[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 September 2026 23:07
To: Crown Casework
Subject: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843 – MOD Bicester Site A

Categories: [redacted]

[redacted]

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

I write with my objection to this application.

My objection is not to asylum accommodation in principle, nor to the nationality of those accommodated. It is to the scale, location and apparent rush to approve accommodation for up to 1,256 single adult men without sufficiently demonstrating that this is the right location and operating model for either those residents or the existing community.

A site having capacity for 1,256 people does not make the location suitable for 1,256 people.

1. Scale and location

The proposal would introduce a population of more than 1,000 people into a rural area bordering very small communities, including Piddington.

The assessment must go beyond whether the site itself can physically accommodate them. It must consider the combined impact of 1,256 non-detained residents on the surrounding area.

The Government should demonstrate why 1,256 is an appropriate population for this location, rather than simply the site's maximum capacity, and what criteria were used to select both the location and occupancy level.

It should also explain why accommodation exclusively for single adult men at this scale is considered the appropriate model here, and what alternative occupancy levels and accommodation models were assessed.

2. Existing infrastructure

A population increase of this magnitude inevitably creates additional demand.

The application should demonstrate, at maximum occupancy, the expected impact on:

- policing and emergency services;
- local healthcare, including GPs, hospitals, pharmacies and mental-health services;
- transport and access to Bicester and surrounding areas; and
- wider local infrastructure.

Providing some healthcare on site and minibuses does not remove these impacts.

The assumptions need to be quantified and stress-tested. What additional demand is forecast? What capacity exists? What additional resource is required? Who is funding it?

3. The operating model must be established before approval

Fundamental safeguards should not be deferred until a future service provider is appointed.

For a development of this size, Government should already know the required staffing, security, healthcare, welfare, transport, safeguarding, education and activity provision based upon its existing asylum accommodation operations.

Those requirements, capacity assumptions and funding should be established before planning permission is granted.

Likewise, references to “signposting” residents to services or activities are inadequate. With potentially 1,256 people, provision needs to be measurable and adequately resourced.

There should be sufficient structured provision for English-language learning where needed, volunteering, education, skills, meaningful activity and community integration, alongside clear induction concerning UK laws, rights, responsibilities and expected standards of behaviour.

People need more than food and accommodation. Prolonged inactivity, isolation and lack of purpose are not good for the people being accommodated or the community around them.

4. Risks and contingencies

The Government should demonstrate that the assumptions behind this proposal have been properly stress-tested.

Before approval, there should be clear answers to basic questions:

What happens if policing demand is higher than forecast?
What happens if healthcare capacity is insufficient?
What happens if transport arrangements cannot cope?
What happens if safeguarding or community incidents exceed assumptions?
At what point would occupancy be paused or capped?

A development affecting this many people for potentially ten years should have defined risks, mitigations, accountable owners, funding and intervention thresholds from the outset.

The approach cannot be to reach the accommodation target first and manage unintended consequences afterwards.

These risks should be shared with the affected community - full transparency reduces confusion and fear. Communication is key.

5. Existing residents cannot be an afterthought

The needs of existing residents, including elderly and vulnerable people, must carry proper weight.

This is not a question of whether asylum accommodation should be placed in a “wealthy” or “poor” community. That is the wrong test.

The test should be whether this particular development is appropriate for this particular location.

Residents should not have to absorb an unsuitable development because central Government urgently needs accommodation.

6. Urgency must not drive the wrong decision

I am particularly concerned by the use of the Urgent Crown Development process for a proposal of this scale and duration.

I recognise that Government has an urgent national accommodation problem. However, urgency in solving one problem must not be allowed to create others which local communities and the people accommodated at the site then live with for years.

The correct sequence should be:

right location → right scale → right operating model → proven infrastructure and funding → implementation.

It should **not** be:

available site → maximum occupancy → approval → manage the consequences afterwards.

Additionally, this site was previously considered for asylum accommodation. A smaller proposal was refused by an independent Planning Inspector before subsequently being cancelled.

I therefore ask the Secretary of State not to approve the application unless and until it can be demonstrated that the proposed scale, location, population model, infrastructure, resources, funding and safeguards are appropriate and sustainable at full occupancy.

The central issue is simple:

The fact that MOD Bicester Site A is large enough to accommodate 1,256 people does not demonstrate that placing 1,256 people there is the right decision.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone