[redacted]

From: Mark Pointer [redacted]
Sent: 13 September 2026 10:17
To: Ministerial Correspondence; Crown Casework; calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: A Site, MOD Bicester PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843

[redacted]

[redacted]

13/09/26

To the Secretary Of State

In response to your "petition response", I would like to make the following observations :

Your reply states that "large sites play an important role in ending asylum hotel use".
The decision to end hotel accommodation for asylum seekers, was taken in response to public objection regarding the cost. This particular large site at Piddington has no current infrastructure, so the cost to the taxpayer to introduce this will be substantial. Also, I think public opinion has changed. Many people feel that hotels are more visible, and their continued use will hold your government more accountable for its immigration policy failures.

I note your plans to expand the facilities at Wethersfield and Crowborough, which leads me to believe that your intention will be to further expand the Piddington facility, should this application be successful.

You refer to the need for "enough secure, safe and sustainable accommodation". Secure and safe for who ? Can you imagine how safe the 370 Piddington residents will feel when gangs of undetained, illegal, undocumented men start roaming through their village ? Certainly not safe or secure for the local residents, so I assume you are referring to safety for the asylum seekers ?
It is my firm expectation that your absolute priority should be the safety of local residents, well before asylum seekers. If this does not happen, I will be holding the ministers and local government officials, personally responsible, through legal recourse, if necessary.
I would respectfully remind you that the Hillsborough Law requires authorities and relevant officials to act with transparency and truthfulness, and in regard to this application I have seen little evidence of this to date.

It is ironic that security officers are already manning the gates of the proposed site (presumably to keep local residents out), yet there would be no security present if 1250 single, undocumented men were to be housed on site.

Your response states the application will "be progressed in consultation with local authorities and statutory partners. This statement has been and still is, completely untrue. Our local MP has, until very recently, been completely ghosted by the Home Office, as have
many relevant authorities.

I have seen no evidence to date of the "fair and equitable" manner you refer to. The Home Office has refused to respond to all manner of enquiries, whilst it pursues its underhand "Urgent Crown Planning" application, which is not valid, as the Home Office could have submitted an application through the usual

channels, back in November 2025, but chose not to. Also, the fact that an existing accommodation model (hotels) is already in use and working, is another reason why an urgent crown application should be disallowed.

Currently, the Home Office is absolutely not “engaging with local authorities etc”. You have just announced a 10 day consultation period. 10 days for locals to object to a 1000 page application ? On what level could you possibly describe this as “fair” ?

For your further information, the Piddington MOD site is not self-sufficient, with no essential services on site, as it has always been used by the MOD as a warehouse and open storage facility.

Your response claims “Lessons have been learned”. I see no evidence of this, as the Piddington site was considered for use as asylum accomodation back in 2001. After wasting £24M of taxpayer’s money, in 2005 the Labour government conceded it would be too expensive to install the infrastructure required to operate the site successfully. Nothing has changed since this decision was made.

In conclusion, I would suggest this Home Office application is deliberately underhand and misleading. It seems to be part of a deliberate scheme to house illegal migrants in out of the way rural locations to reduce the government’s visibility, rather than dealing with the source of the problem, which would be to stop the flow of illegal migrants into this country.

Please reject this application.

Mark Pointer

[redacted]