Email 05 of 35

Bicester Site A - proposed asylum centre

Source file	Bicester Site A - proposed asylum centre .msg
From	[redacted]
To	Ministerial Correspondence
Cc	Calum Miller MP

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

Dear Sirs

I am previously written to you but at the time of writing I have not received a response.

As a recap, I am writing as a local resident to strongly 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.

As you are aware, On 9 July, my MP, Calum Miller, was informed by a Defence Minister that the Home Office first approached the Ministry of Defence regarding the use of this site in November 2025. Given this timeline, it is impossible to understand how the Government can credibly claim that this application is now so urgent that normal planning procedures must be bypassed.

The proposal has evidently been under consideration for many months. If the Government chose not to progress it through the usual channels during that period, local residents should not now be denied a fair opportunity to scrutinise and respond to a development that would have a significant and lasting impact on our community. The use of emergency procedures in these circumstances appears unreasonable and risks undermining public confidence in the planning system.

This is not a minor development. It is a proposal to accommodate up to 1,250 single adult men in one location. Such a substantial increase in population will inevitably place additional demands on local infrastructure, healthcare services, policing, transport networks, and other public services. Local authorities, service providers, and residents deserve adequate time and information to assess these implications properly.

I am also deeply concerned that the voices of local people are being sidelined. Those who will live alongside this development and experience its consequences should be afforded a meaningful opportunity to contribute to the decision-making process. It is unacceptable for central government to consider a proposal for many months and then expect local communities to respond within days.

Beyond the planning issues, there are legitimate concerns regarding community safety, social cohesion, and the cumulative impact of current asylum accommodation policies.

As a woman, I am increasingly concerned about violence against women and girls and the wider erosion of public confidence in the authorities' ability to protect vulnerable members of society.

Residents who raise such concerns are too often dismissed or labelled unfairly. However, public safety concerns are neither racist nor discriminatory. They are legitimate matters that deserve serious consideration, particularly when proposals involve large-scale accommodation for single adult males.

Recent high-profile cases involving individuals who entered the United Kingdom through irregular migration routes have understandably heightened public concern about the effectiveness of vetting, monitoring, and enforcement processes. While it would be wrong to judge all asylum seekers by the actions of a minority, it would be equally wrong to ignore genuine public concerns arising from incidents that have received significant media attention and have undermined confidence in the system. It is an uncomfortable truth that women are being attacked by asylum seekers who come from predatory cultures. This needs to be addressed and acknowledged without being accused of bigotry or racism. Policy should reflect this; citizens have a right to feel safe in their communities.

Furthermore, I have also heard lived accounts from a friend who resides in Leicestershire near asylum dispersal accommodation. She describes experiencing harassment, intimidation, and anti-social behaviour that have altered how women and girls use public spaces. She will not allow her daughter to go out alone, and the park is out of bounds. It's extremely sad for young people. This demonstrates why communities must be fully consulted before large-scale accommodation sites are approved. The social consequences for neighbouring residents cannot simply be treated as an afterthought.

Bicester is not an affluent community as it is sometimes portrayed due to its connections with Bicester Village retail outlet. It includes many lower-income households, working families and residents already experiencing significant socioeconomic pressures. The assumption that Bicester therefore has the capacity to absorb accommodation for up to 1,250 single adult men is misplaced and fails to reflect the realities faced by many residents.

The Government has a duty not only to those seeking asylum but also to the communities expected to accommodate them. That duty includes transparency, meaningful consultation, proper assessment of local impacts, and respect for the planning process. None of these principles are served by attempting to force through a proposal of this scale under the guise of urgency.

I therefore urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject the use of the urgent planning process and require this application to proceed through the normal planning system. Residents, elected representatives, public services, and community organisations must be given sufficient time and information to scrutinise the proposal and make informed representations.

Anything less would be a failure of both due process and democratic accountability.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for iOS <https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Faka.ms%2Fo0ukef&data=05%7C02%7CMinisterial.Correspondence%40communities.gov.uk%7C4bc82735042f4408c61708def7fd7dca%7Cbf3468109c7d43dea87224a2ef3995a8%7C0%7C0%7C639220865305182915%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=HbWpEbBXdgt2b0agD%2Bv%2BW7xjcnmOqBB4G38ng%2FZ8ctU%3D&reserved=0>