From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 12 September 2026 13:46:08

[redacted]

FORMAL OBJECTION TO URGENT CROWN DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION
Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
MOD Bicester Site A, Piddington

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 for the proposed development of MOD Bicester Site A for temporary non-detained asylum accommodation.

I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds of its impact on the existing community, lack of adequate infrastructure, road and pedestrian safety, environmental and ecological consequences, air quality, long-term sustainability and the significant public expenditure involved.

I also believe the planning history of this site, including the previous proposal for asylum accommodation in 2002/2003, must be given substantial consideration.

[redacted]

A development of the scale proposed has the potential to fundamentally alter those qualities.

I am concerned that the impact on existing residents is being treated as secondary to the Government's objective of finding accommodation, when the two issues should be considered together.

The proposal would provide accommodation for up to approximately 1,256 asylum seekers, together with staff and associated services.

This is effectively the introduction of a substantial new population into the

area.

My concern is that the necessary infrastructure has not been demonstrated to exist at the level required to support a development of this scale.

There needs to be clear evidence demonstrating how the area will cope with the additional demand on:

- local roads;
- pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
- public transport;
- healthcare and GP services;
- emergency services;
- utilities;
- wastewater and drainage;
- refuse and waste services;
- local amenities;
- community facilities; and
- other public services.

The infrastructure needs to be demonstrated, assessed and appropriately provided before the facility becomes operational none of this has happened based on the application.

If the Government proceeds with this development, the additional costs and pressures must not simply be transferred to the existing local community or local authorities.

Safety is one of the principal reasons my family chose to live in the village.

I am particularly concerned about the effect this proposal could have on children’s ability to safely walk, cycle and move independently around the area.

A facility accommodating up to 1,256 people will inevitably generate additional movements involving residents, staff, contractors, visitors, taxis, buses, deliveries and emergency vehicles.

This needs to be considered in terms of the actual roads and paths surrounding the site and the way that people currently use them.

Our children should not lose the independence they currently enjoy because a large-scale facility has been placed in an area that was not designed to accommodate such a population.

I therefore believe that a comprehensive assessment of pedestrian safety, cycling safety, traffic movements, road capacity and emergency access is essential.

The village currently benefits from its relatively rural setting and cleaner air.

The proposed development would introduce additional traffic, vehicle movements, construction activity, generators running 24/7 and infrastructure into an area that currently has a substantially different character.

I am concerned about the impact this will have on local air quality.

The environmental assessment should not simply consider the immediate construction footprint. It should consider the longer-term consequences of the proposed use and the associated increase in traffic and activity.

I am also deeply concerned about the potential impact on the local ecology.

The land provides habitat and forms part of a wider ecological network. Development can result in the loss or fragmentation of habitats, disturbance to wildlife, impacts on biodiversity, changes to drainage and loss of soil and vegetation.

These impacts need to be considered cumulatively rather than assessing individual habitats or species in isolation.

Once established ecological assets are damaged or lost, they cannot necessarily be recreated elsewhere with equivalent value.

The Government should therefore provide robust evidence demonstrating that the development will not result in unacceptable long-term ecological harm.

One of my greatest concerns is that the proposal has not adequately demonstrated what its impact will be on the existing community over the full proposed period of operation and beyond.

Although the proposal is described as temporary, a ten-year period is a significant proportion of a child’s life and a substantial period for any community.

Temporary does not mean insignificant.

The decision-maker needs to consider what the consequences will be

over 10 years, including:

- pressure on local services;
- increased traffic;
- road safety;
- impact on children’s independence;
- changes to the character of the area;
- environmental impacts;
- community facilities;
- healthcare provision;
- emergency services;
- waste and utilities;
- noise and disturbance; and
- the cumulative effect alongside other development in the Bicester area.

There also needs to be a clear plan for what happens to the site and its infrastructure at the end of the temporary period.

The 2003 planning history must be considered

There is a particularly important precedent involving this same site.

An asylum accommodation proposal was previously considered in 2002/2003, with a public inquiry taking place between December 2002 and March 2003.

The Planning Inspector recommended that permission should not be granted. Although the then First Secretary of State subsequently disagreed with the Inspector and approved the proposal, Cherwell District Council challenged that decision through judicial review.

The previous proposal therefore generated significant planning scrutiny, local concern and public expenditure.

That history should not be disregarded simply because the current proposal is being brought forward through a different planning mechanism.

The Government should explain clearly what has materially changed since 2003 and why the concerns identified at that time should not apply now.

Indeed, the scale of the current proposal makes that question even more important.

There is also a significant question concerning the use of public money.

The previous proposal resulted in substantial expenditure and legal proceedings.

The current proposal will also involve significant public expenditure, including site preparation, construction, accommodation, infrastructure, security, staffing, utilities, healthcare, welfare services and eventual decommissioning or reinstatement.

Given the scale of this expenditure, the Government should demonstrate that the site represents a properly assessed and economically responsible use of public funds.

I would ask that the full financial implications are made transparent, including:

- capital costs;
- operating costs;
- infrastructure costs;
- healthcare and welfare costs;
- security costs;
- transport costs;
- environmental mitigation;
- costs falling on local authorities and public services; and
- eventual decommissioning or reinstatement costs.

It should not be assumed that because expenditure is being undertaken by central Government, it does not have an impact on the public or local community.

It is still taxpayers’ money.

The Crown Development process should not mean reduced scrutiny

I recognise that the Government has powers to use the Urgent Crown Development process.

However, the use of that process should not mean that legitimate concerns regarding infrastructure, safety, environmental impact and community capacity are given less weight.

The fact that Cherwell District Council is acting as a consultee rather than the ultimate decision-maker does not make the impact on local residents any less real.

Residents will live with the consequences of this decision every day.

The Government therefore has a responsibility to ensure that the same

level of rigorous assessment is undertaken that would reasonably be expected for a development of this scale under the normal planning process.

A fundamentally different environment from that required to support this proposal

The location of the site is particularly concerning.

This is not an established urban accommodation facility with extensive public transport, healthcare, community facilities and pedestrian infrastructure immediately available.

It is a site within and around a community whose existing infrastructure and character have developed around a very different scale of population.

The proposed accommodation could therefore create a significant mismatch between the scale of the facility and the infrastructure available to support it.

The answer cannot simply be that the facility is temporary.

Ten years is a substantial period for local residents, families and children.

Conclusion

I recognise that the Government has a responsibility to provide appropriate accommodation for people seeking asylum.

However, that responsibility must be balanced against the legitimate interests of the communities in which such accommodation is located.

Our community should not be expected to absorb a development of this scale without the necessary infrastructure, services and safeguards being properly demonstrated and provided.

[redacted]

Those qualities have genuine value.

I am deeply concerned that this proposal risks undermining them while placing substantial additional demands on roads, public services, infrastructure and the environment.

The fact that the proposal is being pursued through the Crown Development process should not remove the need for rigorous assessment of its consequences.

The previous asylum accommodation proposal at this site in 2002/2003 demonstrates that these concerns are not new. The Government should learn from that history rather than simply repeating it.

I therefore respectfully request that application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 is refused.

Alternatively, if the Government is minded to proceed, I ask that no permission or commencement is allowed until there has been full and transparent assessment of:

1. the capacity of local infrastructure;
2. road, pedestrian and cycling safety;
3. air quality and traffic impacts;
4. healthcare and emergency-service capacity;
5. ecological and biodiversity impacts;
6. the cumulative impact of development in the Bicester area;
7. the long-term effect on the existing community;
8. the full financial cost to the taxpayer and local public services;
9. the lessons and evidence from the 2002/2003 planning process; and
10. the arrangements for the site at the end of the proposed ten-year period.

Above all, I ask the Government to recognise that a community is more than a site on a planning map. The safety, wellbeing, environment and quality of life of the people who already live here must form a meaningful part of this decision.

