[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 16 September 2026 10:13
**To:** Crown Casework
**Cc:** calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; [redacted]
**Subject:** Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I write as a resident of [redacted], concerned also about the safety and quality of life of established communities in Piddington and the wider Bicester area, to object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843. The application seeks the temporary change of use of Site A, MOD Bicester, to provide non-detained asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 people for a proposed period of ten years.

I recognise the Government's statutory responsibilities towards people seeking asylum. I make this representation without hostility towards those who may be accommodated at the site. My objection is to the planning merits of this particular proposal: its substantial scale, its isolated rural location, and the lack of sufficient evidence that its effects can be managed safely and sustainably.

The applicant's Planning Proposal Statement acknowledges that the site lies in a rural location approximately 4.75 km south of Bicester, with very limited facilities nearby. It also acknowledges that there is no pedestrian infrastructure along the relevant section of the B4011; that neither site access is accessible on foot; and that there is no local cycling infrastructure on a 60 mph single-carriageway road. These are not minor matters. They affect the safety, independence and day-to-day welfare of a large resident population, and they are likely to create additional travel demands on the local road network and on Bicester itself.[1]

The proposal is said to be "self-contained". However, it is intended to operate for ten years and to accommodate up to 1,256 residents. It is unrealistic to assume that a community of that size will not need regular access to transport, healthcare, shops, legal and advice services, recreation, places of worship, education or training, and wider social contact. Calling the site self-contained does not demonstrate how these needs will be met without placing unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure and neighbouring communities.

If that assumption proves unrealistic, the effects will not be confined to the site. They will be felt in neighbouring settlements, especially Piddington, and across the wider Bicester area. The Secretary of State should therefore require clear evidence that policing, safeguarding, emergency response,

transport management, and community-safety arrangements will be adequate for both those housed at the site and existing residents in nearby villages and Bicester. The application does not, in my view, explain in sufficient detail how the safety and amenity of those communities will be protected throughout the proposed ten-year period.

This proposal also differs substantially from the site's earlier planning history. The 2003 permission for an immigration accommodation centre was for 750 people, including families and individuals. It included pedestrian-access improvements and a free minibus service, specifically to address the site's relative isolation. The current proposal is for up to 1,256 service users, about 68 per cent more than the earlier proposal. That makes it especially important to test whether the site can now support a development of this size, given the same fundamental limitations of location and infrastructure.[1]

The application documents also identify key site constraints. The Planning Proposal Statement records that approximately 25 per cent of the site has a high annual likelihood of surface-water flooding, while other areas are at medium risk. The proposal includes a wastewater treatment plant and substantial modular development. Before any permission is granted, there must be reliable, independently robust evidence that drainage, wastewater capacity, flood resilience, emergency access and long-term maintenance arrangements are adequate.[1]

I am also concerned about using the Urgent Crown Development procedure for a proposal intended to run for a decade. A development of this scale and duration requires careful scrutiny of its transport, safety, infrastructure, environmental and community-cohesion implications. Important planning matters should be resolved before a decision is made, rather than left to conditions or to later operational arrangements.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that planning permission be refused. At the very least, the application should not be determined unless there is a deliverable, funded and enforceable package of measures addressing:

- Safe, direct pedestrian and cycle links between the site, public transport and local facilities.

- A reliable, frequent and fully funded transport service for residents and staff for the full period of use.

- The capacity and funding implications for local health, emergency, policing, waste and other public services.

- Flood-risk, drainage and wastewater-treatment arrangements capable of safely serving the proposal for its intended ten-year duration.

- A detailed operational, safeguarding, security and community-engagement plan, prepared with local authorities, Thames Valley Police, health bodies and affected communities, including residents of Piddington and Bicester.

- Clear arrangements for monitoring, review and enforcement, including defined triggers for intervention if assumptions in the submitted material prove inaccurate.

I do not consider that the application has demonstrated that this isolated rural site is suitable for an accommodation centre of this scale, or that its effects can be adequately mitigated. I therefore respectfully ask that you refuse planning permission.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Source

[1] Planning Proposal Statement, Urgent Crown Development application: MOD Bicester (Site A) https://www.gov.uk/guidance/urgent-crown-development-application-mod-bicester-site-a