[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 21:18
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, Site A, MOD Bicester

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing as a local resident to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, concerning the proposed accommodation of up to 1,256 asylum seekers at MOD Bicester.

I share the planning and infrastructure concerns that have already been raised by many local residents, but I particularly want to raise my concerns about the effect of a development of this scale on public safety and community cohesion.

I want to make clear that I support the UK's responsibility to provide refuge to people who need our protection. My objection is not to asylum seekers themselves. I am concerned about the decision to concentrate such a large number of people in one location and the entirely foreseeable tensions that this may create.

Recent events elsewhere, including Portsmouth, have shown how asylum accommodation can become a focal point for organised far-right activity. It is therefore extremely concerning that far-right activists have reportedly already identified the proposed Bicester/Piddington site as a target for future mobilisation.

As [redacted] living locally, I am deeply worried about what this could mean for the safety of my family and the community in which we are raising our children.

My [redacted] and our family is of [redacted]. Since the announcement of the proposed site, we have already noticed what we perceive to be an increase in racist sentiment locally. The prospect of organised far-right groups travelling to our area to demonstrate against a site accommodating more than a thousand asylum seekers is therefore not an abstract political concern for us. It is something that could directly affect our family's sense of safety in the place we call home.

Hostility directed towards asylum seekers does not necessarily remain confined to them. In an atmosphere of heightened racial and anti-immigration tension, people can become targets simply because of their appearance or because they are perceived to be immigrants.

I am also very concerned that I have seen no convincing plan for the additional policing that a site of this scale may require. If this proposal is likely to attract substantial demonstrations, what additional resources will Thames Valley Police receive, and what measures will be taken to protect the surrounding communities?

Even if sufficient additional policing is provided, however, that does not address the fundamental unfairness of the policy. It seems unreasonable that a relatively small number of communities should be expected to bear a disproportionate share of the public-order consequences of a national asylum policy simply because placing more than a thousand people together in one location may be administratively convenient or less expensive.

I also struggle to see how this approach is fair to the asylum seekers themselves. Concentrating so many people on an isolated and highly visible site risks making them an obvious target for precisely the hostility and intimidation from which we should be protecting them. It may also make integration into the wider community more difficult.

I fear that rather than bringing communities together, this policy risks doing the opposite: increasing resentment towards asylum seekers, attracting extremists to the area, making established ethnic-minority families feel less secure, and driving a further wedge between different parts of our society.

We have a responsibility to provide safety and dignity to people who genuinely need refuge. But the way in which we fulfil that responsibility should not unnecessarily undermine the safety and cohesion of the communities in which they are accommodated.

I therefore ask the Secretary of State to consider carefully the public-order, equality and community-cohesion consequences of concentrating up to 1,256 asylum seekers at this particular site, and the disproportionate burden this places upon the surrounding population.

For these reasons, together with the wider planning objections that have been raised regarding the suitability of MOD Bicester, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Yours faithfully,

