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 (4).msg
From	[redacted]
To	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 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?

I expect you will recognise the format and wording of this email, as many of the people you are meant to represent are not accustomed to expressing their concerns in writing. That does not make those concerns any less genuine or any less deserving of consideration.

I am writing because I am deeply concerned by the proposal to house up to 1,250 asylum seekers at this site. Whatever the intentions behind the proposal, the scale of the development is unprecedented for our local area and would have a significant impact on the surrounding communities.

My greatest concern is for the safety, wellbeing, and quality of life of my family, particularly my children and grandchildren. They should be able to enjoy the freedoms that previous generations have taken for granted—to walk, play, and socialise within their own community without feeling that their way of life has fundamentally changed because of decisions made without the support of local residents.

Many people feel that the views of those who already live here have been given far too little weight. Consultation should be meaningful, not simply a procedural exercise. If so many residents are expressing serious concerns, those concerns deserve to be listened to and addressed, rather than dismissed.

As elected representatives, your first responsibility is to the people you serve. I urge you to consider whether this proposal is proportionate, whether the local infrastructure and services can realistically cope, and whether it is fair to expect our community to absorb such a substantial change.

Please do not dismiss the concerns of local residents as prejudice or intolerance. Many of us are motivated not by hostility towards others, but by a desire to protect the character of our community and the safety and wellbeing of our families.

I ask you and your colleagues to reconsider this proposal before irreversible decisions are made. Once public trust is lost, it is far harder to rebuild than it is to preserve.

You really need to wake up before it’s too late.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]