From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 22:06:18

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the proposal to accommodate up to 1,256 asylum seekers at MOD Bicester Site A.

I want to make clear that my objection is not based on hostility towards people seeking asylum or assumptions about the individuals who may live there. My objection is to the suitability of this particular site and the scale of what is being proposed.

Having looked at the location and considered the surrounding area, I do not believe this is a suitable place to accommodate up to 1,256 people.

The site is surrounded by very small rural villages, including Piddington and Ludgershall. The proposed population of the site would be significantly larger than the individual populations of the communities around it. This is an enormous concentration of people to place in an isolated rural area with very limited infrastructure and amenities.

There is very little nearby. Ludgershall has one pub. Brill has two pubs and two small shops. There are no safe footpaths connecting the site to these villages or facilities. The roads are rural roads and are simply not designed for large numbers of pedestrians.

I therefore do not believe this is a sustainable location for a development of this size.

The most basic question is: how will up to 1,256 people live their everyday lives here?

Where will they shop? How will they access healthcare? How will they attend appointments? How will they get to towns and other services? What will they do during the day?

There appears to be very little within easy or safe walking distance, meaning that a large population will either need to be transported elsewhere or will be travelling through surrounding villages and along rural roads.

This is not a suitable location to place such a large number of people without significantly affecting either the people living there or the small communities around the site.

I am also particularly concerned about healthcare and mental health provision.

Many people seeking asylum may have experienced significant trauma and may have complex physical or mental health needs. I therefore struggle to understand how an isolated rural site with limited access to healthcare and support services can be considered appropriate.

We have a small GP surgery in [redacted] with the next significant medical facilities in Bicester. I do not believe the existing local infrastructure was designed to absorb an additional population of up to 1,256 people.

I am concerned that this proposal could place significant pressure on GPs, mental health services, ambulance services and hospitals while also failing to provide the people living on the site with appropriate access to the support they may need.

I am also concerned about the lack of facilities and meaningful activities available to such a large number of people.

If people cannot easily access shops, services, towns, education, training, work or recreation, then I question whether this is an appropriate environment in which to accommodate them.

This concern is not based on assumptions about how people will behave. It is based on the simple reality that accommodating a large number of people in an isolated location with very little to do and nowhere easily accessible is unlikely to be beneficial for anyone.

I also object because of the impact that a development of this size could have on the surrounding communities.

Piddington, Ludgershall and neighbouring villages are small, quiet rural communities. Their existing infrastructure and public services are limited.

The introduction of a new population of up to 1,256 people has the potential to place significant additional pressure on healthcare, transport, policing, emergency services and local infrastructure.

I am particularly concerned about the safety and sense of security of women and children in the surrounding communities.

I want to be clear that I am not suggesting that asylum seekers should automatically be considered dangerous. However, I do believe it is entirely reasonable to question whether the safeguarding and community impact of placing such a large, concentrated population next to small rural communities has been properly assessed.

Women and children regularly walk, cycle and use the roads and countryside around these villages. The development would significantly change the nature and population of the immediate area.

I believe the safety, safeguarding and sense of security of existing residents should be properly considered when deciding whether this location is suitable.

I also have serious concerns about policing and emergency services.

The site is located in a rural area and the nearest significant police facilities are in Bicester. I do not believe it is reasonable to assume that existing local services can simply absorb the demands created by a new population of up to 1,256 people.

The same applies to ambulances, fire services and emergency planning. A site of this size requires a clear and robust plan for managing emergencies, incidents and the day-to-day needs of a very large population.

I am also concerned about the infrastructure required to support this development, including water, drainage, wastewater, roads and environmental impacts.

This is not a small temporary development. It involves accommodating up to 1,256 people and could remain in place for up to 10 years.

I do not believe it is appropriate to place a development of this scale in a rural location and then attempt to address the consequences through management plans and mitigation afterwards.

The fundamental problem is the location itself.

I am also extremely concerned about the way this proposal has been brought forward and the limited opportunity local people have been given to understand and respond to it.

A proposal of this size, which could fundamentally affect the surrounding area for up to 10 years, deserves proper scrutiny and meaningful consultation.

Instead, local communities have been given a very limited period to consider a large and complex application.

I do not believe that local residents have been given a meaningful opportunity to properly examine and challenge the assumptions being made about transport, healthcare, mental health provision, policing, safeguarding, infrastructure and site management.

Having considered all of these issues, I believe MOD Bicester Site A is fundamentally unsuitable for accommodating up to 1,256 people.

The surrounding area does not have the infrastructure, amenities, safe pedestrian access or public services required for a development of this scale.

I am concerned that this proposal is unsuitable both for the people who would be accommodated there and for the small rural communities expected to absorb the impact.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposal and ask that permission for the development is refused.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]