[redacted]

From: Mark Elliott [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 12:30
To: Crown Casework
Cc: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk; [redacted]
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester

[redacted]

For the Attention of Secretary of State

I am writing as a member of the public to **object** to 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.)

Having studied the documents submitted with the application I would first of all 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.

A smaller accommodation centre was proposed early in 2000, this scheme was abandoned after inspectors found the location isolated, strain on services, road safety (very few pavements on main or surrounding roads leading into the town of Bicester). The national Audit Office found that a comparable accommodation programme in early 2000 was uneconomic and did not represent value for money.

The proposal is for a capacity to house 1256 single adult males, [redacted] Piddington which is the nearest settlement and borders the proposed facility, the current population of which is 304 residents, this proposal is four times the capacity of the village and I have serious concerns of being overwhelmed by this facility, there are no facilities within the village, no shop, no pub just a church and village hall, we also don't have any street lighting after mid night and no pavements to walk on. It is extremely concerning that this facility is proposed in such a rural location with no amenities close by.

Independent evidence, including High Court findings concerning a comparable site (RAF Wethersfield), has found that large-scale, isolated institutional accommodation of this kind carries a foreseeable risk of mental health deterioration among occupants, describing the Home Office's failure to assess the equalities impact of its own allocation policy as "a most serious and inexplicable omission".

Having said that the facility is to house 1256, single adult male above, section 1 (executive summary) of the PRELIMINARY UXO RISK ASSESSMENT – SITE 015 states a service capacity of 3510 users, this is nearly 3 times the capacity stated elsewhere, which would suggest that future planning may be much larger. The risk assessment is also a primary document based on a desk based assessment, no actual intrusive surveys seem to have been carried out and there is a risk that unexploded ordnance and contamination may be present.

There are so many unknown entities within the proposal such as flooding and drainage concerns, wastewater and electricity concerns, with no solution to a permanent solution, the applicants

assessment for the electrical supply even states that the current capacity is unknown and that generators would need to be relied on to meet the demand, this would, of course, mean diesel would be required to power these adding to pollution and noise creation.

The ecology survey was undertaken between 26th March - 10th April 2026 (item 2.3.1 Habitats in ecology report), this is inside/outside of the recommended time scale of April to September, so can not be relied on as a comprehensive survey.

If this application was to follow normal planning procedures, for say, a 300 home housing estate (x4 occupants/property =1200 people), this would never be approved for construction based on the information received.

In view of just a few notes above and not having time to consume all of the documents submitted due to the short representation period allowing insufficient time, I do not consider the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed facility is a suitable location for the area, taken together with the many presumed/preliminary documents submitted in the application, I would request that **planning permission is refused.**

Yours faithfully

Mark Elliott

[redacted]

13th September 2026