[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 23:16
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

Categories: [redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident to 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 am deeply concerned about the impact that this proposed site will have on the local infrastructure and the environment. I ask that planning permission be refused.

The application lacks the completeness and rigour that one would expect of an application for a plan of such magnitude. It is vital that all of the evidence is fully submitted and considered with careful scrutiny, and not overlooked out of the desire to find alternative solutions. Whilst this plan might divert pressure on Asylum hotels and hmos it is a plan that raises multiple and significant serious concerns for local residents of Piddington, the surrounding villages and the local town of Bicester. I ask that the evidence be considered in full and considered by a separate government department in order to maintain fairness and full objectivity. Evidence should be submitted with the same completeness and rigour that is demanded of any large planning application. Long standing pressure on the asylum system is a systemic policy issue and not an unexpected sudden emergency. It is not appropriate for "urgency" to cause public consultation to be limited or evaded. This constitutes procedural unlawfulness and does not qualify this application for section 293a of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. Furthermore, the application does not allow an adequate amount of time for public response and representation, given the enormity of the proposal.

Crucial ecological work has not been undertaken and it is vital that this goes ahead. Piddington lies close to Otmoor, a protected RSPB nature reserve. There is a huge amount of wildlife that is connected to Otmoor in the area of Piddington. As a local resident of Ambrosden I have walked the bridal paths between Piddington and Ambrosden for a decade now and observed this unique habitat that is strongly linked to presence of water throughout this area. It attracts a host of wildlife. For example, Great Crested Newts a European protected species under UK law. Data indicates that they are present in and around the site. This is omitted in the Ecological Assessment. Furthermore local landscape data maps multiple records of bat species in the immediate vicinity and these are also missed on the application. Badgers, a legally safeguarded species, were ignored in the paperwork. Also, there is no mention of protected reptile species in the area. Going ahead with construction work on this site without carefully and properly accounting for these species could constitute a wildlife crime.

I respectfully request a full Environmental Impact Assessment is undertaken. Accommodating 1256 service users produces urban scale impact on waste water and protected habitats. An EIA is legally mandatory before any development of this site can proceed. The water levels in this area that

attracts beautiful wildlife also brings a regular flooding. Having lived here for many years I have witnessed the regular effects of flooding in autumn through to Spring each year. There are very serious concerns related to this high flooding risk and concerns over drainage. The site is at risk of surface water flooding and the drainage strategy is inadequate.

In addition to this ground contamination has not been properly investigated. Previous land quality work raised potential contamination issues and yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to consider those risks.

I am particularly concerned by a myriad of issues linked to transport. Firstly I am concerned and puzzled as to why the the Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road. Secondly, the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions. It poses a risk to service users themselves using unlit rural road and also local motorists who use these roads daily. The site is isolated and cut off through the absence of suitable roads/pavements.

The proposal is also disproportionately large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance. The proposal envisages the 1256 service users using the local bus service. The local bus that runs between the site and Bicester town is the bus that already provides much needed transport into the town for the elderly, non drivers, people accessing local community hospital in Bicester from Arncott and Ambrosden as well as Piddinton. Rural isolation and limited services in our villages has been a long standing concern. Having [redacted] these villages as their [redacted] I have witnessed a high degree of rural poverty in this area, especially in Ambrosden and Arncott. These villages depend on the very limited transport available to them now. The bus service they have now is limited and infrequent (it ceases on a Sunday) and also serves children making their way to schools in Bicester and Heyford Park on the public bus. The pressure placed on this bus route will, I anticipate, massively impact local residents, young and old in a negative way, impacting mental health, physical health and wellbeing. It is not a route that can absorb 1256 extra users overnight. I do not see any proposals for extra bus services for local residents to mitigate the effects of the drastically increased use. Also the application mispels Upper Heyford throughout the entire document, another example of a lack of attention to detail.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled. The same objections that were relevant then and led to the cancellation remain relevant today, even more relevant given the larger size of the proposed site compared to the previous application.

In conclusion, I do not believe that the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

I therefore 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,

[redacted]

[redacted]