From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 15 September 2026 17:31:22

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A.

I am objecting to the suitability of this particular site and the planning merits of the proposal. My objection is not directed at people seeking asylum, but at whether this is an appropriate, sustainable and properly assessed location for accommodation of this scale.

Having considered the information available about the proposal, I have a number of serious concerns.

1. The evidence supporting the application is incomplete

I am concerned that important assessments and surveys have not been completed or are not sufficiently comprehensive to demonstrate that the site is suitable.

In particular, the issue of ground contamination requires proper investigation. This is a former MOD site, and I do not believe the potential risks associated with its previous use should be treated as an issue that can simply be resolved after occupation.

Before such a substantial residential development is approved, there should be convincing evidence that the land is safe and suitable for its intended use.

2. Flooding and drainage

Flooding and drainage are also significant concerns.

Accommodation is proposed in an area of the site understood to experience regular flooding. This raises obvious questions about the safety and resilience of the development, particularly given the scale of the proposed population and the ten-year proposed duration.

I am not convinced that the application demonstrates adequately that flood risk, surface-water drainage and wastewater can be safely and sustainably managed.

These matters should be resolved before permission is granted, rather than being left to subsequent stages.

3. Essential infrastructure has not been adequately demonstrated

The proposal raises serious questions about basic infrastructure, including water, electricity and wastewater.

I am concerned that the application does not demonstrate a reliable, permanent supply of essential utilities sufficient for a development of this scale. The proposed reliance on generators and tanker-based arrangements is particularly concerning.

A development intended to house up to 1,256 people for up to ten years should have

appropriate and reliable infrastructure in place. It should not depend on arrangements that appear inherently temporary or vulnerable.

4. Transport, roads and pedestrian safety

The additional traffic generated by a development of this scale needs to be properly assessed.

There will be movements associated with residents, staff, deliveries, maintenance, healthcare, waste collection and emergency services. I am concerned about the effect this could have on the surrounding road network and nearby communities.

Pedestrian safety is also important. The application should demonstrate how people staying at the site will safely access public transport, shops, healthcare and other services, particularly given the rural nature of the surrounding area.

I do not believe these impacts should be underestimated simply because the development is described as temporary.

5. Impact on the countryside and local environment

I am concerned about the continued loss and degradation of countryside around Bicester.

The surrounding open land has value to local residents and wildlife and contributes to the character of the area. Development of this scale should only take place where there is a compelling case that the site is suitable and that less environmentally damaging alternatives have been properly considered.

I am particularly concerned that the ecological assessment is not yet sufficiently complete to provide confidence that the full environmental consequences are understood.

The fact that this is Government-owned land should not, in my view, make the environmental and landscape considerations any less important.

6. The site has previously been rejected for asylum accommodation

I believe considerable weight should be given to the fact that this site has previously been considered and rejected as a location for asylum accommodation.

If the Government now considers the site suitable, it should clearly explain what has materially changed since that earlier decision and why the concerns that previously made the site unsuitable no longer apply.

Simply asserting a current need for accommodation does not demonstrate that this particular site has become appropriate.

7. Impact on local services and public expenditure

I am concerned about the additional demands that a development accommodating up to 1,256 people could place on local services and infrastructure.

This includes healthcare, policing, emergency services, roads, waste management and other public services.

There is also a legitimate question about the overall cost to the public. The Government should demonstrate that the expenditure required to prepare, operate, secure and ultimately

decommission this site represents good value for money when compared with genuinely suitable alternatives.

I am particularly concerned that costs and pressures generated by a national policy decision should not simply fall upon local services and local taxpayers.

8. Proximity to HMP Bullingdon

I also believe the proximity of the proposed development to HMP Bullingdon requires proper consideration.

I am not suggesting that asylum seekers should be associated with criminality or treated as a security risk because of their status. My concern is about the planning and operational implications of locating two substantial and sensitive facilities in close proximity.

The relevant authorities should demonstrate that the interaction between the two sites has been properly assessed, including implications for emergency access, traffic, policing, site management and the operation of HMP Bullingdon.

This is a legitimate site-specific consideration and should be addressed with evidence before any decision is made.

9. The exceptionally short representation period

Finally, I am concerned about the exceptionally short period available for the local community to consider and respond to a proposal of this complexity and scale.

The application raises issues involving contamination, flood risk, drainage, ecology, infrastructure, highways, public services and the wider environmental impact. Residents need a reasonable opportunity to understand the evidence and make informed representations.

The urgency of the Government's objective should not remove the need for proper scrutiny of the planning evidence.

Conclusion

Taken together, these issues lead me to the conclusion that the Government has not demonstrated that MOD Bicester Site A is a suitable location for this development.

There are too many unresolved questions concerning contamination, flooding and drainage, infrastructure, transport and pedestrian safety, environmental impact, the effect on local services, value for money and the relationship with HMP Bullingdon.

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

If the Government is nevertheless minded to proceed, I ask that the outstanding evidence and assessments on these matters are completed and made available for proper public scrutiny before any decision is taken.

Thank you for considering my representation.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

