From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: FORMAL OBJECTION – MOD Bicester Site A – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 12 September 2026 12:56:44

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

FORMAL OBJECTION – MOD BICESTER SITE A
Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A.

I recognise the Government's urgent need for asylum accommodation. However, the relevant question is whether **this particular site is suitable for a development of this scale, nature and duration**.

I believe there are several significant reasons why the application should be refused.

1. The scale is fundamentally disproportionate to the location

The proposal would accommodate up to **1,256 asylum service users**, in addition to staff and associated infrastructure.

This is effectively a substantial new community being established at one location.

The fact that the land was previously used by the MOD does not demonstrate that it is suitable for high-density residential accommodation. Military storage/logistics use has very different requirements from a facility housing more than 1,000 people.

The applicant needs to demonstrate that the surrounding area has sufficient capacity for the resulting demand on transport, healthcare, emergency services, utilities, drainage, waste management and other essential services.

2. The site's relative isolation is a major concern

The proposed accommodation is not simply a collection of buildings that can function independently.

Residents will require access to shops, healthcare, public transport, recreation and other essential services.

The application should therefore demonstrate that the existing transport network and local facilities can realistically accommodate the needs of up to 1,256 residents for the proposed ten-year period.

I am concerned that the existing military access arrangements are being treated as evidence of suitability when they were designed for an entirely different use.

3. The impact on local services has not been adequately demonstrated

A population of this size concentrated at one location could create substantial additional

demand for:

- healthcare and GP services;
- hospitals and emergency healthcare;
- policing;
- ambulance services;
- fire and rescue;
- pharmacies;
- public transport; and
- other community services.

It is not sufficient to assume that existing services will simply absorb this demand.

The applicant should demonstrate that the relevant services have been consulted and that adequate capacity and mitigation exist.

4. The ten-year “temporary” period is highly significant

The proposed use is described as temporary, but **ten years is an exceptionally long period in planning terms**.

For local residents, businesses and services, this would effectively represent a long-term change to the character and functioning of the area.

The Secretary of State should therefore require a clear justification for why ten years is necessary and what safeguards exist to ensure that the use genuinely ends at that point.

The proposal should not receive the reduced scrutiny that might reasonably apply to a genuinely short-term emergency arrangement.

5. There are unresolved protected-species issues

The applicant’s own Preliminary Ecological Appraisal states that it **cannot be considered a comprehensive assessment** and recommends further targeted surveys, including for:

- great crested newts;
- reptiles;
- breeding birds;
- barn owls; and
- dormice.

This is particularly significant because Bicester Garrison is a documented **great crested newt stronghold**, with breeding newts recorded in multiple Garrison ponds.

The issue is therefore not simply that wildlife might theoretically be present.

There is documented evidence of a significant protected-species population on the wider Garrison, while the applicant’s own assessment says further investigation is required.

The development should not be approved until the necessary ecological evidence has been obtained and assessed.

6. There is a significant question regarding the biological records used

The PEA states that its biological records search was obtained from the **Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Environmental Records Centre (BMERC)**.

However, the development is in Oxfordshire, where the relevant Local Environmental Records Centre is the **Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC)**.

I am not asserting that this automatically invalidates the application, but it is a material question that should be answered.

The applicant should confirm whether a full TVERC search was undertaken and provide the results.

If it was not undertaken, the Secretary of State should establish why the appropriate Oxfordshire biological records were not obtained, particularly given the known ecological importance of Bicester Garrison.

7. Infrastructure, drainage and wastewater require further scrutiny

The development will create a substantial new demand for:

- water;
- electricity;
- foul drainage;
- wastewater treatment;
- surface-water drainage;
- waste collection; and
- telecommunications.

The proposal also introduces new wastewater and drainage infrastructure.

The applicant should demonstrate that these systems have sufficient capacity and resilience for a population of this scale and that their operation will not create unacceptable risks to surrounding land, watercourses or habitats.

8. Emergency access, evacuation and safeguarding are critical

Housing more than 1,000 people at one location creates substantial emergency-planning requirements.

The Secretary of State should be satisfied that the site can adequately accommodate:

- fire and ambulance access;
- emergency evacuation;
- medical emergencies;
- safeguarding requirements;
- major incidents; and
- emergency communications.

Existing military infrastructure should not automatically be assumed to be suitable for a large civilian accommodation facility.

9. The cumulative impact is the real planning issue

None of these concerns should be considered in isolation.

The proposal combines:

1,256 residents + staff + increased traffic + increased demand on services + new infrastructure + wastewater requirements + security + lighting + construction activity + ecological uncertainty + a ten-year duration.

The cumulative effect could be substantial.

The Secretary of State should therefore assess whether the **combined impact of the development is appropriate for this location**, rather than considering each individual issue separately.

10. The Government's urgency should not replace proper planning assessment

I fully appreciate the urgency of the Government's accommodation requirements.

However, urgency cannot by itself demonstrate that a particular site is suitable.

The central question remains:

Is MOD Bicester Site A an appropriate location for a 1,256-person accommodation facility operating for up to ten years?

In my view, the application has not demonstrated this.

There are unresolved questions regarding infrastructure, transport, public services, emergency planning, residential amenity and protected species.

REQUEST FOR REFUSAL

For the reasons above, I respectfully ask the Secretary of State to **refuse application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843**.

In particular, I ask that significant weight is given to:

- the exceptional scale of the proposed accommodation;
- the site's relative isolation from services;
- the additional burden on local infrastructure and public services;
- transport and accessibility;
- emergency access and safeguarding;
- the unusually long ten-year duration;
- drainage and wastewater capacity;
- unresolved protected-species issues;
- the question regarding the completeness of the local biological records search; and
- the cumulative impact of all of these factors.

If the Secretary of State is not minded to refuse the application, I respectfully request that **no determination is made until the outstanding ecological surveys, infrastructure assessments and other material information have been completed and independently assessed**.

To approve this application without the necessary assessments having been properly completed would, in my view, represent a profound disregard for the concerns of law-

abiding families and residents in the local area, as well as the wider community and taxpayers across the country. This is not about opposing the Government's responsibility to provide accommodation; it is about ensuring that decisions of such significant local and national consequence are made transparently, lawfully and with proper due diligence. We live in a democratic country where established planning procedures and safeguards exist for a reason. Those procedures should not simply be bypassed or diminished because the Government considers the proposal urgent. The people who will live with the consequences of this decision deserve to know that the application has been properly scrutinised and that every reasonable alternative and potential impact has been fully considered before such a significant development is imposed upon the local community.

I ask that this representation is formally recorded against **PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843** and given full consideration when the application is determined.

Yours faithfully,

The [redacted] family,

Hugely concerned local residents.