to walk. The document does not address the risk or health and safety of these people or that of the road users. It states that due to the need for a fast-track application no pre-application assessment was prepared.

Within the documents submitted I would also like to bring attention to the application form section 19 which states that the use is for C2A which is secure institutions similar to prisons and secure hospitals, however the Home Office has stated that this is not a secure institution as the residents are free to come and go day and night, 7 days a week and therefore the application should **NOT** be classified under the class stated as this is not a true reflection of the proposal.

There are many inconsistencies within the documents when describing the site. Some documents state it is vacant and non -operational, a green field site, others that it is in active use for defence storage. It is in fact a former Army Ordinance depot with hardstanding, former rail sidings and a history of handling munitions. I have not seen any detailed assessments of the safety of this site for transformation to homes for the 1256 people anticipated to use it.

The application does not submit detailed plans of the proposed site layout, lighting, boundary and security fencing or drainage layouts. On July 14th 2026 the Home Office was asked in Parliament what assessments had been made of the adequacy of utilities and infrastructure at Site A. The answer was ''suitability assessments are ongoing '' and that these assessments would consider the above as well as operational planning including impacts on local services and communities. Many details within the

documents submitted seem to list unresolved and outstanding assessments. Surely these finalised assessments should be available to establish whether this site is suitable or not.

The application refers to the planning for the site as Urgent and temporary and states a period of at least 10 years but it also refers to the facilities being designed for longer case use. This does not make sense to me as longer use suggests ongoing use for a period of time unknown.

The proposal is for homes for 1256 single adult males, [redacted] Piddington which is the nearest settlement and borders the proposed facility, the current population of which is around 340 residents being elderly, working age and families. This application is for four times the capacity of a very quiet village and I have serious concerns with regard to the impact on [redacted] village. There are no facilities within the village, no shop, no pub just a church and village hall, [redacted] also don't have any street lighting after mid night and no pavements to walk on. It is extremely concerning that this facility with open doors is proposed in such a rural location with no amenities close by.

There is no evidence that Thames Water has confirmed in writing that the network can accommodate the scale of demand needed and Piddington already has low water pressure. There are little considerations given to the regular, high-risk flooding of the site which happens during wet weather and references to handling waste water are described as provisional. Electrical power, the applicant proposes to supply using a diesel-powered generator. Not only creating air pollution but also significant noise. This will affect the surrounding ecology which is well established on this site and in surrounding countryside. Once again, I question the choice and suitability of this site and its proposed change of use.

I understand that some aspects of a planning application are developed after the planning has been approved. But this application fails to produce many assessments, operational planning and evidence which establishes it as a safe and suitable site for conversion to accommodate 1256 asylum seekers.

These are some objections that I raised having considered the application for the use of Site A MOD Bicester, they are not political objections. I would like them to be considered carefully and ask that planning consent is **not** given until all questions and assessesments have been resolved and the necessary evidence produced for proper consideration of the site.

I would be grateful if this objection could be placed on the official case file and considered when the application is determined.

Application Ref – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

Joyce Priddle,
[redacted]

Date 13 September 2026.