From: [redacted]
To: Ministerial Correspondence
Subject: Objection to an urgent Crown Development Order for MOD Bicester Site A
Date: 18 July 2026 08:25:58

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident 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.

On 9 July, my MP, Calum Miller, was informed by a Defence Minister that the Home Office first approached the MOD about the use of this site in November 2025.

You will be aware that the use of the site for such a huge asylum camp is very controversial – and widely opposed – locally. It is very important that local people – and our local representatives in the councils, health board, police and other services – are given sufficient information and time to make an intelligent response.

It is clearly unreasonable for this to be considered "urgent". The Government cannot consider it for nine months and then give local residents a matter of days to contribute to a consultation.

Can I therefore urge you to withdraw consent for this to be treated as an urgent application and instead insist that the usual planning process is followed, so local voices can be heard about a proposal that will affect us far more than any Secretary of State in London?

Yours sincerely,
Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident 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.

On 9 July, my MP, Calum Miller, was informed by a Defence Minister that the Home Office first approached the MOD about the use of this site in November 2025.

You will be aware that the use of the site for such a huge asylum camp is very controversial – and widely opposed – locally. It is very important that local people – and our local representatives in the councils, health board, police and other services – are given sufficient information and time to make an intelligent response.

It is clearly unreasonable for this to be considered “urgent”. The Government cannot consider it for nine months and then give local residents a matter of days to contribute to a consultation.

Can I therefore urge you to withdraw consent for this to be treated as an urgent application and instead insist that the usual planning process is followed, so local voices can be heard about a proposal that will affect us far more than any Secretary of State in London?

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android