From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Formal objection to MOD Bicester Site A: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 15 September 2026 17:35:38

[redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I wish to submit a formal objection to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A.

My objection is based on the suitability of the site and the planning consequences of the proposed development. I fully recognise the need for suitable accommodation for people seeking asylum, but I do not believe that need removes the requirement to identify a site which is properly serviced, environmentally appropriate, safe and sustainable.

In my view, the Government has not demonstrated that MOD Bicester Site A meets that test.

1. A former MOD site should not automatically be regarded as suitable for residential occupation

The fact that land is owned by the Government does not necessarily make it suitable for housing more than 1,200 people.

This is a former military site with a particular history and a range of constraints. Before it is used for residential accommodation on this scale, there needs to be compelling evidence that the land, infrastructure and surrounding area are suitable for this purpose.

I am concerned that the investigations into ground conditions and contamination are not sufficiently complete to provide that assurance.

2. The proposed development is temporary, but its impacts are not

Although the proposal is described as temporary, the accommodation could remain in place for up to ten years.

That is a substantial period in planning terms. The impacts on roads, infrastructure, landscape, ecology and public services would therefore not be short-lived.

I do not think describing a ten-year development as temporary should diminish the weight given to those impacts.

The planning authority should consider the proposal on the basis of the real-world consequences of having a development of this scale operating for a decade.

3. Flooding and drainage need to be resolved before occupation

I am concerned about the known flooding issues affecting parts of the site, particularly given the location of proposed accommodation.

A development accommodating up to 1,256 people needs to be resilient to extreme weather and capable of protecting residents and emergency responders.

The drainage arrangements also need to demonstrate that the development will not worsen flood risk elsewhere.

I do not believe these matters should be dealt with through conditions or remedial measures after residents have moved onto the site. The suitability of the site should be established first.

4. The proposed utility arrangements are not appropriate for a development of this size

I have serious concerns about the apparent lack of confirmed permanent infrastructure for water, electricity and wastewater.

The proposal's reliance on generators and tanker arrangements raises questions about resilience, reliability, environmental impact and long-term practicality.

This is effectively a small settlement rather than a conventional building project. Essential services should therefore be planned and provided to an appropriate standard for the population being accommodated.

5. Traffic and transport impacts

The development will generate considerably more activity than the number of residents alone might suggest.

There will be staff, contractors, deliveries, waste collection, healthcare provision, maintenance and emergency-service movements in addition to journeys made by residents.

The surrounding roads are not urban roads designed around a large residential development. I am therefore concerned about congestion, road safety and the effect on neighbouring villages.

There should also be proper provision for pedestrians and access to public transport. Residents should not be placed in a situation where safe access to everyday services requires navigating unsuitable rural roads.

6. Landscape and countryside

I strongly value the countryside surrounding Bicester and believe that its protection should be given proper weight.

The area is already experiencing significant development pressure. A large complex of accommodation blocks, security infrastructure, roads, lighting and associated facilities would have a substantial effect on the character of the site and surrounding landscape.

Even if the development is eventually removed, ten years is a significant period during which the landscape will be altered.

I therefore believe the Government should demonstrate clearly why this location is necessary and why alternatives with fewer landscape and environmental impacts have not been selected.

7. Ecology and biodiversity

The environmental consequences also require greater certainty.

Where ecological surveys and assessments remain incomplete or provisional, it is difficult to understand how a decision can responsibly be made on a development of this scale.

The precautionary approach should be to establish the ecological baseline properly and understand the consequences before construction begins.

8. Local services and infrastructure

A population of up to 1,256 people will inevitably create additional demand for local services.

The relevant question is not simply whether services can technically be accessed, but whether there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand without disadvantaging existing residents.

This should include healthcare, emergency services, policing, transport and other local infrastructure.

Any additional costs should be identified transparently and should not simply become an unforeseen burden on local authorities or local taxpayers.

9. Value for money

I am also concerned about whether this represents an appropriate use of public funds.

The Government is proposing substantial expenditure on accommodation, infrastructure, security, staffing and site preparation, followed by eventual decommissioning or restoration.

Before proceeding, there should be a transparent comparison with alternative locations, including the whole-life cost rather than simply the initial cost of establishing the site.

The need for asylum accommodation is not, by itself, evidence that this particular proposal provides value for money.

10. HMP Bullingdon and the need for proper site-specific assessment

The proximity of HMP Bullingdon is another reason why this particular location requires careful consideration.

I am not raising this on the basis of assumptions about the people who would be accommodated at the site. Rather, two significant and sensitive facilities would operate in close proximity, and the practical consequences should be properly assessed.

That should include emergency access, traffic management, policing, emergency response, site security and the operational requirements of HMP Bullingdon.

There should be clear evidence that all relevant authorities have been consulted and that any interaction between the two sites has been properly considered.

11. Previous consideration of the site

I am also concerned that the site has previously been considered for asylum accommodation and rejected.

If the circumstances have changed sufficiently for the Government now to regard it as appropriate, those changes should be clearly explained.

In particular, the Government should demonstrate what has changed in relation to infrastructure, flooding, environmental constraints, local services and the other factors that previously made the location unsuitable.

12. Proper scrutiny should not be sacrificed because the proposal is urgent

Finally, I am concerned about the use of an urgent planning process for a proposal involving such a substantial population and such a wide range of planning issues.

I appreciate the Government's need to address asylum accommodation capacity, but urgency does not make the planning impacts less important.

Residents should be able to have confidence that the same fundamental questions would be asked of this development as would be asked of any other large residential scheme.

Conclusion

For all of these reasons, I do not believe the Government has demonstrated that MOD Bicester Site A is the right location for this development.

The combination of unresolved contamination issues, flooding and drainage concerns, uncertain infrastructure, transport impacts, environmental and landscape considerations, pressure on local services, questions over public expenditure and the proximity of HMP Bullingdon makes this an inappropriate site in my view.

I therefore respectfully request that application **PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843** be refused.

If the application is nevertheless being considered for approval, I ask that the outstanding evidence and assessments are completed and made publicly available before a decision is reached, and that the cumulative impact of the development is fully considered.

Yours faithfully,

