From: Jake
To: Crown Casework
Subject: Objection – MOD Bicester Site A – Ref: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 07 September 2026 20:24:50

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

I am writing to formally object to the proposal to accommodate up to 1,256 single adult male asylum seekers at MOD Bicester Site A.

I live with my wife and our two young daughters in Oakley, only a few miles from the proposed site. My objection is not based on opposition to asylum seekers as individuals or to national asylum policy. My concern relates specifically to the scale and concentration of the proposed accommodation, its location, and whether sufficient safeguards and infrastructure are in place to protect both residents of the site and the surrounding communities.

As a father of two young girls, safeguarding and community safety are particularly important to me. Accommodating up to 1,256 single adults in one location represents a substantial change in the population concentrated within this rural area. I would therefore expect the application to demonstrate, with clear evidence, how the potential impacts of a development of this scale on neighbouring villages have been assessed and mitigated.

In particular, I am concerned about the adequacy of security, supervision and site-management arrangements. I would like clarification on what security will operate on the site, whether it will be staffed 24 hours a day, how residents entering and leaving the site will be managed, how incidents or safeguarding concerns will be dealt with, and what arrangements have been agreed with Thames Valley Police and other relevant agencies.

I am also concerned about the potential impact on the safety and security of our home. This is not an allegation that the future residents of the site will commit offences. Rather, with a proposal that would introduce such a significant population into a relatively rural location, I believe residents are entitled to understand whether any assessment has been undertaken of potential impacts on crime, antisocial behaviour, policing demand and community safety, and what mitigation will be provided if additional pressures arise.

More broadly, I question whether the surrounding infrastructure is suitable for accommodation on this scale. A development housing up to 1,256 people will inevitably generate demand for transport, healthcare, policing, utilities, wastewater and other services. I would ask the Secretary of State to consider whether the application provides sufficient evidence that these services have the capacity to accommodate that demand without adversely affecting existing communities.

I would therefore ask that, before any approval is granted, clear evidence is provided addressing:

- The safeguarding and community-safety assessment undertaken for Oakley and other surrounding villages.
- The proposed 24-hour security, supervision and site-management arrangements.
- The expected impact on Thames Valley Police and what additional policing resources, if any, will be provided.

- How safeguarding incidents and antisocial behaviour will be reported, managed and escalated.
- How movement to and from the site will be managed given its rural location.
- The assessment of impacts on local healthcare, transport, utilities and other infrastructure.
- What ongoing monitoring will take place and what action will be taken if the assumptions within the assessments prove incorrect once the site is operational.
- How local residents and parish councils will be able to raise concerns and hold the site operator accountable.

I recognise the need for the Government to provide appropriate accommodation for people seeking asylum. However, that does not remove the responsibility to demonstrate that a development of this exceptional scale is appropriate for its proposed location and that its effects on neighbouring communities have been properly assessed and mitigated.

As a local resident, husband and father, I do not currently feel sufficiently reassured that the proposal has demonstrated how the safety and safeguarding of my family, our home and the wider Oakley community will be protected.

I therefore respectfully ask that these matters are given substantial consideration before any decision is made and that the proposal is not approved unless the Secretary of State is satisfied that the identified risks and infrastructure requirements have been comprehensively assessed and adequately mitigated.

Yours faithfully,

Jake Thomas
[redacted]