From:	Rachel Timbs
To:	Crown Casework
Cc:	joe.marshall@piddingtonpc.org
Subject:	Re: Objection to Urgent Crown Development Application - MOD Bicester (Site A); Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Date:	11 September 2026 21:34:50

Rachel Timbs
[redacted]

11th September 2026

Crown Casework Unit Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Re: Objection to Urgent Crown Development Application MOD Bicester (Site A)
Application reference: PCU/RARE/C3105/3378843
Site: Bicester Garrison, Launton Road, Oxfordshire, OX25 1AE
Applicant: Home Office

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed use of the MOD site for asylum accommodation.

My objection is based principally on public safety, security, the exceptional scale of the proposal and the suitability of this location for accommodating such a large population of single adult men.

The proposal represents a fundamental change in the scale and intensity of activity at this site. This is not a small residential development. It would create a substantial accommodation facility for a very large number of single adult men in an area surrounded by comparatively small rural communities.

The combination of the number of occupants, the predominantly male demographic, the intensity of the proposed accommodation and its location must be properly assessed.

As a woman living in the local community, I am particularly concerned about the consequences for personal safety and the potential impact on the way local residents are able to use roads, footpaths and public spaces, particularly during evenings and at night. I should be able to travel locally, walk in the area and use public spaces without feeling unsafe or anxious.

I recognise that individual occupants must not be prejudged and that asylum seekers are entitled to be treated fairly. However, that does not mean that the demographic characteristics and exceptional concentration of occupants are irrelevant when considering the practical security and public-safety implications of a proposed development.

The planning system expressly recognises public safety, security, crime, disorder and the fear of crime as legitimate considerations. Where a development involves a very large

number of people being accommodated together, these matters require particularly careful assessment.

I am therefore concerned that the application must demonstrate, with evidence rather than general assurances, that the proposed development can be operated safely and securely without creating unacceptable risks or pressures for the surrounding community.

In particular, I believe the following matters require detailed assessment:

* the maximum number of single adult men to be accommodated;
* the proposed ratio, qualifications and experience of on-site security personnel;
* 24-hour security arrangements and incident-response procedures;
* perimeter security and controlled access;
* arrangements for managing occupants entering and leaving the site;
* the potential impact on local roads, footpaths and surrounding communities;
* anticipated additional demand on Thames Valley Police and other emergency services;
* emergency access, evacuation and major incident procedures;
* arrangements for dealing with crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour;
* measures specifically designed to protect women and other potentially vulnerable members of the existing community; and
* whether the proposed security arrangements are genuinely proportionate to the exceptional number and demographic profile of the proposed occupants.

The surrounding community should not be expected simply to accept a significant change in its security environment without proper evidence that the associated risks have been identified, assessed and adequately mitigated.

I therefore ask Crown Developments to provide clear evidence addressing these matters rather than relying upon general assurances that the site will be appropriately managed.

To be clear, my objection is not based on nationality, ethnicity or immigration status. It concerns the proposed land use, the extraordinary scale of the accommodation, the concentration of single adult men at one location, the resulting security considerations and the suitability of this particular site.

A development of this magnitude should not be approved unless there is compelling evidence that it can operate safely and securely without placing an unacceptable additional burden on the surrounding community, local infrastructure or emergency services.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposal and ask that these public-safety and security concerns are given proper and substantial consideration in the planning process.

Yours faithfully,

Rachel Timbs
[redacted]