[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 September 2026 20:03
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,

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

I am writing as a local resident to object to the proposed use of MOD Bicester Site A as accommodation for up to 1,256 asylum seekers.

I want to make clear that my objection is not to providing refuge to those who need it. I strongly believe that the UK has a responsibility to protect people fleeing persecution and to treat asylum seekers with dignity. My objection is to concentrating such a large number of people in one isolated location, and the foreseeable consequences this will have for asylum seekers, the local population and community cohesion.

Public safety and far-right mobilisation

My greatest concern is that a centre accommodating 1,256 asylum seekers will become a focal point for organised far-right activity.

This is no longer a hypothetical concern. Recent events in Portsmouth have demonstrated how locations associated with asylum accommodation can attract large-scale anti-immigration protests, including people travelling from outside the local community. More concerning still, the hard-right Patriot Platform has reportedly already identified the proposed Bicester/Piddington site as a target for future mobilisation.

The House of Commons Home Affairs Committee has recognised that asylum accommodation can attract people seeking to promote divisive agendas or instigate disorder, creating substantial additional demands on police forces. The Government itself has arrangements to provide additional police funding where large asylum sites create such pressures.

Yet I can see no adequate plan explaining how the public-order consequences of placing 1,256 asylum seekers here will be managed: how many additional police officers will be required, how this will be funded, or how neighbouring communities will be protected during major demonstrations.

The consequences for ethnic-minority residents

For my family, this issue is deeply personal.

I am a non-white British man living locally with my family. Since the announcement of the proposal, I have already perceived an increase in racist activity and sentiment around Bicester. I am genuinely concerned about what will happen if this site becomes a destination for large numbers of far-right activists.

Hostility generated around asylum accommodation does not necessarily remain directed at asylum seekers. People from ethnic-minority backgrounds can become targets simply because they are perceived to be immigrants or outsiders.

I work as a doctor in the NHS and have contributed to this country through healthcare, research, innovation and commercial development. I mention this not because my family's safety matters more than anyone else's, but because I am a British citizen who has built a life here and contributed substantially to the society in which I live. I do not believe my family, or any other local family, should be expected to accept a foreseeable increase in racial hostility and public disorder because concentrating asylum accommodation in one location is considered administratively or financially convenient.

Even substantially increased policing would not resolve the fundamental unfairness. A small number of communities should not be required to bear a disproportionate burden of protests, disruption, intimidation and increased policing in order to implement a national policy.

This also raises an important equality question. Under the Public Sector Equality Duty, public authorities must have due regard to eliminating discrimination and harassment and fostering good relations between people with different protected characteristics. I therefore ask what assessment has been made of the impact of this proposal on ethnic-minority residents in Bicester and the surrounding communities, particularly given the evidence of organised far-right interest in this specific site.

Unfair to asylum seekers and damaging to integration

I also believe this policy is unfair to the asylum seekers themselves.

Concentrating more than a thousand people in an isolated former military site, with limited transport and access to local services, risks isolating them from the wider community. At the same time, it creates an obvious and highly visible target for those wishing to mobilise against them.

A policy that isolates asylum seekers while creating resentment and anxiety among neighbouring communities is unlikely to promote successful integration. Instead, it risks driving a further wedge between new arrivals, established immigrant and ethnic-minority communities, and the wider population.

There must be a better and fairer way of meeting our responsibility to people seeking refuge.

Outstanding planning concerns

These concerns are in addition to significant unresolved questions regarding the suitability of the site.

Important issues remain concerning ground contamination, surface-water flooding and drainage, wastewater, electricity supply, ecology, fire safety and highways. The B4011 has limited pedestrian infrastructure, and the transport evidence itself contains apparent errors.

It is difficult to understand why permission for accommodation on this scale should be granted before such fundamental matters have been satisfactorily resolved.

I am also concerned by the extremely short representation period. Residents and technical specialists have been expected to examine well over 1,000 pages of material concerning a development accommodating up to 1,256 people for potentially ten years. I ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026.

The site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation, with a smaller proposal refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

Conclusion

Taken together, I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that MOD Bicester is an appropriate location for a development of this scale.

My position is not anti-asylum seeker. Britain should provide refuge to those who need it. But compassion towards asylum seekers does not require us to accept a policy that is unfair to them, unfair to the surrounding community and potentially damaging to community cohesion.

The risk of far-right mobilisation is particularly serious because it is no longer merely theoretical: this specific site has reportedly already been identified as a target. That foreseeable consequence must be considered before permission is granted, not dealt with afterwards as a policing problem for the local community.

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If the Secretary of State is nevertheless minded to approve the application, I ask that no decision be made until the outstanding technical work has been completed and published, and there has been a proper site-specific assessment of community cohesion, equality and public-order risks, together with a credible and fully funded policing plan.

The Government has a responsibility towards people seeking asylum. It also has a responsibility towards the communities in which it chooses to accommodate them. **Those responsibilities should not be set against one another. A policy that protects one vulnerable group should not foreseeably make another group feel less safe in their own community.**

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please inform the sender and permanently delete the message and any attachments.

Recipients should be aware that all emails received and sent by this Authority are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party.

****