From: [redacted]
To: Crown Casework
Cc: calum.miller.mp@parliament.uk; wpwsobjection@gmail.com
Subject: Objection to Urgent Crown Development application – MOD Bicester Site A asylum accommodation (Ref: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843)
Date: 15 September 2026 19:46:26

[redacted]

[redacted] this may concern,

I writing this letter as a resident [redacted] and as a British citizen who feels extremely let down by the British Government.

It has been a horrible summer filled with unanswered questions and that list of questions only grows. Yet we still have no contact from those in charge.

I'll address the concerns I have which I'm sure you've already heard thousands of times.

1. Unsuitable scale and isolation for the location

The proposal would introduce approximately 1,250 (on a rolling basis) asylum seekers onto a former military storage and logistics site lying between small villages (Piddington has only a few hundred residents). The site is relatively isolated, several miles from central Bicester, with limited pedestrian access, public transport, shops, and everyday services. Historical planning examinations of similar proposals on this site previously raised serious concerns about the isolated nature of the location and pedestrian safety. A development of this scale in such a setting has not been shown to be compatible with the rural character of the surrounding communities or capable of being properly integrated.

2. Transport, access and road safety

Surrounding rural roads (including the B4011) have limited continuous footways, lighting and public transport. The Transport Assessment in the application appears to contain errors (references to the wrong road in places) and does not fully resolve long-standing safety issues for pedestrians and other road users. Increased vehicle and foot movements associated with a large residential population on this site risk exacerbating existing hazards.

3. Infrastructure capacity and site conditions

There remain unresolved questions about water supply, wastewater treatment, electricity capacity, drainage and flooding. This is sure to be an enormous cost on a daily basis. How is this any better than housing them in a hotel!

4. Pressure on local services and safeguarding

Local healthcare, emergency services, and other public services already serve rural communities with limited capacity. The application must clearly show how GP, hospital, mental-health, ambulance and other provision will meet the needs of up to 1,256 additional people without detriment to existing residents. Safeguarding arrangements for both residents of the site and the surrounding community (including women, children and vulnerable people) need to be evidence-based, transparent and robust, with clear accountability. An example close to me is my 2yr old son can't even sign onto a NHS dentist like the rest of his family. Yet this site provides dental care to non UK residents.

5. Process, urgency and incomplete evidence

Local communities and councils were not meaningfully consulted while this proposal was developed. The use of the Urgent Crown Development route shortens normal scrutiny. I also challenge the need for Urgent crown development when the site was being looked at in November 2025 and likely won't be online until 2027. Doesn't sound very urgent to me.

Lastly [redacted] I have extreme concerns about the risk to the local community. We don't have to look far to see the devastating impact some asylum seekers have had on British citizens. As someone who writes victim personal statements for victims to read in court I know first hand the lasting impact someone deals with as a victim of crime. We have to get a grip of this situation and it's about time the government became accountable for the impact these sites and the people living on them cause.

I am worried about the lasting impact on the character of our villages, the strain on already stretched rural infrastructure and services, and the sense that a major change is being advanced without the communities most affected having a proper opportunity to shape it. Residents deserve clear answers on suitability, safety, cost and accountability before any permission is granted.

I respectfully ask that the Secretary of State refuse this application, or at the very least require the outstanding evidence gaps to be filled, independent scrutiny of the technical assessments, and meaningful engagement with local communities and councils before any decision is taken.

Thank you for considering this email. Please can you acknowledge receipt of it and provide a timeline of a response.

[redacted]