[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 09:27
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 member of the public to object to planning application PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843, the proposed 1,256-person asylum accommodation centre at Site A, MOD Bicester, Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE.

I ask that planning permission be refused. Below are the many serious rebuttals to this ill-thought-out scheme based solely on facts that demonstrate conclusively that this project should not go ahead. Before you get to those, I would like to give my personal reasons for why I am vehemently against this scheme.

You cannot import 1,250 unknown men into a community where they have no ties or occupation and allow them to roam unencumbered. I fear for my and my family's safety with this influx of unknown males. At present, my children and I are free to walk the streets of Bicester without undue concern. Once there are groups of men hanging around the streets, I will no longer be able to allow my children to walk unsupervised and I will not feel safe walking alone any longer either. I would feel this way if these men were from anywhere but the fact they are from countries that view women as second-class citizens, inferior to their male counterparts, and consider any woman without a chaperone to be fair game makes this even more frightening. You are playing with your citizens' safety in a shockingly cavalier manner and demonstrating daily your distain for the general public with your wilful inability to understand just why this is so unacceptable. It is not racist to fear the very real risk of welcoming men who do not share our cultural values; it is sensible. It is not being a NIMBY to worry about a huge influx of new people with no understanding of the community they are joining; it is sensible.

We do not have an open door border policy and anyone entering the country through approved means needs to do so with a passport and have no right to remain. Yet, these men arrive without documentation, we have no idea who they are, and they are allowed to enter indefinitely. They could be criminals. They could be terrorists. They could be foreign spies. They need to be put in secure accommodation until we know who they are and remain there as they progress through the system. Yet, instead, you allow them to roam unchecked. This is madness. Successive governments have failed to get a handle on this issue and continue to come up with harebrained schemes that cost a lot and achieve little. We already have a scheme that is tried and tested and it needs to return. That of camps that were put in place during and after World War II. We need to put in place secure camps where these people are held while we discover who they are and whether their refugee status is genuine. Once they are vetted and their identity is known, they can then be moved through the system. Either, to return to their homeland or to be prepared to enter British life. They need to be taught English and the necessary skills to become a part of society, while remaining in secure accommodation until it is time for them to integrate into society. It would also be important to engage the services of a refugee service with therapeutic support. Many will have been through severe

trauma and to allow them to bring that into everyday life without any assessment is again dangerous, both to the outside world and the individual.

At present, you, the government, and every Member of Parliament are failing their constituents and you should feel utterly ashamed of your ineptitude at tackling this important issue. Rather than engaging in pointless point-scoring exercises and virtue signalling, you should work together to find a humane and fair way to deal with this situation. It is better for all sides to know that a clear and fair system is in place. By your inaction and feeble efforts, you are putting so many people at risk as it falls to individuals to take matters into their own hands. Your inaction also opens the door wide to allow bigots and racists to take centre stage.

I implore you to not only quash the suggested scheme for Bicester but to also quash the scheme in general and put in its place a comprehensive, well-thought-out scheme to deal with this issue properly. I return you now to the many factual reasons this use of Site A is not possible.

I have concerns about the completeness of the evidence submitted with the application. Important ecological and technical work remains outstanding, and significant questions remain around fire safety, ground conditions and the suitability of the site.

I am particularly concerned that ground contamination has not been fully investigated. Previous land-quality work identified potential contamination issues, yet no borehole investigation has been carried out to resolve those risks.

There are also significant flooding and drainage concerns. Parts of the site are at high risk of surface-water flooding and aspects of the drainage strategy remain unresolved.

The transport evidence also raises serious questions. The Transport Assessment repeatedly refers to the wrong road, while the B4011 serving the site has limited pedestrian infrastructure and a recorded history of serious collisions.

The application has not demonstrated a confirmed permanent solution for essential infrastructure such as electricity and wastewater. I do not believe a development accommodating up to 1,256 people should be approved while such fundamental matters remain unresolved.

The proposal is also exceptionally large for an isolated rural location with little surrounding infrastructure, limited public transport and few services within walking distance.

I am concerned that the extremely short representation period does not provide sufficient time for residents, councils and technical specialists to properly examine such a substantial and complicated application. The application documents run to well over 1,000 pages across multiple technical disciplines, and it is not reasonable to expect them to be read and properly considered in so short a time. Ordinary planning applications carry a minimum 21 day period, and the standard Crown Development route prescribes 21 days at every stage, so I ask that the representation period be extended to at least 21 days from 7 September 2026, to Monday 28 September 2026, since the 21st day falls on a Sunday.

This site has also previously been considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

Taken together, these issues mean I do not believe the applicant has demonstrated that Site A is a suitable location for a development of this scale.

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 is made until outstanding work concerning drainage, flooding, wastewater, contamination, ecology, highways, pedestrian safety, power supply, lighting, noise, fire safety and decommissioning has been completed and made available for proper scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]