From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework; "Calum Miller MP"
Cc: wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 16 September 2026 20:58:24

[redacted]

Good Evening,
Please find my opposing comments to the Bicester MOD. Ref - 26/01833/CROWN & PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 The factual points for opposing are numbered below, but some comments a from a personal stance first.

For myself; a single women who lives by herself, who has recently purchased a house in a [redacted] very close by to the proposed site, a mere [redacted] is now scared and worried what this could now mean for my safety.
This proposal is to house 1256 males. Males – who come from a place where women are not respected, where they are raped and abused. To be honest, I don't really care where these men are from. I would feel exactly the same if you stuck 1250 white British unemployed men, with known backgrounds in a camp next to small villages / town, free to roam, no security, with nothing to do all day and no money. Regardless of who they are or where they come from this is the perfect storm for trouble either amongst themselves or within the villages and towns locally. This is going to cause the most sudden rise of theft, and antisocial behaviour within our sleepy area.
I invested in this area because I've grown up around here, the rural feel to the villages, and the abundance of footpaths which are secluded. I now will not feel safe to walk/run out on my own now with the increase risk and fear of bumping into gangs of males in remote spots where anything could happen. The impact of this alone on my own mental health will be huge and feel I am being punished for being a working class citizen trying to make ends meet.
How long will it be until a women or child gets abused or raped by these people in villages and social areas that were once nice places to live. How long or how many times does it have to happen for you to realise that the majority of these people are not hear to seek safe asylum - they have paid their way to be here, funded gangs and to use and abuse our systems.
The MOD land and buildings should be used as an asset for the British defence and army. In a time where we need them more than ever, you are giving up space for some portacabins. We have army veterans homeless on our streets and you can't even put up the portacabins for them when they served for our country.
The income tax bill doesn't even cover the costs of the welfare bill and you are spending further tax payers money to house people who have entered the country illegally. Please tell me where the logic in this, that money needs to be spent on people in our own country, and on our own people first. Sort the British people out, get employment off the floor, before you spend money on others.
Looking through these documents and working in the construction industry, I know first hand the costs to get this project up and running. Andy Burnham stated that 'they made a pack to stop using hotels' – why? Use hotels and facilities that are already built and purposeful?. Why spend more of tax payers money on getting this site up and running. It makes a mockery of the system us tax payers work so hard for, for it to spent on this.

To summarise, the site to house illegal immigrants at Bicester MOD is purely a dumping ground for the governments complete inability to secure the border.

I am a British women who now fears for her life, knowing there are over 1000 men being housed locally who have no care or respect for women and could abuse daily. The lies and secret planning this government has done in conjugation with the MOD is suicidal.

1. The Urgency was created by the home office, and we were told last.

   The plan was made public on the 25th June 2026 and Cherwell District Council says it was told hours beforehand. By then the Home Office already had a 2025 feasibility study, a National grid enquiry dated 21st November 2025, site visits in February and March 2026, and exploded ordnance assessment dated 31st March, and traffic counts and an asbestos survey in April.

   Ecology, flood risk and ground reports were finalised in May.

   The article 4 notice is dated 16th June and calls the application 'submitted' – before any announcement. Yet the government's factsheet of 30th June still said the site was only being 'considered' with feasibility work 'that could take several months'. The Transport Assessment confirms 'no pre application scoping discussions have been held with the local planning and highways authorities'.

   Months of private preparation, then 10 days for us to respond.

2. It is not temporary

   It is presented as a 10 year temporary use. The Home Office's own documents sat the site will subsequently be expanded for use as a long term asylum accommodation solution, that 'there is no definite plans to decommission the site' and it will run for a 'minimum' of 10 years. With the potential for this to be extended. The temporary Class Q route was rejected because it would not give certainty for permanent infrastructure solutions.

   The ordnance assessment was commissioned for 3510 people across 50.5 hectares – nearly three times what is being applied for. This looks like phase one of something much bigger.

3. Sewage and brooks.

   Sewage already goes into our local brooks and this will make it worse. The drainage design statement admits ' there are no apparent watercourses that seem suitable for discharge within the curtilage of the site' and Home Office correspondence says effluent would go to a watercourse… exact watercourse is unknown. A mains connection is 'preferred' but Thames Water Capacity is unconfirmed.

   Phase 1 may rely on a cesspool, with the waste being taken away, which the documents admit is not a viable option for the total number of residents.

   There is no Environmental Agency permit, and the document expect 'protracted negotiations'. There is nothing on what happens if the treatment plant fails? Run-off control 'does not include detailed water quality treatment design'. The treatment works would sit about 100m from residents, falling to roughly 45m in later phases, against the document's own '250m' odour standard. Nothing guarantees that only treated foul sewage reaches our brooks.

4. Wildlife

   The site is 1.8km from Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI and about 1km from the River Ray,

in the Otmoor Lowlands. On the 16 July the Home Office told Natural England 'it is reasonable to assume that the site's surface water could enter the SSSI'. On the 23rd July Natural England advised 'the proposal could have potential significant effects on Arncott Bridge SSSI, and a hydrological connection cannot be ruled out' all while noting it had not sight of the drainage details themselves. The habitats regulations screening still claims there is no hydrological pathway.

The ecology survey was 'only a single visit' 'just outside the optimal survey window' and 'cannot be considered comprehensive'. It recommends further surveys for dormouse, barn owls, breeding birds, great crested newts, reptiles, invertebrates and roosting bats. None has been published. Along with no information on biodiversity net gain assessment.

5. Contaminated land and unexploded ordnance.

   This was the UK's larges WWII bulk ordnance depot. Yet: No intrusive ground investigation has been undertaken. Desk based information only and remain 'unverified'. The document recommend sampling 'the area where munitions were handled and stored and testing shallow soil for asbestos'. Asbestos is confirmed in the building and part of the winder site is excluded 'due to health & safety concerns'.

   The ordnance report is a desk study too. It says munitions storage 'cannot be discounted' and 'further research is warranted', yet its only mitigation is training and an emergency plan. Nobody has tested this ground, so nobody can say it is safe to live on.

6. Infrastructure the site doesn't have.

   The water network is of 'limited capacity relative to any concentrated development'. The electricity networks' 'condition, capacity and configuration are currently unknown' against a 2.16 MVA demand, so generators are proposed. There is no response from any utility company. There is 'no pedestrian infrastructure' on a fast largely unlit rural, busy B road, yet the transport assessment still claims the villages are within 'reasonable walking distance'. It is ket traffic figures are blank, and construction traffic is not possible to estimate. Health provision is 'subject to discussion' and the equality impact assessment accepts the scheme 'may ave additional demands on the police'. Piddington has around 358 residents. This is 1,256 people – nearly four times that.

7. No details of materials or design

   The application form gives no materials and the fire strategy says 'more information is necessary'. Detailed design is left to 'discharge of conditions'. The landscape statement assessed buildings 'no greater than 6 metres' while the parameters plan allows 'up to 12m high, with double stacked accommodation' – so the visual assessment was done on half the height being applied for.

8. Housing, but no new homes.

   The application claims no gain in residential units , yet describes a 'residential development; and living accommodation' with residential buildings and the screening request calls it 'typical of this scale of housing development'. The form references use of Class C2A, which covers secure residential institutions for something described as 'non detained'.

9. Work has already started, and the EIA covered a different scheme.

The form says work has not commenced, yet a large amount of property and goods has already gone from the site. The documents say military equipment ‘is to be removed during summer 2026’ and the site ‘will be vacated during summer 2026’.
More seriously, the screening that avoided a full environmental impact assessment told the Secretary of State there would be ‘no demolition of existing buildings’ aparet from the 5 nissen huts, The planning statement proposes demolishing 15,950sqm plus ‘vegetation clearance’. That decision was made on a different scheme and should be revisited.

10. A defence site given up at the wrong moment, for the wrong thing.
    Parts of the site are still leased for defence storage and in active use. Not one document confirms the MOD has no future need for it. With the world as it is and our forces needing to grow, locking up one of our few remaining large MOD sites in the regions for a decade or more makes no sense.

11. It has failed here before.
    A 2003 permission for a 750 person home office accommodation centre on this same site was ‘ultimately abandoned’ This one is roughly 70% bigger, on less evidence.

If a member of the general public had submitted a planning application, it would have been thrown out at the start of point one.
Why should the government try to get this through when there are clearly SO many flaws in the proposal. This is and always will be, the wrong site for this plan.

Regards,

[redacted]