[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 11:17
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Site A MOD Bicester

[redacted] [redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Crown Casework Team,

I wish to submit my formal objection to Urgent Crown Development Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 concerning the proposed use of MOD Bicester Site A as asylum accommodation.

My details are:

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
[redacted]
Postcode:

I live in [redacted] and am concerned about the proposed establishment of a very large residential facility at an isolated former military site within this wider rural area.

My objection is not directed at people seeking asylum. The Government has a responsibility to provide accommodation that is safe, suitable, accessible and supported by dependable infrastructure and public services.

My concern is that this application does not demonstrate that MOD Bicester Site A can meet those requirements. It also leaves many of the most important questions to be answered after planning permission has been granted.

1. The urgent procedure is no longer justified

The application relies heavily upon urgency to justify its accelerated determination.

However, the ministerial statement published on 13 August 2026 states that the Home Office no longer intends to use MOD Bicester for asylum accommodation.

That statement appears to remove or materially alter the operational need upon which the urgent application was based.

The applicant should be required to confirm whether the proposal remains active, whether Site A is still intended for asylum accommodation and why planning permission continues to be sought.

If there is no longer an identified requirement for the proposed use, the application should be withdrawn or refused.

An urgent procedure should not be used to obtain a planning permission for a development which the Government has publicly stated it no longer intends to pursue.

2. The site is unsuitable for large scale residential accommodation

Site A is an isolated former military facility, separated from established settlements, regular public transport and everyday services.

Residents would require access to healthcare, shops, legal advice, education, recreation, places of worship and other support.

The application relies heavily upon onsite services and organised minibuses. This would leave residents dependent upon arrangements controlled by the operator.

People should not be placed in accommodation where they cannot reach essential services independently and safely.

The isolation of the site was known before the application was submitted. It is an inherent feature of the location which cannot simply be overcome through a future management plan.

3. The proposal is disproportionate to the surrounding rural area

The proposed residential population would be very large when compared with the small villages surrounding Site A.

The effects would not remain within the site boundary. Residents, staff, contractors, delivery vehicles, healthcare providers, taxis and emergency services would all interact with the wider area.

The application should assess the cumulative effects upon all nearby settlements and the wider rural road network.

A development of this size should only be approved where the surrounding infrastructure has been shown to possess sufficient capacity. That has not been demonstrated.

4. Transport assumptions are unrealistic

The proposal depends heavily upon residents using scheduled minibus services.

This assumes that journeys will be predictable and that independent travel will be limited.

In reality, residents may need to travel at different times for healthcare, legal appointments, shopping, religious observance and other personal reasons. Some may miss scheduled transport or need to travel when a service is unavailable.

The assessment should also include:

- Staff movements at shift changes
- Deliveries and waste collection

• Contractors and visitors
• Healthcare and emergency journeys
• Taxis
• Evening and weekend movements
• Independent walking and cycling
• The consequences of transport breakdown or cancellation

The application should explain how the transport arrangements would be funded and maintained throughout the occupation.

A travel plan based on future monitoring cannot correct the fundamental isolation of the site.

5. Pedestrian safety remains unresolved

The rural roads around Site A include narrow sections, limited visibility, constrained verges and routes without continuous pavements.

Some residents are likely to walk independently, even if organised transport is provided.

The application does not demonstrate a continuous, safe and accessible pedestrian route between the site and surrounding destinations.

Telling residents not to walk would not prevent pedestrian movements. A sound planning assessment must consider reasonably foreseeable behaviour.

The safety of future residents, cyclists, drivers and people living in the surrounding communities should be established before permission is granted.

6. Healthcare and support provision has not been secured

A development accommodating a substantial number of people would create additional demand for healthcare, mental health services, dentistry, pharmacy provision, ambulance services and specialist support.

Some future residents may have experienced trauma or have significant physical or mental health needs.

The application should clearly identify:

• What healthcare would be available onsite
• The qualifications and number of healthcare staff
• Hours of operation
• Arrangements outside those hours
• Access to general practitioners
• Mental health and trauma support
• Dentistry and pharmacy services
• Emergency treatment
• Transport to external appointments
• Interpretation services

These arrangements should be formally agreed with the responsible organisations and supported by adequate funding.

A future operational plan cannot create doctors, nurses, appointments or treatment capacity.

7. Electricity and generator provision

The Utilities and Infrastructure Assessment identifies an estimated electricity requirement of approximately 2.16 MVA.

It also acknowledges that the condition, capacity and configuration of the existing electrical infrastructure cannot currently be relied upon.

The proposal may therefore require temporary or permanent generators.

The application should identify the number, capacity, location and operating hours of any generators. It should also assess:

- Noise and vibration
- Exhaust emissions and air quality
- Fuel storage
- Tanker deliveries
- Fire risk
- Fuel spills
- Maintenance
- Equipment failure
- The anticipated duration of generator use

Reliable electricity would be essential for heating, lighting, cooking, communications, security, water, drainage and healthcare.

The application should not be approved without a confirmed and environmentally acceptable electricity supply.

8. Foul drainage and surface water

The proposed facility would generate substantial foul water flows every day.

The final drainage solution has not been established with sufficient certainty.

If a mains connection is intended, its availability and capacity should be confirmed.

If the development would use holding tanks, treatment equipment or tankering, the application must assess storage capacity, odour, noise, vehicle movements, maintenance, overflow, breakdown and pollution risk.

The surface water system must also account for extreme rainfall, climate change, blockages, equipment failure, maintenance responsibility and safe exceedance routes.

Drainage is essential infrastructure. It should be designed, assessed and confirmed before residential occupation is approved.

9. Environmental evidence remains incomplete

The application acknowledges that further ecological surveys are required.

Where surveys are incomplete or seasonally constrained, the absence of recorded harm cannot be treated as evidence that no harm would occur.

The assessment must consider the combined effects of construction, traffic, noise, lighting, vegetation removal, drainage changes and increased activity.

The proximity of Arncott Bridge Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest requires particular care.

Potential impacts include polluted runoff, changes in water conditions, disturbance, lighting and recreational pressure.

The necessary ecological evidence should be completed and published before a decision is made.

10. Contamination and former military use

The history of the site creates potential risks from contaminated land, fuel residues, asbestos containing materials and unexploded ordnance.

These risks are particularly important where buildings and land are proposed for residential occupation.

The application should establish which areas have been investigated, what hazards have been identified, what uncertainties remain and what remediation is required.

It must demonstrate that the site can be made safe before anyone is accommodated there.

Conditions may control the implementation of an established remediation scheme. They should not be used to postpone the basic decision about whether the land is suitable for residential use.

11. Safeguarding and emergency planning

A facility of this scale requires clear safeguarding, fire safety and emergency arrangements.

The application should identify which organisation would hold overall responsibility and how concerns would be reported and investigated.

It should also demonstrate:

- Coordination with the police and emergency services
- Safe access for emergency vehicles
- Firefighting water supplies
- Evacuation procedures
- Support for vulnerable residents
- Emergency assembly arrangements
- Response to electricity, water or communications failure
- Management of serious incidents outside the site

This is not about making assumptions about individuals because of their immigration status. It is about ensuring that a large institutional residential facility has arrangements proportionate to its scale.

These matters must be resolved before permission is granted.

12. Too many essential matters are deferred

The application leaves fundamental issues to future surveys, management plans and planning conditions.

These include transport, pedestrian safety, electricity, generator provision, drainage, healthcare, safeguarding, ecology, contamination, lighting, fire safety and emergency planning.

These matters determine whether the proposal is safe and acceptable in principle. They are not minor details.

The possible solutions also create additional impacts.

For example, sewage tankering would generate additional heavy vehicle movements. Diesel generators would create noise, emissions and fuel deliveries. Security lighting could affect the rural landscape and wildlife.

These cumulative effects should be assessed before the application is determined.

Conclusion

The application has not demonstrated that MOD Bicester Site A is a safe, sustainable or suitably serviced location for the proposed use.

It would place a large residential population at an isolated site before reliable utilities, transport, drainage, healthcare and emergency arrangements have been secured.

The ministerial statement that the Home Office no longer intends to use MOD Bicester for asylum accommodation also materially undermines the urgency relied upon.

I therefore respectfully request that the application be refused.

If it is not refused or withdrawn, no decision should be made until all outstanding evidence has been completed, published and subjected to a fair further consultation period.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email and confirm that my objection will be placed before the decision maker and taken into account when the application is determined.

Yours faithfully,

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
[redacted]
Postcode:_

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone