[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 17:17
To: Crown Casework
Cc: wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted]

[redacted]

Good afternoon,

My name is David Hutley and I live at [redacted]

I'm writing to voice my concerns and object to the proposed asylum site in MOD Bicester - PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843.

The first is for the safety of my wife [redacted] you are now putting her at risk of being attacked or raped. She should not have to stop [redacted] because of the decisions of others that disregard the safety. If she continues [redacted] I fear it's just a matter of time before headline news is made again for terrifying reasons. This is not a safe thing to Introduce to a quiet rural community. At this stage you are putting a.value on human life and safety.

There are a number of other social, safety and sustainability reasons why this should not be going ahead.

There isn't adequate drainage on site and the proposed site is in a notorious flood area. I know this area well [redacted] houses around here and that site itself floods excessively.

There is no waste-water solution or electricity solution and I see that you are proposing installing generators at a massive cost to the tax-payer and the environment. Neither of these are sustainable or suitable for a modern-day asylum site.

Sewage capacity is at peak in the area, and [redacted] Marsh Gibbon have just had the news that a new 90-home development will be going ahead, which will add even more pressure to the already at capacity sewage and water treatments sites. To then add 1250 service users is beyond comprehension.

Back in 2003 this asylum site was rejected by an Independent Planning Inspector, for good measure. Nothing has changed since then, if anything the pressures on services are worse.

In March 2024, the Home Office found that your programme has been forecast to cost the tax-payer MORE than the hotels you previously housed the asylum seekers in. [redacted] we feel misled and like our tax money is being wasted. We want to see money being invested into our own economy, people and healthcare before looking at foreign aid.

Finally, the Home Office have also confirmed that your evidence findings on making sure that the site is risk-approved are incomplete, there are particular weaknesses in the ecological and fire-safety side of things. It feels totally irresponsible in 2026 to even consider pushing this through an urgent crown process before any of this is confirmed safe for both service users and current residents.

This does not inspire confidence, and none of the community have been consulted. No one's views have been taken into consideration and people are naturally extremely cautious and apprehensive about this site, the cost, the lack of safety through unvetted men, the fact that street lights will be turned off at night, and the sheer ignorance towards the residents already living here.

I'm urging you to reconsider a more appropriate site.

Regards

David Hutley
[redacted]