Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to object to the following planning application, as a local resident of [redacted]
Planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX26 1AE.

I ask that the planning permission be refused based on the following grounds:

Insufficient public representation period:
I have huge concerns for the short representation period in order for communities affected, to properly examine such a large and complex application. A 10-day period is insufficient and at the very least, the standard minimum 21-day representation period should apply. Therefore, I ask that the consultation period be extended.

Historic Public Inquiry 2003 Precedent (Principle of Development):
A virtually identical planning proposal was submitted for the same site, which was rejected by a Public Inquiry in 2003. The geographical and physical constraints of Site A have not altered since. The 2003 Public Inquiry found:

- Site A is entirely unsuitable for a high-density, resident asylum population.
- The site is too isolated, would undermine social cohesion in small, nearby rural communities, and place unprecedented strain on local services.

The current application ignores established planning history that geographic and infrastructure constraints were identified by the Inspector, and remain unchanged and unresolved today.

Disproportionate all-male accommodation scale versus local community:
The proposed 1,256 all male free-to-roam asylum accommodation is hugely disproportionate to the nearest affected villages, Arncott and Piddington. According to the 2021 census, Arncott has a total of 1,660 residents, of which 543 are women. Piddington, a total of 358 people, of which 133 are women. As these men will not be contained, their presence will have a huge impact on local amenities and services, increasing the lack of community assimilation and safety for women in both Arncott and Piddington. As a 20-[redacted], I feel the vast scale of this asylum centre has been overlooked, compared to its nearby impact on our villages.

Major risk to ecology due to insufficient surveys
Incomplete and insufficient wildlife surveys on the proposed site, mean endangered species such as bats and Great Crested Newts, are at huge risk. Rare bats have been identified on the site by a local bat expert, as recently as August 2026. Further, thorough assessments are needed before this proposal can go ahead.
Additionally, full and targeted surveys haven't been carried out for protected and endangered species, such as: hazel dormouse and reptiles and Invertebrates.
The site is located within the SSSI impact zone for Arncott Bridge Meadows, which is 1.82Km away. There has been no consultation with Natural England for the presence of impact pathways, including hydrological connectivity, or pollution risk, which could have damaging effects on the designated site.

Tenuous foul water strategy

There are key data gaps in the Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment, regarding the foul water strategy for the site. The potential lack of capacity at nearby Bicester waste water treatment works, means the possible onsite treatment works with discharge to nearby watercourse, could lead to an environmental catastrophe, with no regard for the local ecology and in particular the nearby SSSI site at Arncott Bridge Meadows. By allowing foul water into the watercourse, this will eventually lead to the water leaching into the nearby River Ray, with dire environmental consequences.

The farm [redacted] intersect our farmland. The proposed foul water strategy could have significant damaging effects for the farm's pasture. This is regularly used to graze sheep, which tends to flood the fields in winter. Retreating water contaminated with foul water from Site A, could lead to a potential biohazard by sheep ingesting contaminated pasture, which then later passes into the food chain.

The farm [redacted] our farmland. The proposed foul water strategy could have significant damaging effects for the farm's pasture. This is regularly used to graze sheep, which tends to flood the fields in winter. Retreating water contaminated with foul water from Site A, could lead to a potential biohazard by sheep ingesting contaminated pasture, which then later passes into the food chain.

Based on the above points, I strongly object to the proposal and ask that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]