From: [redacted]
To: Ministerial Correspondence
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Objection to an urgent Crown Development Order for MOD Bicester Site A
Date: 21 July 2026 18:17:20

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.

While I recognise the national challenge of housing asylum seekers, this site is fundamentally unsuitable due to severe infrastructure limitations, acute geographic isolation, and the disproportionate strain it will place on our rural community.

My primary concerns center on the following key issues:

1. MOD Site A is isolated along the B3011, a narrow rural road with no safe pedestrian footpaths or lighting. The nearest basic village amenities are miles away, and direct, high-frequency public transport links to Bicester do not exist. Expecting hundreds of residents to navigate these roads on foot presents a major safety risk.
2. Surrounding medical practices and NHS networks in Bicester and the surrounding villages are already operating at or over capacity. A sudden influx of up to 1,250 residents requiring complex, wraparound health and wellbeing support will overwhelm local facilities that are already struggling to meet current resident demand.
3. Placing a facility of this scale directly adjacent to small rural villages—where the entire population of nearby Piddington is under 400 people—creates an extreme demographic imbalance. There is no infrastructure or credible integration strategy to support meaningful daily activities or maintain community cohesion.
4. This exact site was subjected to a full public planning inquiry in 2003–2005 for the exact same purpose. The planning inspector rejected the proposal, citing its geographic isolation, lack of sustainability, and detrimental impact on local infrastructure. Those core issues have not changed; in fact, local roads and healthcare networks are under even greater strain today.

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]