[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 12:51
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a member of the public to vehemently object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I ask that planning permission be refused for the proposed development of the MOD Bicester Site A to initially house **1250** single adult male asylum seeking refugees for a period of 10 years. A previous proposal for approximately **750** people was considered more than 20 years ago and was ultimately refused by an independent Planning Inspector. The new proposal means the scale of accommodation, infrastructure, transport demand, environmental impact and pressure on the surrounding area would all potentially be greater than under the previous proposal. Since that time, nothing has changed. The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. I consider that this site is not fit for purpose due to unresolved issues relating to drainage, electricity supply, flood risk, transport and ecology.

MOD Bicester Site A is in a rural, isolated site located on the B4011 which is a very busy and unlit link road with a recorded history of serious collisions.. There is an absence of safe pedestrian and cycling infrastructure around the site, which the Home Office itself has acknowledged. Nearby bus stops cannot be safely reached without crossing this road. The suggestion that providing the men with high viz jackets to minimise the risk is ridiculous. The nearest train station is more than 4 miles away. There has been a proposal for a cycle route which residents of the site could use. This plan has clearly been created by someone who does not understand the area, the roads and the potential dangers for users. The issue is not whether residents should be permitted to leave. The issue is whether the Government has selected a location from which people can leave safely, without creating foreseeable risks for pedestrians, drivers and nearby communities.

We, the local people, all have many concerns about the security of the proposed asylum site for both those seeking asylum and local residents. Despite the proposal of 24hr security, the residents are young men, whose criminal pasts are unknown. As it will be an open site where residents can come and go 24 hours a day, we have genuine fears that these young men, who have nothing to do and who are bored, may visit local villages and towns individually or in groups intimidating women, children and the elderly. This concern is genuine and is based on experiences of others around the UK where asylum seekers have been housed. We are entitled to ask questions surrounding how security would operate beyond the site boundary, how incidents in nearby villages would be handled, whether local police would receive additional resources and how concerns could be reported?

The pressure that housing 1250 men on this site would inevitably add to the already overstretched medical services is unacceptable. The Government should publish a health-impact assessment showing what would be provided on site, what would be required from existing NHS services, how that provision would be funded and whether sufficient local capacity exists. Local residents are already struggling to get appointments at doctors and hospitals and there are no available NHS dentists. It has been suggested that some services may be provided on site, some asylum seekers would still sometimes require treatment elsewhere. We are feeling very frustrated that services will be made available to these non-tax payer residents while we, the locals have to pay huge dentistry bills and accept the frustrations that we feel at not being able to get appointments for medical help. Local communities should not be asked simply to assume that existing services can absorb the additional demand. We are keen to better understand an assessment setting out the expected demand on each service, additional staffing or resources, who would fund those resources, emergency response arrangements, fire and evacuation planning, safeguarding procedures and contingency plans for major incidents.

As this site was previously used by the MoD as a storage depot there is currently little to no basic amenities such as water, foul drainage and electricity services. To install these to accommodate the needs of 1250 residents would be astronomically expensive and the bill would probably fall on to the shoulders of UK taxpayers. During the rainy months of the year, over the years there has been increased flooding in and around the area demonstrating that the current water courses cannot cope. Developing Site A would add to the flooding risk and there will be fewer opportunities for 'run off' of surface water. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

MOD Bicester Site A is not simply an empty piece of land. Despite the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal submitted in support of the Home Office's proposed asylum accommodation centre reporting "no records" for those species groups an independent data search identifies records of protected bats, badgers, otters and breeding great crested newts on and around Site A this has been proved to be incorrect. The facts are that:

- There are 12 protected bat species recorded within 2km of the site including Barbastelle, Bechstein's bat
- An otter has been recorded close to the MOD boundary, with Brenner's analysis placing the record approximately 366 metres from the application site in 2021.
- There are records of breeding great crested newts, including a 2019 record associated with the application site and a breeding cluster, including juveniles, approximately 350 metres away.
- There are records of badger activity approximately 300 metres from the site.
- Nightingales have been recorded on MOD Bicester land in 2020 and again in 2024. Habitat management work at MOD Bicester has helped the species breed in the county again.
- There are 188 records relating to rare and protected wildflowers across 29 species
- There are 66 bird species identified in the local records, compared with 25 reported in the assessment, including 27 species on the UK conservation Red List.

Some of these species are protected by law. Development of Site A would have wider environmental and ecological impact through, habitat loss or disturbance, construction activity, noise, increased vehicle movements, changes to drainage and vegetation, long-term human activity on the site and increased lighting. A development accommodating more than 1,200 people would inevitably require significant external lighting for roads, accommodation, security and communal areas. Artificial lighting can have an impact on wildlife, particularly bats and other nocturnal species. Planners need to understand not only what species are present, but the ecological impact that a development of this site would have over the lifetime of the development.

In conclusion, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale and I am firmly opposed to the development. This land has previously been deemed as inappropriate, and nothing has changed since then. Since I have lived in a small Buckinghamshire village, within an 8 mile radius of this proposed site we have had to tolerate the major developments and increased vehicle movements due to the construction of the Greatmoor Energy Waster Facility (EfW), HS2, EWR, a mega prison in Edgcott and we have had enough! This is the wrong plan and the wrong site. I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision is made until outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

