[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 September 2026 07:49
To: Crown Casework
Subject: FORMAL OBJECTION – MOD Bicester Site A – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted]

[redacted]

Re: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A

I wish to register my strongest possible objection to the proposed use of MOD Bicester Site A to accommodate up to 1,256 asylum seekers.

I am not a resident of the immediate area, and I make no attempt to suggest otherwise. I am writing as a British citizen who is deeply concerned about both this proposal and the wider direction in which our Government is taking the country.

The Government appears increasingly unwilling to listen to the legitimate concerns of the people it represents.

This proposal would concentrate more than 1,200 people at one site, predominantly single adult males, for a proposed period of up to ten years. It represents an enormous change in the intensity and character of the site and will inevitably have consequences for the surrounding communities, infrastructure, policing, healthcare, transport and community safety.

Yet the Government has chosen to pursue this through an Urgent Crown Development procedure, bypassing the normal role of the local planning authority in determining the application.

That is deeply troubling.

People should not have major changes such as this imposed upon their communities and then simply be told afterwards that consultation has taken place.

Consultation must mean that the Government is prepared to listen and change course. It cannot simply mean informing people of a decision and giving them a short period in which to object.

Community safety

The proposed accommodation is for a very large population of single adult males who will not be detained and who will therefore be able to leave the site.

It is entirely reasonable for local residents to ask what effect the introduction of a population of this scale will have on their communities.

That is not prejudice. It is a legitimate question of safeguarding, policing, population concentration and risk management.

Before any permission is granted, the Government should demonstrate:

- the full community safety and safeguarding assessment undertaken for the proposal;
- what additional Thames Valley Police resources will be required;
- how incidents occurring away from the site will be managed;
- what additional demand will be placed on emergency services;
- what safeguarding measures will protect surrounding communities and vulnerable residents;
- how movements between the site, neighbouring villages and Bicester will be managed;
- what happens where an individual subsequently presents a criminality, safeguarding or public-protection concern; and
- who will fund all additional policing and public-service requirements.

The Government should not simply reassure communities that everything will be managed. It should publish the evidence demonstrating how.

Scale and suitability

The fundamental question remains unanswered:

Why is it appropriate to concentrate up to 1,256 people at this particular rural site?

A national requirement for asylum accommodation does not automatically make MOD Bicester an appropriate location.

The Government should demonstrate what alternative locations were considered, whether smaller and more dispersed accommodation was examined, why those options were rejected and why this particular concentration of people is considered proportionate.

There must also be proper evidence regarding healthcare capacity, public transport, pedestrian safety, highways, drainage, sewerage, utilities, waste management, environmental effects and emergency-service capacity.

These are not issues that should be addressed after the site becomes operational.

Wider Government policy

I also want my wider objection placed clearly on record.

I believe the Government has lost the confidence of a substantial part of the British public over immigration and border control.

People see illegal and irregular Channel crossings continuing and then see increasingly large accommodation schemes being established around the country to deal with the consequences.

The answer cannot simply be to distribute those consequences into more communities.

The Government's first responsibility should be to maintain control of the country's borders, determine legitimate asylum claims quickly and remove people who have no lawful right to remain.

There is growing anger about this issue not only in Britain but throughout Europe. Governments should take that anger seriously rather than dismissing everyone who questions current immigration policy.

Prime Minister Burnham, you repeatedly speak about representing the whole country.

You do not represent my views on this issue.

Nor do I believe the Government currently understands the depth of public frustration that is developing.

When governments repeatedly make major decisions despite substantial public opposition, restrict meaningful local involvement and then characterise the outcome as consultation, they create the perception of government by imposition rather than government by consent.

That is profoundly damaging to trust in democracy.

I would strongly urge the Prime Minister and the Government to recognise the level of anger developing across the country.

The United Kingdom does not need further division. It needs political leadership that restores confidence before social tensions deteriorate into serious disorder.

If this Government believes that its approach to immigration, asylum accommodation and border control commands the support of the British people, then it should have the confidence to seek a fresh democratic mandate through a general election.

I therefore call upon the Government to reconsider this proposal and upon the Secretary of State to refuse planning permission for MOD Bicester Site A.

Local communities deserve genuine consultation.

The country deserves effective border control.

And the British public deserves a Government that listens to it.

Please treat this email as my formal representation opposing application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

Kind regards,

[redacted]