[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 21:04
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; [redacted]
Subject: Representation on PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Urgent Crown Development Application, MOD Bicester Site A, Piddington

[redacted]

I am writing to submit my representation on the above Urgent Crown Development application (reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843), for the temporary change of use of the former MOD Bicester Site A to provide non-detained asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 people. I live approximately 4 miles from the site and object to this application.

My objections are as follows:

1. Established planning history confirms the site is unsuitable for large-scale residential use

This is not the first time this land has been assessed for large-scale accommodation. Applications for residential caravan use on adjoining land (references 17/00145/F in 2017, for 16 families, and 21/00033/REF in 2021, for 12 families) were both refused and dismissed on appeal, citing concerns including site access and the adequacy of services such as sewage treatment. If the site could not support developments of this modest scale, the Secretary of State should require rigorous, independent evidence that it can now support accommodation for up to 1,256 people — a figure which government documents have

separately referenced as high as 3,510 — without failure of sewage, power, water, or other essential infrastructure.

2. Rural location with no public transport or amenities
The site is rural, with no meaningful public transport and no local amenities such as shops or healthcare. Housing a large population here with no practical means of accessing services or support raises serious questions about the sustainability and wellbeing implications of the scheme, and about the pressure this will place on neighbouring villages that do have such services.

3. Lack of transparency undermines proper scrutiny
The application was released after a 56-day wait, and 11 sections remain redacted, including provisions for suicide and self-harm prevention and health and safety. Residents cannot properly assess the safety and welfare implications of a scheme of this scale without access to this information, and I would ask that full disclosure be required before any decision is made.

4. Comparison with HM Bullingdon Prison is not a fair analogy
It has been suggested that the presence of HM Bullingdon Prison nearby demonstrates local tolerance for large institutional populations. This comparison does not hold: the prison population is securely contained within the prison, and has never presented an amenity, transport, or community-mixing impact on the village. The proposed accommodation, by contrast, is non-detained, meaning residents will be free to come and go into a village and surrounding area with no infrastructure to support such

movement. The two situations are not comparable, and this application should be assessed on its own facts.

I would ask that the Secretary of State require full disclosure of the redacted sections, independent verification of servicing capacity in light of the site's planning history, and full weight be given to the concerns of local residents and Cherwell District Council before this application is determined.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]