[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 21:14
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Re: Urgent Crown Development Application – MOD Bicester Site A Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A.
My objection can be summarised very simply: this is the wrong idea, in the wrong place, supported by the wrong plan.

The wrong idea

I recognise that the Government has a responsibility to provide appropriate accommodation for people within the asylum system. However, concentrating accommodation for up to 1,256 people on a single site of this nature is not, in my view, an appropriate or sustainable approach.
I also have a very practical concern about bringing together such a large number of people in one relatively isolated location, particularly if there is limited access to meaningful activities, employment, education, recreation or opportunities to integrate with the wider community.
I believe this would be a concern with any development accommodating more than a thousand people in these circumstances. If large numbers of people are living together for prolonged periods with comparatively little to occupy their time, there is an increased potential for frustration, tensions and associated social or community problems. That is neither fair on those being accommodated at the site nor on the existing communities surrounding it.
If accommodation on this scale is proposed, there needs to be a convincing plan explaining how residents will spend their time, how they will access services and activities, how they will interact positively with the wider community and how the potential impacts on neighbouring communities will be managed. I do not believe sufficient reassurance has yet been provided on these matters.
The question is therefore not whether accommodation needs to be provided, but whether concentrating this number of people at this particular location represents an appropriate way of providing it. I do not believe that it does.

The wrong place

MOD Bicester Site A is simply not an appropriate location for a development of this scale and nature. The proposal would effectively introduce a substantial new population into an area without the normal infrastructure, connectivity and services that would be expected to support a development accommodating more than a thousand people.
There are legitimate planning concerns regarding transport and accessibility, drainage and flooding, utilities and infrastructure, ground conditions and the environmental and ecological implications of the development.
These issues are particularly important given the sheer scale of the proposal. A site may be physically capable of accommodating buildings, but that does not automatically make it a suitable location for the community those buildings would create.

Bicester and the surrounding communities have already experienced significant development and population growth. Any proposal of this magnitude must demonstrate convincingly that the location is appropriate and that the necessary infrastructure can support it.
I do not believe that case has been made.

The wrong plan

Perhaps most concerning is the way in which such a significant proposal is being progressed.
This is described as a temporary development, yet permission is being sought for ten years. Ten years is a considerable period for surrounding communities and should demand a correspondingly robust assessment of the long-term consequences.
The application itself involves significant works: demolition, modular accommodation, healthcare and welfare facilities, roads and access ways, security infrastructure, wastewater treatment, staff facilities and recreational areas.
This is therefore far more substantial than simply making temporary use of existing MOD accommodation.
For a proposal of this size and duration, the evidence supporting it should be exceptionally comprehensive. Yet important questions remain regarding matters including infrastructure, transport, drainage, ground conditions and ecology.
Local people should reasonably expect those questions to be fully answered before a decision is taken, rather than subsequently addressed once the principle of development has been accepted.
The use of the Urgent Crown Development process also makes meaningful local scrutiny particularly important. A proposal affecting Bicester and its surrounding communities for potentially a decade deserves proper consideration and a convincing evidence base.

Conclusion

This objection is not about questioning the need for the Government to fulfil its responsibilities towards people seeking asylum.
It is about whether this particular development, at this particular location and on this particular scale, represents sound planning.
I do not believe it does.
There are too many significant questions about the suitability of the site, the infrastructure required to support a population of this size, the environmental and transport consequences and the adequacy of the evidence underpinning the proposal.

A better alternative

A dispersed approach
I also believe there is a better alternative to concentrating such a large number of people on one site.
Rather than accommodating more than a thousand people together at MOD Bicester, I believe the Government should properly examine a much more dispersed model of accommodation across Oxfordshire and, where appropriate, more widely.
Smaller-scale accommodation distributed across a number of communities could reduce the risks and pressures that inevitably arise when very large numbers of people are brought together in one location, particularly where opportunities for employment, education, recreation and other meaningful activity may be limited.
A dispersed approach could also provide much better opportunities for integration. Smaller numbers of people living within established communities would potentially have greater access to local services, voluntary organisations, education, community groups and everyday interaction with residents.

In my view, that would be better both for the people requiring accommodation and for the communities receiving them. Integration and community cohesion are far more difficult to achieve when more than a thousand people are effectively concentrated together on a single, relatively isolated site.
Any dispersed model would, of course, need to be properly planned and adequately funded, with the capacity of local services and individual communities taken into account. But I believe that approach deserves serious consideration before committing to a development of this scale at MOD Bicester.
My objection is therefore not simply an argument against this proposal. It is an argument for a different approach: smaller scale, properly supported and dispersed accommodation that seeks to integrate people into communities rather than concentrating them in one location.

It is the wrong idea, in the wrong place, supported by the wrong plan.
I therefore respectfully request that planning permission for application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 is refused.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]