From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester
Date: 12 September 2026 14:27:43

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to submit a formal objection regarding the Home Office's Urgent Crown Development planning application (Ref: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843) for the temporary change of use to provide non-detained asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 single men at the site.

[redacted]

Because of these established transit links, the geographic footprint and operational impact of this large-scale facility will not be confined to the immediate vicinity of Piddington and Arncott; it will directly extend into surrounding communities [redacted]

I strongly object to the application based on the following material planning considerations:

Public Safety and Policing Infrastructure:

The introduction of up to 1,256 single adult males into a rural location lacks a proportional strategy for community safety, oversight, and policing resources. Given documented concerns surrounding public safety, vulnerability, and crime prevention in areas surrounding similar large-scale, institutionalised camps, a facility of this nature poses an unmitigated risk to women, children, and vulnerable residents both locally and across the wider transit corridor. The local police force does not have the capacity to monitor or safeguard communities across a 20-mile radius impacted by this site's transit footprint.

Transport and Footprint of Impact:

The Home Office's application documents suggest the site is intended to be self-contained to minimise travel. However, the inclusion of shuttle buses and access to public transport networks means that service users will naturally travel to nearby towns and interconnected urban areas. Because our area shares a direct transport link with Bicester, our local infrastructure, public spaces, and neighbourhood security will experience a direct, unassessed secondary impact.

Site Isolation and Infrastructure Strain: As highlighted by local representatives and community groups, this isolated military site lacks the sustainable infrastructure, pedestrian pathways, and baseline utilities required to safely manage a population of this scale.

Forcing an institutional model onto an unsuitable location creates a hostile environment for both the residents housed there and the broader network of communities connected to it. For an application of "national importance," the provided evidence fails to address how community safety, policing capacity, and transit-related impacts will be managed across interconnected areas. I urge the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to reject this proposal.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]