From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework; bicester@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: Formal objection-MOD Bicester Site A Ref:PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date: 10 September 2026 06:45:58

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a resident of [redacted] and as a UK taxpayer to formally object to the Urgent Crown Development application for MOD Bicester Site A, reference PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

I respectfully ask the Secretary of State to refuse this application.

I am deeply concerned about the scale, location and duration of the proposed development and its potential impact on [redacted] and the surrounding communities.

The application proposes non-detained asylum accommodation for up to 1,256 people, while the Home Office has stated that the site would accommodate single adult males aged between 18 and 65 and could operate for a minimum of ten years.

In my view, a development of this scale and duration requires the highest level of scrutiny.

Community safety, non-detained accommodation and policing

One of my most serious concerns as a [redacted] resident is that this is proposed as non-detained accommodation.

I acknowledge that the Home Office states that mandatory checks are carried out against immigration, security, policing and criminality databases. I am not suggesting that asylum seekers should automatically be regarded as criminals.

However, residents would not be detained at the site, and it is therefore reasonable for local people to ask how public protection and safeguarding risks will be managed outside the boundaries of the accommodation.

For a facility accommodating up to 1,256 single adult males, the Government should provide clear evidence explaining how individual risks will be assessed and continually reviewed, what happens where reliable information about an individual's previous history is incomplete or unavailable, how incidents outside the site will be dealt with, and what action can be taken if concerns about an individual arise after they have been accommodated.

Twenty-four-hour security and CCTV within the site do not, by themselves, answer the question of how community safety will be protected outside its boundaries.

There must also be clear evidence that Thames Valley Police and other emergency services will have sufficient additional resources and that these costs will be properly funded by central government rather than absorbed by existing local services.

Impact on [redacted] and neighbouring communities

[redacted] is an established and expanding residential community where families have made their homes.

The proposed site should not be considered in isolation from the substantial residential development that has already taken place and continues to take place in Bicester.

The cumulative impact on residents, roads, pedestrian and cyclist safety, public transport, policing, healthcare and other local infrastructure must be properly assessed.

As a resident of [redacted], I am particularly concerned that people living in the communities affected by this proposal should have a meaningful voice in a decision that could affect our area for at least a decade.

Transport, traffic and infrastructure

A facility accommodating up to 1,256 people will inevitably generate movements associated not only with those accommodated there but also with staff, security personnel, deliveries, contractors, healthcare provision, emergency services and other operational requirements.

I ask that the cumulative impact on the road network around Graven Hill, Bicester, Arncott, Piddington and the surrounding area be fully considered.
Particular attention should be paid to road capacity, pedestrian and cyclist safety, public transport provision and the interaction between this proposal and the continuing growth of Bicester.
Pressure on healthcare, policing and public services
Adding a population of this scale to the area raises legitimate questions about pressure on healthcare, policing, emergency services, transport and other infrastructure.
The Government's intention to provide some services on site should not replace a comprehensive assessment of the inevitable interaction between such a large non-detained facility and the surrounding community.
Existing residents should not experience reduced access to services as a consequence of a decision made at national level.
Scale, location and duration
The Home Office states that the proposed site could operate for a minimum of ten years. For the people living nearby, ten years is not a short-term impact.
The Secretary of State should carefully consider whether concentrating accommodation for up to 1,256 people at this particular location is appropriate and proportionate, and whether smaller or more dispersed alternatives have been adequately considered.
Environmental and planning impacts
The proposal includes modular accommodation, wastewater treatment infrastructure, roads and access ways, security infrastructure, parking and other substantial works.
The effects on drainage, flood risk, ecology, landscape, noise, air quality, traffic and local infrastructure should be subject to rigorous scrutiny before permission is granted.
The fact that the application is considered urgent at national level should not reduce the standard of assessment applied to its long-term consequences for local residents.
Public expenditure and the interests of taxpayers
As a UK taxpayer, I am also deeply concerned about the substantial and continuing public expenditure associated with accommodating large numbers of people whose asylum claims have not yet been determined, including the costs associated with establishing and operating large accommodation sites such as MOD Bicester.
Taxpayers are entitled to expect the Government to demonstrate that public money is being used responsibly and that it is addressing the underlying causes of the demand for this accommodation rather than establishing large facilities that may operate in local communities for many years.
I believe the Government should take much stronger and effective action to prevent unlawful entry into the United Kingdom, accelerate asylum and immigration decisions, and promptly remove people who are determined to have no lawful basis to remain in the country, subject to the UK's legal obligations.
The financial implications of this proposal, its value for money compared with reasonable alternatives and its long-term cost to taxpayers should therefore be fully and transparently considered.
As a local resident and taxpayer, I do not believe local communities should be expected to absorb additional financial, infrastructure, policing and social pressures arising from a national immigration issue without compelling evidence that this particular development is necessary, proportionate, safe and represents good value for public money.
Local consultation and scrutiny
Finally, I am concerned that a proposal of such magnitude is being progressed through the Urgent Crown Development procedure.
National urgency should not come at the expense of meaningful local scrutiny, particularly where the proposed use could continue for at least ten years.
Residents of [redacted] and the surrounding villages will live with the consequences of this decision and their concerns deserve meaningful weight.
For all of these reasons, I respectfully ask the Secretary of State to refuse planning

permission for MOD Bicester Site A unless and until there is clear and robust evidence that the development is suitable for this location, that its cumulative impacts have been properly assessed, that adequate safeguards and fully funded resources are in place, and that it will not cause unacceptable harm to [redacted] and the surrounding communities.

Yours faithfully,

Zlatka Chulova

[redacted]