From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework; planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Cc: joe.marshall@piddingtonpc.org; Sarah Jackson
Subject: Re: Subject: Objection to Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 16 September 2026 17:16:34

[redacted]

Resending to Cherwell DC.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2026 9:27:39 pm
To: crowncasework@communities.gov.uk <crowncasework@communities.gov.uk>; planning@cherwelldc.gov.uk <planning@cherwelldc.gov.uk>
Cc: SMITH, Greg B <greg.smith.mp@parliament.uk>; joe.marshall@piddingtonpc.org <joe.marshall@piddingtonpc.org>; calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk <calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk>; Sarah Jackson [redacted]
Subject: Subject: Objection to Application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – Site A, MOD Bicester

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Application Reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Objection to the proposed use of Site A, MOD Bicester, for asylum accommodation

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of Site A, MOD Bicester, for accommodation of up to 1,256 single adult males.

My objection is based on planning and infrastructure concerns regarding the suitability of the site, the adequacy of the supporting evidence, and the use of the urgent Crown development process for a proposal that appears intended to operate for many years. The scale and nature of the proposal require a far more comprehensive assessment than has been provided to date.

My principal concerns are as follows:

1. Inadequate assessment of infrastructure capacity

The application does not appear to provide confirmation that local water, wastewater and utility infrastructure can support a development of this scale. The applicant's own documents acknowledge that wastewater capacity requires confirmation and that the electricity network capacity serving the site has not been verified. Reliance on assumptions or future investigations is not, in my view, sufficient justification for approving a development intended to accommodate over 1,200 residents.

2. Highway safety and accessibility concerns

The location is poorly served by pedestrian infrastructure and public transport. Existing roads are rural in character, with limited footways and relatively high vehicle speeds. Previous planning assessments for accommodation proposals in this area identified concerns relating to isolation and pedestrian safety. I am concerned that the transport evidence does not adequately demonstrate that the surrounding network can safely

accommodate the increased movements associated with a facility of this size.

3. Flooding, drainage and environmental risks

The applicant's own Flood Risk Assessment identifies areas of the site that are susceptible to surface water flooding, while long-term drainage arrangements remain unresolved. Furthermore, a number of ecological surveys are still outstanding and the ecological assessment itself acknowledges that it is not comprehensive. It is difficult to understand how a fully informed planning decision can be made before these matters have been properly assessed.

4. Ground contamination and unexploded ordnance risks

Site A has a history as a former military ordnance depot. The documentation indicates the potential presence of contamination, asbestos-containing materials and unexploded ordnance risks, yet only preliminary assessments appear to have been completed. I do not believe permission should be granted before comprehensive site investigations are undertaken and the findings made publicly available.

5. Missing information and unresolved matters

A significant number of important details appear to be deferred until after any permission is granted, including elements of drainage, lighting, contamination remediation and power infrastructure. Key plans and supporting information are missing or incomplete. Given the scale of the proposal, these matters should be resolved before a decision is made rather than left to future conditions.

6. Scale and sustainability of the proposal

The proposed capacity of 1,256 residents represents a very substantial development in a rural location. I am not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this site is a sustainable location for a facility of this magnitude, particularly when there remain unresolved questions regarding infrastructure, transport, environmental impacts and community services.

7. Lack of meaningful consultation and scrutiny

The proposal is being advanced through an urgent Crown development procedure despite being described as part of a long-term accommodation solution. The limited consultation opportunity available to local communities raises concerns that important planning issues have not been subjected to the level of scrutiny normally expected for a development of this significance. In addition, there is some confusion as to whether the proposed number is c1,200, or as many as 3,500. It is not acceptable that precise numbers are not known (or published) at this stage.

8. Historical objections

A similar accommodation proposal for this area was previously found unsustainable following a public inquiry, with concerns raised regarding isolation, community cohesion, local services and pedestrian safety. The current proposal is significantly larger, and I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that the concerns identified previously have

been adequately resolved. I am also concerned that no published alternatives' assessment has been provided demonstrating why Site A represents the most suitable and proportionate solution when compared with smaller-scale or dispersed alternatives.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application be refused. At a minimum, no decision should be made until all outstanding surveys, infrastructure capacity confirmations, environmental assessments and site investigations have been completed and independently reviewed.

Please acknowledge receipt of this representation and keep me informed of any future developments relating to this application.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]

cc: Piddington Parish Council, Greg Smith MP, Calum Miller MP