From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Representation against MOD Bicester Site A asylum accommodation proposal – PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 19:30:24

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Urgent Crown Development Application – MOD Bicester Site A
Reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development at MOD Bicester Site A and, in particular, to the proposed conversion of the former MOD site into accommodation for up to 1,256 single adult asylum seekers.

I am a resident of [redacted] and a [redacted]. [redacted]. We chose [redacted] because it has provided us with something incredibly important: a safe, stable community in which my children can grow up, go to school, meet their friends, become increasingly independent and enjoy their childhood.

The proposed development fundamentally changes my perception of that safety.

I want to be very clear that my objection is not based on hostility towards people seeking asylum. I recognise that people seeking protection may have experienced extremely difficult circumstances. However, compassion for people seeking asylum does not mean that the Government should disregard the legitimate safety, wellbeing and quality-of-life concerns of the existing community, nor does it mean that every location is appropriate for accommodating more than 1,200 people in one concentrated site.

1. The scale of this proposal is completely disproportionate to the local community

The proposal is for up to 1,256 residents on a single site, for up to ten years.

This is not a small housing development. It is effectively the creation of a new population concentration on the edge of Bicester.

The Government must properly assess whether placing such a large population in this particular location is appropriate and sustainable, rather than simply establishing whether the physical site can accommodate buildings and beds.

The question is not merely:

“Can 1,256 people be accommodated here?”

It is:

“Can Bicester safely, sustainably and appropriately absorb a population of this scale, in this location, for potentially ten years?”

I do not believe that this question has been adequately answered.

2. Community safety must be treated as a material consideration

As a mother, this is my most serious concern.

I am genuinely frightened by the prospect of more than 1,200 single adult men being accommodated in such close proximity to our community.

I am not suggesting that every asylum seeker represents a risk. That would be unfair and unsupported. My concern is the scale and composition of the proposed population, the potential pressures created by such a large concentration of people, and whether the Government can genuinely guarantee the safety of residents, children, women, businesses and those being accommodated themselves.

I currently feel comfortable allowing my children to enjoy a degree of independence appropriate for their age. They can meet friends, travel locally and enjoy their childhood without me constantly fearing for their safety.

This proposal changes that.

I am already imagining myself being afraid to walk around Bicester with my children. I am particularly concerned about my daughter as she gets older. I cannot accept that a decision made by central government could result in me feeling that I have to restrict where my children go, who they meet or whether they can safely walk around their own town.

I certainly do not want to reach a point where I feel unable to allow my children to walk anywhere independently because I no longer feel that the environment is safe.

[redacted].

The Government therefore needs to provide compelling, evidence-based assurances regarding:

- the level and nature of security provision;
- the ratio and training of security staff;
- policing arrangements;
- emergency response arrangements;
- arrangements for dealing with antisocial behaviour;
- safeguarding arrangements;
- management of incidents occurring both inside and outside the site;
- arrangements for residents travelling into Bicester;
- arrangements for vulnerable people;
- and the additional resources being provided to Thames Valley Police and other emergency services.

It is not sufficient simply to state that appropriate arrangements will be put in place. The community needs to see what those arrangements are, who will fund them, who will operate them and whether they are adequate for a population of this size.

3. The impact on women and children has not been sufficiently addressed

The Government must consider the lived reality of local residents.

Bicester is not an isolated settlement. People walk, cycle, shop, work, attend schools, use public transport and socialise throughout the town and surrounding villages.

The presence of a large population of single adult men will inevitably change how many

local residents experience public spaces.

Even if there is no intention to cause disruption, the sheer scale of the proposal creates legitimate concerns about how public spaces, transport routes, shops and recreational areas will be used.

As a mother, I should not have to choose between allowing my children to enjoy normal independence and worrying about whether I am putting them at risk.

4. Impact on local infrastructure and public services

Bicester is already a growing town.

The proposal would introduce up to 1,256 additional residents who will require appropriate access to healthcare, emergency services, transport, utilities, waste management and other infrastructure.

The Government's own application identifies the need for significant infrastructure and facilities, including roads, access ways, security infrastructure, wastewater treatment, health and welfare facilities and recreational areas.

This demonstrates the scale of the development.

The relevant question is therefore whether the existing local infrastructure and public services can cope with the additional pressure generated by the site.

I am particularly concerned about:

- GP and healthcare capacity;
- emergency healthcare;
- ambulance services;
- policing;
- fire and rescue services;
- roads and traffic;
- public transport;
- wastewater and utilities;
- waste collection;
- and other local services.

Any additional costs imposed on local services must be fully identified and funded by central government rather than being absorbed by local taxpayers or reducing the level of service available to existing residents.

5. Transport and traffic impacts require particularly careful consideration

The location of the site means that movement between the accommodation and Bicester will be an important issue.

The Government should provide a clear and independently scrutinised assessment of:

- anticipated daily movements;
- walking routes;
- cycling routes;
- public transport use;

- private and contracted transport;
- traffic generation;
- pedestrian safety;
- road safety;
- and the effect on neighbouring villages.

The proposal must not create unacceptable pressure or safety risks on local roads and routes.

6. Impact on Bicester Village and the local economy

Bicester is internationally recognised for Bicester Village and has developed a significant visitor economy around it.

Bicester Village is an important economic asset, employer and source of tourism.

The Government must properly assess whether locating a large asylum accommodation centre close to Bicester could affect:

- visitor perceptions of the area;
- employee safety;
- customer confidence;
- tourism;
- local businesses;
- and the reputation of Bicester as a destination.

This is not about suggesting that asylum seekers should automatically be excluded from commercial areas. It is about recognising that a development of this exceptional scale can have consequences for the local economy and that those consequences need to be properly assessed rather than assumed away.

7. The impact on existing residents and neighbouring communities must be properly assessed

Cherwell District Council itself has raised concerns about site security, community safety, infrastructure, public services and community impacts.

Those concerns should not be dismissed as simply political opposition.

They are precisely the types of issues that need to be properly considered before approving a development of this scale.

The Government should demonstrate that it has undertaken a genuine assessment of the cumulative impact on Bicester and surrounding communities rather than assessing the site in isolation.

8. The lack of meaningful local consultation is deeply concerning

I am particularly troubled that Cherwell District Council states that it was not consulted before the proposal was announced and was only notified shortly before the plans became public.

A decision of this magnitude should involve meaningful engagement with the community and the local authorities responsible for the services that will be affected.

The fact that the proposal is being progressed through the Urgent Crown Development process does not remove the need to properly consider material planning considerations or the legitimate concerns of affected residents.

Indeed, the Government's own published guidance confirms that representations received during the consultation period will be taken into account where they raise material planning considerations relevant to the proposed development.

I therefore ask that the concerns raised in this representation are given genuine weight.

9. The proposed ten-year duration is particularly concerning

This should not be treated as a short-term emergency measure.

The proposal is for temporary use lasting up to ten years.

Ten years is a substantial proportion of a child's life.

[redacted]. That makes the decision particularly significant to me as a parent.

A development of this duration should therefore be assessed as a long-term change to the character, environment, infrastructure and lived experience of Bicester, rather than as a temporary inconvenience.

10. The Government should consider alternative locations and a more distributed approach

I understand that the Government is under significant pressure to provide asylum accommodation and reduce reliance on hotels.

However, solving a national problem does not automatically make every available site an appropriate location.

Concentrating up to 1,256 people in one location creates a very different set of risks and pressures from a more distributed accommodation model.

The Government should therefore demonstrate why this particular site is necessary, why this scale is necessary, and why alternative locations or a less concentrated model would not be more appropriate.

11. I ask that the application is refused

For all of the reasons above, I respectfully but strongly object to the proposed development.

I ask the Secretary of State to give particular consideration to:

1. The exceptional scale of the proposed population;
2. The concentration of up to 1,256 single adult asylum seekers at one location;
3. Community safety and safeguarding;
4. The impact on women and children;
5. The ability of local police and emergency services to respond adequately;
6. Pressure on healthcare and other public services;

7. Transport, pedestrian and road safety;
8. Infrastructure and utilities capacity;
9. Noise and disturbance;
10. The impact on neighbouring communities;
11. The potential economic and reputational impact on Bicester and businesses including Bicester Village;
12. The absence of meaningful prior local consultation;
13. The exceptionally long proposed duration of up to ten years; and
14. Whether a large, concentrated facility is an appropriate planning solution when less concentrated alternatives may be available.

Finally, I want to explain what this means to me personally.

I have built a life in [redacted] We have friends here, our routines here and a sense of belonging here.

I chose this town because I believed it was a safe place to raise my children.

I want my daughter and my son to be able to enjoy their childhood. I want them to be able to meet their friends, walk around their town, go to the shops, use local facilities and gradually become independent without their mother living in fear.

I am already deeply distressed by the thought that a decision made without meaningful involvement from the local community could fundamentally change that feeling of safety.

I do not believe that asking residents to accept such a substantial change to their community is reasonable without overwhelming evidence that the development can operate safely, without unacceptable impacts on existing residents, local services, infrastructure and businesses.

I therefore strongly urge the Secretary of State to refuse planning permission for the proposed MOD Bicester Site A asylum accommodation development.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]