Objection to an urgent Crown Development Order for MOD Bicester Site A

Source file	Objection to an urgent Crown Development Order for MOD Bicester Site A (6).msg
From	[redacted]
To	matthew.pennycook.mp@parliament.uk; Ministerial Correspondence

You don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident who lives just 3 miles away to oppose the use of the urgent planning process for the proposal to accommodate up to 1,250 single adult male asylum seekers at Site A, MOD Bicester.

My concern is principally one of scale, location and due process.

This is a rural area. Many of the surrounding villages have populations of only 100–200 people, connected by rural roads and supported by public services that already have to cover considerable distances. Access to healthcare, policing, public transport and other essential services is naturally more limited here than in a large town or city. Introducing accommodation for up to 1,250 people would therefore represent a substantial change in the local population and could create significant additional demands on infrastructure and services.

For those reasons, I struggle to understand the rationale for locating a facility of this scale here. A proposal accommodating considerably more people than several of the surrounding villages combined deserves careful assessment of transport, pedestrian safety, healthcare capacity, policing, local infrastructure, costs and the longer-term implications for neighbouring communities.

There are also environmental considerations that deserve proper assessment. This is a rural landscape with farmland, hedgerows, footpaths and important habitats for local wildlife. An increase of this scale in the number of people using the surrounding area could lead to substantially greater litter, waste, pedestrian activity and pressure on the countryside and wildlife habitats. The question is not simply whether these impacts can be managed, but what additional waste collection, site management and environmental protections would be required, who would provide them and how they would be funded. These are precisely the kinds of issues that a proper planning and consultation process should examine before any decision is made.

There is also an important question of process. On 9 July, my MP, Calum Miller, was informed by a Defence Minister that the Home Office first approached the MOD about use of the site in November 2025. If the proposal has therefore been under consideration within government for around nine months, it is difficult to see why local residents and public bodies should now have only a matter of days in which to understand the proposal and respond.

A normal planning process would allow the councils, NHS, police, wildlife groups, other local services and residents to assess the evidence properly and provide informed views. Given the exceptional scale of the proposal relative to the communities surrounding it, I believe that is both reasonable and proportionate.

I would therefore be very grateful if you would withdraw consent for the proposal to be treated as an urgent application and require it to proceed through the usual planning process. This would give local people and the organisations responsible for delivering local services a meaningful opportunity to understand the plans, assess their consequences and be properly heard.

Thank you for considering the views of those of us who live close to the site.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]