From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 - Formal Representation regarding the Urgent Crown Development Application for Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 16 September 2026 09:50:17

[redacted]

Dear Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident living in [redacted] to formally submit my objection to the Urgent Crown Development Application for temporary asylum accommodation at Site A, MOD Bicester (PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843)

While I recognize the national need for asylum accommodation, the scale and location of this specific proposal present severe, unmitigated local planning and infrastructure impacts that directly affect nearby residents. My primary objections center on material planning considerations regarding local amenities, highway safety, community services, drainage, and public safety:

1. Severely Limited Retail and Post Office Infrastructure

The surrounding villages lack the commercial infrastructure required to absorb additional demand. Ambrosden has only one very small convenience shop and a small Post Office, both of which already struggle to meet the daily needs and demands of existing local residents. The neighboring village of Arncott similarly possesses only one small convenience shop. Expecting these tiny local amenities to cater to an additional population of up to 1,250 people is completely unsustainable and will lead to severe overcrowding, shortages, and disruption for long-standing residents.

2. Public Safety, Lighting, and Protection of Vulnerable Residents and Children

As a [redacted] I have extreme concerns regarding public safety, street lighting, and pedestrian security along the routes connecting Site A to Ambrosden and Arncott. The rural roads between these locations are dark, unlit, and lack secure footpaths. The proposal fails to demonstrate how off-site pedestrian movement will be safely monitored or lit, leaving vulnerable residents, mothers with young children, and pedestrians feeling unsafe when navigating their own neighborhood.

3. Pedestrian Safety and Highway Infrastructure

Ambrosden is situated within easy walking distance of Site A. Introducing up to 1,250 adult residents into a semi-rural environment without continuous, well-lit footpaths and safe crossings creates an immediate highway safety hazard for both pedestrians and passing traffic, particularly during dark winter hours.

4. Pressure on Essential Health and Emergency Services

Local healthcare facilities and GP surgeries in the Bicester and surrounding area are already operating at capacity. Placing a 1,250-person facility in this location will place an unsustainable burden on NHS resources, emergency service response times, and local transport networks that vulnerable residents rely on.

5. Drainage, Environmental, and Flood Risk Concerns

The proposal introduces heavy wastewater and sewage demands onto a rural site with known localized drainage issues. The application fails to demonstrate that surrounding watercourses and sewage systems can accommodate a facility of up to 1,250 occupants without posing environmental risks, surface water flooding, or pollution to nearby local land.

6. Unsustainable Location and Lack of Public Transport

The development breaches core sustainable transport principles set out in national planning policies. The site is isolated from main transit hubs, with virtually no regular public bus services linking Site A to broader amenities. This forces complete reliance on foot traffic along unsafe rural roads or private vehicles, placing unnecessary pressure on local rural highways.

7. Impact on Rural Character and Local Amenity

Placing a large-scale institutional development next to small rural villages like Ambrosden, Arncott, and Piddington represents a severe overdevelopment that is completely out of scale with the surrounding countryside. The resulting light pollution, noise, and sheer volume of occupants permanently harms the rural character, ecology, and quiet residential amenity of our villages.

8. Procedural Concerns Regarding Consultation Timeframes

The compressed 10-day consultation window provides insufficient time for local communities, parish councils, and statutory bodies to fully scrutinize complex technical assessments regarding traffic, ecology, and wastewater management for a proposal intended to last up to 10 years.

For these combined material planning reasons, I strongly urge the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State to take these impacts into account and recommend that this application be refused.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]